JELE

Journal ofEnglish Languageand Education

Editorial Board

PREFACE

We proudly present the *Journal of English Language and Education (JELE) Vol.1, No.2* whichis presented for practitioners and researchers in accomodating their findings of research. By sharing the idea through this journal, it is expected that issues dealing with the English language and teaching can be overcome as it can be a reference to conduct a new research in the future.

This journal comprises seven articles concerning on linguistics and English language teaching. They are categorized into discourse analysis, syllabus design and techniques to teach English that aim to improve the quality of Englishlearning.

We would like to thank to the contributors who have already participated in sharing the ideas towards the content of this journal. We would like also to express our sincere thanks to all members of editorial board who have worked hand in hand in creating this journal. We hope that this fine collection of articles will be beneficial and valuable to stimulate a further research.

Yogyakarta, December 2015

Editor

TABLE OF CONTENT
<u>Vol.1 No.2, December 2015</u>

PROJECT-BASED COLLABORATIVE WRITING IN TEACHING GRAMMAR FOR STUDENTS WITH HIGH AND LOW MOTIVATION

Kunto Nurcahyoko
Dual Masters' Degree Program of The Ohio State University and State University of Semarang
Email: kunto.edu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Although the body of literature has been supporting the use of Project-Based Collaborative Writing (PBCW) to teach grammar, there is still huge urgency to measure its effectiveness for language learners with different motivation. This study aims to investigate the effectiveness of PBCW, the effect of motivation in teaching grammar for ten graders,and the interaction among techniques, motivation, and students' grammar. The study employed a 2X2 factorial research design involving 48 students in two experimental groups and two control groups. The samples were divided into students with high and low motivation group. The data were collected by using pretest and posttest techniques. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for analyzing the data. The result showsthat project-based collaborative writing and collaborative learning techniques are more effective to be used to teach grammar for students with high motivation as compared to students with low motivation. The result also reveals that motivation does not really affect the students' grammar performance. However, there is still different improvement between students with low and high motivation in their grammatical accuracy. Lastly, the analysis of variance shows that there is no interaction among students' motivation, techniques, and students' grammar with the level of significance at 0.934. The study suggests that teachers must be able to consider the presence of both variables in teaching and learning, especially to teach grammatical accuracy.

Keywords : Project-based collaborative learning (PBCW), collaborative learning, high and low motivation, grammar

INTRODUCTION

The body of literature has been suggesting that in learning language, students must not only learn the knowledge by memorizing it but they must also construct the knowledge through several inquiry steps namely observing, questioning, experimenting, associating, networking/ communicating (*PusatKurikulum,* 2013). There have been many studies to support evidence that students who are able to construct language through inquiries steps are those who succeed more academically, especially in learning language.

In Indonesia, English language learners are mostly prone to grammatical inaccuracy. There are

several factors which cause the barrier of learning English. One of them is because the grammatical rules in *Bahasa* Indonesia are different to English. Therefore, English language learners in Indonesia must struggle to understand the basic concept of grammatical features such as the use of tenses, preposition, pronoun, etc.Language learners specifically show such challenge in their writing assignment.

Teaching grammatical accuracy,especially in writing, therefore is challenging for teachers. According to Robb, Ross, and Shortreed (1986), there are several factors limiting a language learnerin improving their writing skill. One of the factors is lack of confidence to produce language output especially in a written form. Besides, a limited language exposure and writing task difficultyare among those limiting factors.

Responding to the problems, several experts have suggested a solution through the implementation of group work activity (Storch, 2005; Skehan, 2009; Dobao, 2012). The approach is believed to be effective to improve students' writing skill. A

study in Indonesia conducted by Ivone (2005) is in favor with the body of literature supporting the collaborative approach. The study reveals that a better writing composition can be achieved through collaboration activities among students.

Therefore, more studies on collaborative learning in foreign language setting are needed. In particular, there is an urgent call for this research to be conducted for students in tenth grade. The grade mainly consists of students from 14-15 years old and is an important stage for a language learner. In this stage, students are considered as an intermediate language learner (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). In Indonesian context, the tenth grade is where students learn more sophisticated structure and grammatical rules, especially in writing. More importantly, one conventional teaching technique like an individual writing task does not seemto give significant improvement on students' writing skills. According to the researcher's observation, most of students encounter such a hard time in this stage because the writing material transcends to be much more

difficult as compared to their junior high school level.

