

**APPENDIX A
FORMAT OF ASSESSMENT**

Student: **Date :**..... **Topic :**.....

Score	Level	Descriptors
Content	30 – 27	Excellent to Very Good: knowledgeable; substantive; thorough development of thesis; relevant to assigned topic.
	26 – 22	Good to Average: some knowledge of subject; adequate range; limited development of thesis; mostly relevant to topic; but lacks detail
	21 – 17	Fair to Poor: limited knowledge of subject; little substance; inadequate element of topic
	16 – 13	Very Poor: does not show knowledge of subject; non-substantive; not pertinent; Or not enough to evaluate
Organization	20 – 18	Excellent to Very Good: fluent expression; ideas clearly stated/ supported; succinct; well-organized; logical sequencing; cohesive
	17 – 14	Good to Average: somewhat choppy; loosely organized but main ideas stand out; limited support; logical but incomplete sequencing
	13 – 10	Fair to Poor: non-fluent; ideas confused or disconnect; lacks logical sequencing and development
	9 – 7	Very Poor: does not communicate; no organization; Or not enough to evaluate.
Vocabulary	20 – 18	Excellent to Very Good: sophisticated range; effective word/idiom choice and usage; word form mastery; appropriate register
	17 – 14	Good to Average: adequate range; occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured
	13 – 10	Fair to Poor: limited range; frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage; meaning confused or obscured.
	9 – 7	Very Poor: essentially translation; little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form; Or not enough to evaluate.
Language Use	25 – 22	Excellent to Very Good: effective complex construction; few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions.
	21 – 18	Good to Average: effective but simple constructions; minor problems in complex constructions; several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured.
	17 – 11	Fair to Poor: major problems in simple/complex constructions; frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions; meaning confused or obscured.
	10 – 5	Very Poor: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules; dominated by errors; does not communicate; Or not enough to evaluate.
Mechanics	5	Excellent to Very Good: demonstrates mastery of conventions; few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing
	4	Good to Average: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing; but meaning not obscured.
	3	Fair to Poor: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing; poor handwriting; meaning confused or obscured.
	2	Very Poor: no mastery of conventions; dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing; handwriting illegible; Or not enough to evaluate.
TOTAL SCORE	READER	COMMENTS
	
	
	

Adapted from Jacobs, HL. Hughey, JB., Wormuth, DR., Hartfiel, VF. 1983. *Teaching ESL Composition: Principles and Technique*. London: Newbury House. Page: 140.

**APPENDIX B
STUDNETS' OBSERVATION SHEET**

Meeting :

Cycle :

Student :

Phase	Indicator	Score
Apperception	1. Doing daily activity	
	2. Focus on objective	
	3. Listening to explanation	
	4. Involvement in activating prior knowledge	
	5. Involvement forming the group	
	6. Comprehending the task	
Exploration	1. Understanding the worksheet	
	2. Questioning	
	3. Involvement in group discussion	
	4. Involvement in finishing the worksheet	
	5. Work in group	
	6. Attention to media	
	7. Preparing the report	
	8. Reporting the group work	
	9. Responding the report	
Reflection	1. Responding the conclusion	
	2. Reflection	
Total		

Medan,

Observer,

(.....)

APPENDIX C
LECTURER'S OBSERVATION SHEET

Meeting :

Cycle :

Phases	Indicator	Score
Apperception	1. Instructing topic and objective of learning	
	2. Choosing the topic and its importance	
	3. Activating the students' prior knowledge	
	4. Designing the group	
	5. Explaining the students' work in group	
	6. Explaining the group responsibility	
	7. Motivating the students	
	8. Providing the media of elaring	
Exploration	1. Instructing the students to comprehend the worksheet	
	2. Ask the students to find the points	
	3. Helping the students to learn and work together	
	4. Helping the students to solve the problems	
	5. Asking the group to prepare the report	
	6. Managing the queue of presentation	
	7. Managing the queue of response	
	8. Modelling	
	9. Refelction	
	10. Real scoring	
Reflection	1. Responding the learning activity	
	2. Doing daily activity	
Total		

Medan,

Collaborator

APPENDIX D
STUDENTS' PSYCHOLOGICAL QUESTIONNAIRE CHECKLIST
(For Student)

Meeting:

Cycle :

Student :