Although it seems that some studies have advocated strong support toward the effectiveness of project-based collaborative learning in improving students' writing skill especially for their grammatical accuracy, there is still a need to examine the topic in foreign language domain. A further inquiry to address iswhether or not project-based learning in writing class is better than collaborative learning itself for the different students with different learning motivation. The previous studies from some project-based learning and collaborative learning have not really touched the possibility of other variables that might affect learning process like motivation factor. A highly-motivated student might be different in taking their learning process as compared to a low-motivated student.

By discussing the project-based learning, the researcher attempts to answer the following research questions: 1) how is the effectiveness of the project-based learning in teaching grammar for the students with high and low motivation? 2)

howis the effectiveness of the collaborative learning in teaching grammar for the students with high and low motivation? 3) how is the effect of motivation for students' grammatical accuracy in a class using project-based learning and collaborative learning? 4) is there any interaction among students' motivation, techniques, and students' grammar?

Literature Review

A study called "*cooperative and collaborative learning strategies for content-area teachers*" by George and Dale (1990) confirms that the collaborative technique can improve a student's academic performance. This study also reveals that collaborative project can help students to comprehend the material better because collaborative technique provide friendlier environment for the students to learn.

Supporting the previous findings, Storch and Wigglesworth (2010)in their study "*What role for collaboration in writing and writing feedback*" once again confirm that the collaboration technique would significantly help the learning process.

In addition, Shehadeh (2011) examines the effectiveness of collaboration-based approach in the language teaching. The study is very important as it provides the proof that the collaborative approach is also positively working for a foreign language settings. Shepperd (1998) reveals that the use of project-based learning and collaborative works have positive influence on students' acquisition of critical thinking. The support of the use of the project-based learning is even stronger. A study namely "*Project OMEGA: A Winning Approach for At-risk Teens*" by Ljung and Blackwell (1996) reveals that project based learning helps the students to enhance their academic performance.

According to some experts, collaborative learning itself can be defined as a learning approach where learners can work as a group to solve a particular academic task (Slavin, 1990; Gillies, 2006). This approach enables the learners to build an interaction among students and increase their confidence because they can engage in a learning process actively with their peers. Collaborative learning is stemmed from the assumption that language learners are 'the creators of that language' themselves (Brown, 2001). Under this conception, languagelearners are the one who have the individual intrinsic motives to develop a writing composition in collaboration with other individuals as part of their social communication.

When language learners are allowed to actively use the language in some collaborative tasks, they can achieve better comprehension. Swain (2001) explains that the collaborative tasks are communicative tasks in the sense that they involve the learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing, or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on the meaning rather than the form.

Project based collaborative writing is a technique of learning where some learners will work in group to organize their learning around some projects for their writing class (Thomas &Mergendoller, 2000). The projects are designed to activate students' higher thinking skill. The role of students is central in project-based collaborative writing as they are expected to learn from autonomous

learning process. The project based learning stimulates the students to engage more in synthesizing, forecasting, producing, evaluating, and reflecting process. Additionally, project-based collaborative writing is also effective in improving students' social participation behavior (working together, initiating, managing, intergroup awareness, and inter-group initiating). Further, Shepperd (1998) also finds that the use of project-based collaborative writing and collaborative works have positive influence on students' acquisition of critical thinking.

In regard to language learning, one of the most important aspects is grammar. Grammar can be defined as a structural regulation of language (DeKeyser, 1995). Most experts believe that grammar is the heart of language teaching and assessment. Therefore, teaching the accurate and correct grammar is central to language learning. Accuracy deals with the correct form of grammar which a language learner composes. Grammatical accuracy also relates to whether a language learner uses an appropriate context for the expected text type of their writing (Storch,

2005; Skehan, 2009). Therefore, grammatical accuracy means the use of correct and accurate grammatical rule in the target language production.

Grammatical accuracy can be also defined as the appropriate use of grammar in a students' composition. Grammatical accuracy is measured by seeing the proportion of error-free sentences of all sentences. However, such measure will not distinguish between types and severities of errors. The errors include syntactical (errors in word order, missing elements) and morphological (verb tense, subject-verb agreement, errors in use of articles and prepositions, errors in word forms).

Beside grammar, another aspect to consider in learning language is motivation. A lot of research in a natural language setting has shown the positive correlation between a student motivation and their language attainment on students (Pintrich& Groot, 1990; Schunk, 1991; Skinner & Belmont, 1993). According to Schunk (1991), motivation is the power of learning activator from a learner. The power and effort include the ability to arrange any necessary preparation to achieve certain academic purpose.

Winkel (2006) explains that motivation is categorized into two domains, namely internal and external motivation. Both motivations are essential for language learners. Motivation also refers to the level of self-engagement that students own toward their academic performance.

METHODS

This study employed experimental research using 2 X 2 factorial design to investigate the effect of the project-based collaborative writing technique for students with high and low motivation students toward their grammatical accuracy in writing. The population of the study was the tenth grader students of SMA N 1 Bangsri in the academic year of 2013/2014. The school is located in Jepara, Central Java, Indonesia. Two English intensive classes participated in this study: XI MIA 3 and XI MIA 4 with48. All students who were enrolled in this class were considered as the intermediate English learners. There was as English entrance test in the beginning of the academic year in that school and the students in both classes

were qualified.

The instrument of data collection included pretest and post-test, questionnaire, students' writing project, and field notes. The questionnaire the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) developed by Pintrich & Groot (1990) was used to determine students' level of motivation. Allinstruments were discussed with the educational experts before being used to collect the data. The experts, who then validated the instruments, were two English Professors at Semarang State University and also an English teacher in SMA N 1 Bangsri.In order to minimize the human error, biased judgment, and subjectivity, the researcher implanted inter-rater reliability.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The implementation of project-based collaborative writing technique in this study was started by instructing the students to make a group of five in every meeting. However, before the students did the project, researcher asked the students to discuss some topics or watch videos

as the ice breaking activities. The projects required the students to work collaboratively in doing one particular project. The topics and projects in each meeting were different. At the end of each meeting, the students were asked to give feedback for the other groups dealing with the story and also their grammatical accuracy.

Project-Based Learning in Experimental Group

The icebreaking activities were given before implementing the project-based collaborative writing. The examples of the icebreaking topics were "the best book you have ever read" and "the best gift you gave ever got". The ice breaking activities were particularly aimed to activate the students' background knowledge before the technique was implemented. Besides, the students had opportunity to interact with their members of group.

After the icebreaking activity, researcher instructed the students to make a group of five. In the experimental group, the students were asked to do some projects in each meeting. The projects required the students to work collaboratively to do

one particular project. The students had to work in a group that they called a "project group". Then, researcher assigned them to discuss the goal of mission each day. The project topicsused mainly involved the art and collaborative writing. For example, the students were asked to compose a group text at the end of each meeting.

Each student within the group had to be responsible for one particular grammar aspect in their writing. The students received information from the researcher about the use of verb tenses, prepositions, articles, and pronouns.

Researcher who served as teacher, asked each student to master onegrammar aspect in each group with the help of researcher. A student with specific expertise had to give comment and provide constructive feedback in terms of students' grammar that they had mastered. Therefore, in one group, there were students who had to mastertheconcept of article, preposition, verb tenses, and pronoun. In this activity, the role of teacher was central. The teacher was the facilitator when the students found difficulties during the discussion process. After giving the comments,

each grammar expert came back to their group and discussed the final revision for their own work. Eventually, each project group produced one jointly written text in the end of the meeting. They were asked to present the result of the project in front of the class. They were also encouraged to provide another feedback for other groups by giving them feedback notes.

The project in the first meeting was to create a movie advertisement. The students had to draw a movie poster that they like and then put a brief description for the poster they made. After finishing the project, the students were asked to take a look at the other groups' works and to give feedback on their writing. The students then came back to their group and discussed their finding about the other groups' works. Then they had to revise their own project. After the discussion, in five minutes, the group had to provide a brief oral presentation to the rest of the class.

The process of the activity was repeated for the second and the third meetings. However, in the second meeting, the project was to create a picture story. The students worked in

group to draw sets of picture about fable stories. In the third meeting, the students were asked to create a chained story. The students worked as a whole class to create a story. The teacher started one sentence, one student continued the sentence, and the next students took turn. In the experimental group, the students were not only required to engage in a teamwork activity to do a project, but also actively participated in the discussion and feedback session.