No	Descriptors	Done				Note
		1	2	3	4	
1	Dengan metode pengajaran pada pertemuan ini, saya menjadi lebih memahami cara menulis eksposisi					
2	Metode ini membuat saya lebih berfikir sistematis dalam membuat sebuah karangan eksposisi					
3	Selama mengikuti pertemuan ini, saya menjadi lebih percaya diri untuk memberikan ide-ide kepada rekan sekelompok					
4	Metode ini membuat saya lebih bisa bekerjasama dengan rekan sekelompok					
5	Selama menjadi anggota kelompok, saya merasa harus berperan agar kelompok kami menjadi kelompok yang terbaik dibanding dengan kelompok lainnya					
6	Kemampuan berbicara saya dapat saya terapkan dengan lebih baik					
7	Dengan metode ini, saya dapat lebih menghargai pendapat rekan lain yang lebih baik dibanding pendapat saya sendiri					
8	Belajar menulis eksposisi dengan menggunakan metode ini menjadi lebih menyenangkan dibanding metode yang selama ini digunakan					
9	Saya merasa dengan menggunakan metode ini kemampuan menulis eksposisi saya lebih baik dibanding sebelumnya					
10	Jika dosen Writing 2 saya terus menggunakan metode ini dalam mengajar maka saya yakin kemampuan menulis saya akan jauh lebih bagus jika dibandingkan dengan metode sebelumnya					
11	Topik yang kami tulis menarik karena memang datangnya dari kami					
12	Belajar dengan metode ini lebih memotivasi saya untuk terus mengikuti program ini					
13	Metode ini menyenangkan bagi saya dalam belajar menulis					
14	Dalam menilai kemampuan, keaktifan mahasiswa dalam proses belajar mengajar dilibatkan					

Catatan:

1. Tidak Setuju Medan,
2. Kurang Setuju Student,
3. Setuju
4. Setuju Sekali

(.....)

APPENDIX E VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

1. Validity of the Test

In measuring the validity of the test, the researcher used *correlation product moment*. Since it was the essay test and consisted 1 item of writing, the researcher only analyzed the score of pre test and post test. And both scores were correlated one each other.

The following formula was used:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

N : Number of Students

X : Score of Pre Test

Y : Score of Post Test

The Calculation of Validity and Reliability

No	X	Y	XY	X ²	Y ²
1	55	65	3575	3025	4225
2	50	60	3000	2500	3600
3	60	75	4500	3600	5625
4	60	75	4500	3600	5625
5	70	83	5810	4900	6889
6	65	75	4875	4225	5625
7	65	80	5200	4225	6400
8	70	78	5460	4900	6048
9	50	65	3250	2500	4225
10	60	70	4200	3600	4900
11	50	60	3000	2500	3600
12	65	75	4875	4225	5625
13	70	85	5950	4700	7225
14	70	80	5600	4900	6400
15	50	65	3250	2500	5200
16	50	60	3000	2500	3600
17	50	60	3000	2500	3600
18	55	60	3300	3025	3600
19	60	75	4500	3600	5625
20	65	85	5525	4225	7225
21	70	80	5600	4900	6400
22	50	60	3000	2500	3600
23	70	80	5600	4900	6400

24	65	78	5070	4225	6084
25	55	65	3575	3025	4225
26	50	60	3000	2500	3600
27	50	60	3000	2500	3600
28	50	65	3250	2500	4225
29	60	70	4200	3600	4900
30	50	60	3000	2500	3600
31	60	75	4500	3600	5625
32	55	70	3850	3025	4900
33	55	65	3575	3025	4225
34	50	60	3000	2500	3600
35	60	75	4500	3600	5625
36	60	75	4500	3600	5625
37	70	83	5810	4900	6889
38	65	75	4875	4225	5625
39	55	65	3575	3025	4225
40	50	60	3000	2500	3600
	2340	2815	168850	138900	201435
	58.5	70.38			

$$r_{xy} = \frac{40 \times 168850 - (2340)(2815)}{\sqrt{[40 \times 138900 - 5475600][40 \times 201435 - 7924225]}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{6754000 - 6587100}{\sqrt{[5556000 - 5475600][8057400 - 7924225]}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{166900}{\sqrt{[80400][133175]}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{166900}{\sqrt{10707270000}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{166900}{32721.9651}$$

$$r_{xy} = 5.1005$$

From the data, it can be found that the r_{xy} was 5.1005. Then, the degree of freedom was $n-2$ or $40-2$, it means that the degree of freedom was 38. After consulted to r critic, the near df of 38 was 40. On 5% significance, the value was 2.021. It means that r table 5.1005 > r critic 2.021. It can be concluded the test that was given to the students was valid.

2. Reliability

In determining the reliability of the test, the following formula was used.

$$t = \frac{2xr}{1+r}$$

$$t = \frac{2 \times 5.1005}{1 + 5.1005}$$

$$t = \frac{10.201}{6.1005}$$

$$t = 1.672$$

From the result of that calculation, it indicated that the test was reliable.