Collaborative Learning in Control Group

The control group was administrated differently. Although the students in control group used collaborative technique as well, the class did not involve particular projects to solve. The class in control group used the default technique that was suggested by the National Curriculum namely collaborative technique. The technique only suggested the students to collaborate with their peers in doing the writing task without any necessary effort to look for a project solution.In each meeting, the students in control group received regular class using

collaborative instruction as their main activities. The first, second, and third meetings did not have special projects to solve. The discussion was the main activities for the students in the control group. The students had to submit group text also at the end of each meeting.

The icebreaking activities were given to the students in control group in order to activate their background of knowledge. The materials were given by the teacher and students were encouraged to actively participate during the lesson. In the end of the meeting, students were instructed to write jointly written texts.

It is important to note that researcher always monitored the students' progress individually and collectively during the implementation of both techniques. As a whole, the treatments were administered in three meetings. Each class consisted of 90 minutes class meeting. In the experimental group, there was 5 minutes provided for the icebreaking activities, 45 minutes to conduct students' initial discussion and project, and 25 minutes for material comprehension.

At the end of the meeting, the students had 15 minutes to write jointly written text. In the control group, students had 45 minutes for the collaboration without any hand-on project to solve. They were just asked to discuss the material and to write a joint text.The teacher piloted the trialbefore doing the treatment in both groups. During the process of both expert group and main group discussion, the teacher always assisted them in order to be the facilitator when the students found difficulties.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Students' writing compositions were analyzed according to their grammatical accuracy. From the calculation of pretest and posttest results, the mean ratio of grammatical accuracy for highly-motivated students in the experimental group and low-motivated students were increased until 35.58% and 25.55% respectively. And in control group, the mean ratio of grammatical accuracy for highly-motivated students was increased as much as 28.22%. And there is 15.52% improvement of grammatical accuracy for low-motivated students in the control group. The below table shows

the result of ANOVA.

Table 1. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable:Result

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1442.055[a]	3	480.685	2.485	.073
Intercept	36544.059	1	36544.059	188.954	.000
Motivation	589.191	1	589.191	3.046	.088
Techniques	851.515	1	851.515	4.403	.042
Motivation * Techniques	1.350	1	1.350	.007	.934
Error	8509.700	44	193.402		
Total	46495.814	48			
Corrected Total	9951.755	47			

a. R Squared = .145 (Adjusted R Squared = .087)

From the table, the researcher can conclude that:

The significance of techniques

The result of significance of the project-based collaborative writing is measured by looking at the table of tests of between-subjects effects. By looking at the value of significance (sig.) for the technique, researcher draws a conclusion to answer the hypothesis.

The hypothesis:

1) Ho : There is no significant difference on students' grammar between the group which are taught using project based learning and the group which are taught by collaborative learning.

2) Ha :   There is a significant difference on students' grammar between the group which are taught using project based learning and the group which are taught by collaborative learning.

From the tests of between-subject effects table, we could see that the value of sig. for technique is 0.042. This value is equal to 4.2% and lower than 5% of standard error. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. The result reveals that the score of grammar between samples using different techniques are significantly different. The result also infers that the technique received by the students will determine their grammar score. By looking at the results of pretest and posttest, the result also shows higher

improvement on the experimental group.

The significance of students'motivation

The motivation of the students is investigated by looking at the table of tests of between-effects. The significance is showed in the column of significance value (sig.) for the motivation. The score appeared on the column for motivation then is reviewed to determine the accepted hypothesis.

The hypotheses are:

1) Ho : The scores of grammar among samples with different level of motivation are not significantly different.

2) Ha : The scores of grammar among samples with different level of motivation are not significantly different.

From the table of tests between-subject effects, we could see that the value of sig. for motivation is 0.88. This value is equal to 8.8% and this value is higher than 5% of standard error. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Ho is accepted and Ha is rejected. The result concludes that the score of motivation between samples in this study are not

significantly different. Although the posttest results shows improvement from the pretest, the different is not significant. It also infers that the level of students' motivation does not significantly affect the students' grammar.

The interaction among students' motivation, techniques, and students' grammar

Another inquiry to answer through this study is whether or not there is an interaction among students' motivation, techniques, and students' grammar. The study investigated the interaction by looking at the significance value (sig.)

From the table of tests between-subject effects, the result reveals that the value of sig. for motivation is 0.934. This value is equal to 93.4% and this value is higher than 5% of standard error. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Ho is accepted and Ha is rejected. The result basicallyshows that there is no significant interaction among students' motivation, techniques, and students' grammar. Therefore, this result implies that the variables do not affect each other.

From the questionnaire, students in the experimental group say that they enjoy the group work and projects they have done so far. The field notes of the researcher also record that the project-based work in the experimental group makes students to able to positively interact with their peers. The feedback and discussion session help them to understand the grammar better. The students in control group also believe believed that the collaborative activities would work better when they havehand-on project to do. By having a project, they are challenged to actively participate in teaching and learning activities.

Most students with high motivation students respond the idea of collaboration and project-based collaborative writing. They felt that the atmosphere in project-based collaborative writing really encouraged them to learn more. However, for the students with low motivation, the collaborative atmosphere sometime intimidates them to participate in learning. Most students with low motivation in this study are introvert. They also think that they could learn best by

themselves. By having individual learning, they feel more secured and less intimidated. Therefore,

Discussion

This study mainly aims to investigate the effectiveness of the project-based collaborative writing in enhancing students' grammar. The study also tries to reveal how motivation really affects the students' grammatical accuracy. By comparing two classes using different techniques, namely the project-based collaborative writing and the collaborative learning, researcher have analyzed the results to reveal the significance of both the techniques and the motivation using experimental study.

In this study, researcher used two groups: the experimental and the control groups. The experimental group was taught using the project-based collaborative writing and the control group is taught using collaborative learning. The body of literature has provided strong support toward the use of project-based learning, especially in writing (Storch: 2005, Skehan: 2009). However, there is a further need to investigate how this project-based collaborative

writing affects the students' grammar with different level of motivation.

This study believes that the use of project-based collaborative writing is effective to activate the students' learning interest and motivation. The project-based learning is proven to be effective in improving students' grammar. This finding is in favor of the previous studies showing that the project-based learning is significant to enhance students' academic performance in the natural language setting (Horan, Lavaroni, and Beldon: 1996, Storch 2005). The experiment in study shows that project-based collaborative writing is also effective to be used to improve students' grammar, both for the highly-motivated students and also the low-motivated students in foreign language setting. The students in the experimental group receive better improvement as compared to the students in the control group.

The experiment on the project-based collaborative writing also reveals that the students learn grammar in a more positive and friendlier atmosphere. The students are challenged to create a constructive investigation within their own

learning. Thomas (2000) strengthens this point by saying that a project-based learning provides an investigation which is a goal-directed involving inquiry, knowledge building, and resolution. A good project-based learning must involve the transformation and construction of knowledge on the part of the students. Therefore, when the central activities do not challenge students, the technique cannot be called as the project-based learning.

The experiment of this study is in favor with the previous suggestions from the area of collaborative works. The students have undergone some activities and projects which enable them to advocate an autonomous and meaningful learning. They are the center of learning and they also contribute to the other groups' learning. When they are asked to create and make a movie poster or chained story, the students are positively challenged to expand their creativity and collaboration to achieve better performance. Hence, the students are very enthusiastic to show their best in each meeting.

This significant motivating feature does not appear in the control

group as much as in the experimental group. Although the students in the control group perform positive enthusiasm in learning, the collaboration among students is limited to the instruction of the teachers. The students' creativity and enthusiasm are not very well-developed as compared to the experimental group.

The active participation and learning confidence of the students in experimental group also show that the project-based collaborative writing is effective to activate students' critical thinking behavior. The project based learning does not only stimulate the students to engage more in synthesizing, forecasting, producing, evaluating, and reflecting process but also boosts up the students' social participation behavior such as working together, initiating, managing, intergroup awareness, and inter-group initiating.

In regard to the effect of motivation in learning a language, the result shows that the motivation does not significantly affect the students' grammar. Although the results of pretest and posttest in both groups show an improvement, such

improvement is not significant. The students in both experimental and control groups believe that the technique helps them a lot in overcoming the grammar issues. The low motivated students are assisted to participate during the lesson by the collaborative works they do with their peers. Therefore, motivation does not appear to be a significant factor to improve students' grammar in this study.

This study also reveals that there is a no interaction among students' motivation, techniques, and students' grammar. The result of significance value shows that the techniques affect students' grammar and the students' motivation does not affect their grammar score.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The results indicate that the project-based collaborative writing is effective to be used to teach students grammar. The results show that students with high motivation in the experimental group have the highest improvement score among other groups (35.14%). And the students

with low motivation in the control group have the lowest improvement score among others (19.71%). The results also show that there is no interaction among students' motivation, techniques, and students' grammar with sig. value of . 0.934.

Having the treatment of project-based learning to the students of *SMA N 1 Bangsri*, the researcher has several suggestions for teachers, students, and future researcher with similar topic.

Teachers and schools are strongly recommended to apply project-based learning in their classroom. The effectiveness of project-based learning to teach grammar is higher than collaborative learning. Project based learning gives a broadened chance for the students to engage in their learning activities. Additionally, project based learning can promote social interaction among students and enhance their higher thinking skill.

In implementing project-based collaborative writing, teachers must be creative in designing the project and addressing the instruction. Ideally, the project must be based on the authentic problem and must not burden the

students especially dealing with time allocation. However, teachers must understand that the students are the center of learning. The participation of teachers is only expected as the facilitator only. The autonomous learning environment is very important in project-based collaborative writing. This way, students can receive their knowledge without being lectured by the teachers all the time.

REFERENCES

Brown, D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (second edition).* San Fransisco: Pearson Education.

DeKeyser, R. M. (1995). Learning secondlanguagegrammarrules. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 17(3), 379 – 410.

Dobao, F. (2012). Collaborative writing tasks in the L2 classroom: Comparing group, pair, and individual work. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(4), 40–58.

George, J., & Dale, K. (1990).cooperative and collaborative learning strategies for content-area teachers". *Paper presented at the Annual Plains Regional Conference of the International Reading Association (18 th*

Wichita, KS, October 17-20, 1990.

Gillies, R. M. (2006).Teachers and students verbal behaviors during cooperative and small-group learning.*British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *76* (2), 271–287.

Horan, C., Lavaroni, C..&Beldon, P. (1996).Observation of the Tinker Tech Program students for critical thinking and social participation behaviors. Novato, CA: Buck Institute for Education.

Ivone, F. (2005).Teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesia: The urge to improve classroom vocabulary instruction.*TEFLIN Journal, 16(2),* 195-208

Lightbown, P. &Spada, N.(2006).*How language are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Ljung, E. J., & Blackwell, M. (1996).Project OMEGA: A winning approach for at-risk teens. Illinois School Research and Development Jounal, 33, 15-17

Pintrich, P.R.,& Groot, E. (1990). Motivational and self-regulatedlearning components of classroomacademicperformance.*Journal of Educational Psychology,* 82(1), 33-40.

PusatKurikulum. (2013). *Kajian standar proses kurikulum 2013*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.

Robb, T., Ross, S. &Shortreed, I. (1986).Salience feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality.*TESOL Quarterly*, *20*(1), 82-94.

Schunk, D. H. (1991).Self-efficacy and academic motivation.*Educational Psychologist, (26)*, 207-231.

Shehadeh, A. (2011). Effects and student perceptions of collaborative writing in L2.*Journal of Second Language Writing*, *20*(4), 286–305.

Shepherd, H. G. (1998). The probe method: A problem-based learning model's effect on critical thinking skills of fourth- and fifth- grade social studies students. Dissertation Abstract International, Section A: Humanitie and Social Sciences, September 1988. 59 (3-A), p. 0779.

Skehan, P. (2009). Modeling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. *Applied Linguistics, 30* (3), 510–532.

Skinner, E.A., & Belmont, M.J (1993). Motivation in the classroom:reciprocal effect of teacherbehavior and studentengagementacross the schoolyear. *Journal of Educational Psychology*,85(4), 571-581.

Slavin, R. E. (1990). Cooperative learning. *Review of Educational Research, 50* (2),

315–342.

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(2), 153–173.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010).Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 303–334.

Swain, M. (2001). Integrating language and content teaching through collaborative tasks. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 58*(3), 44–63.

Thomas, J.W (2000). A Review of research on project-based learning. California: The Autodesk Foundation.

Thomas, J. W. &Mergendoller, J. R. (2000). Managing project-based learning: Principles from the field. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Winkel, F. W. (2006). Peer Support Groups: Evaluating the mere contact / mere sharing model and some impairment hypotheses. *Victimology: International Perspectives, 2*(1), 101-114.