Workshop Writing in Composing Paragraph to Improve Students' Writing Skills at SMA Negeri 1 Sampolawa'S Eighth Grade

Hasrida Ardin[1], Hikmawati[1]

[1]Universitas Muslim Buton, Indonesia
*Correspondence: Hasridaardin332@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not using collaborative writing to compose paragraphs improves students' writing abilities at SMA Negeri 1 Sampolawa's VIII grade students. It also sought to determine whether or not using collaborative writing sparks students' interest in writing. An experiment using a quassi design was used in this study. Cluster random sampling was utilized as the sample-taking technique, with two classes out of three being taken. 25 students from the XI IPA-2 class were separated into an experimental group by the researcher. and the XI IPA-1 class, which served as the control group, had 25 students. As a result, 50 students made up the research sample. The test and questionnaire served as the study instrument. The research tool was categorized using multiple methods. Pretest, posttest, and questionnaire were those.The results of this study demonstrated that, following treatment with the collaborative writing approach, students' English writing proficiency increased. Based on the experimental group's pretest mean score of 65.97 and posttest mean score of 77.23. The research's hyphotesis resulted in notable effects. Based on the average student perception score of 3,87—a very high level—it is determined.

1. Introduction

Writing, in the words of Siahaan (2008), is the writer's capacity to communicate ideas and information to readers. Writing can also help a person get greater understanding of himself. Writing is meant to communicate ideas and thoughts of the writer in a clear and comprehensive manner. Writing is therefore a creative process that involves expressing ideas and thoughts through written language for a variety of objectives, including convincing, entertaining, and enlightening (Prihandoko et al., 2021; Hasnia et al., 2022). Writing or composition are other terms that are frequently used to describe the end products of the creative process. Writing and composition both relate to the same outcomes, despite some people's claims to the contrary (Rahman et al., 2019; Junaid et al., 2024).

Writing is one of the most significant human accomplishments because of its diversity and purpose, according to Hulon (1981). Writing has the power to imply, inspire, convince, enlighten, educate, and direct. Writing can be as basic as a one-sentence letter, as complex as a book full of philosophical debates, as self-expression, as impersonal as a work report, or as great as a subject and recommendation work. Its creation can arouse feelings in us such as pride and happiness or anxiety and frustration (Malecki, 2023; Prihandoko et al., 2022; Suma et al., 2024) Due to faulty human security, its content is prone to bias and inaccuracies. Its perfection depends on very various evaluation values, and its validity depends on language logic and societal conventions and prejudices.

Handley (2013) asserts that a proficient writer possesses auxiliary skills. Supporting competences show how well the writer understands the subject matter. These competencies are: 1) Content that is well-written anticipates readers' queries. It is the reader who gains from effective writing, not the writer. Not overly so. 2) Facts are the foundation of well-written material. Data provides context for your material and increases your trustworthiness. Offer evidence to back up your claims: Data, interpretation, confirmation, and curation. Your opinions, convictions, and points of view might or might not be reflected in the narrative, depending on what you like to convey. But stuff that is grounded in reality rather than just your personal viewpoint is more reliable.

3) Effective writing and instruction are comparable. Effective writing strives to make things more plain, even in the case of a basic product description, and to make sense of our surroundings. 4) A well-written piece tells the whole narrative. Writing well resolves contradictions. 5) Excellent writing comes through in rewriting. That implies, of course, that there has been rewriting. It ought to, too. Writing is labor-intensive, and it's usually disappointing to turn in a subpar first draft. The most crucial step, though, is to get started writing so that you may begin to piece together what appears to be a coherent narrative.

6) Writing well is similar to arithmetic. There are two meanings to this: First of all, well-written writing is ordered and logical. It is the writer's enormous task to translate a disorganized collection of ideas into something coherent and understandable. 7) However, simple writing is not always simple. Business can be complex, just like life. Products might be involved, or concepts might seem unsolvable. However, well-written material eliminates business jargon and substitutes understandable human language to simplify complex ideas into plain, intelligible English. 8) Previous opinions have no bearing on good writing. Rather, it opts to convey them in a more efficient manner. This is where you can differentiate yourself with style, whether it's on your website or in your writing. 9) A word about authors: Expert authors are not haughty. The majority of exceptionally talented writers I know still find it hard to refer to themselves as writers because the term is linked to works of literary perfection. However, as with many other achievements in life, the label of "good parent" or "successful" feels more meaningful when it comes from someone else.

One of the issues here is that the students are unable to write. When requested to write, they write in their mother tongue, which is their first language, rather than in English. They are not required to utilize English in English classes, which is the cause. Students' writing difficulties are mostly caused by a lack of appropriate vocabulary, weak sentence construction abilities, and a lack of enthusiasm for writing assignments.

Writing issues, like any other learning issue, can negatively affect a child's education and self-esteem, according to Levine (2002). Children are required to utilize written language to communicate their understanding of a wide range of topics as they move through the educational system. These additional demands will not allow a youngster to write as swiftly and smoothly as they need to achieve unless they have learned certain fundamental skills. In fact, for kids who have trouble with writing assignments, writing itself is a learning barrier. When pupils are up against overwhelming odds, they struggle to remain motivated.

As a result, writing issues rarely occur on their own, and improving non-writing skills undoubtedly helps one's writing abilities. Hence, issues in one of these domains typically impede the child's growth as a writer. The author's techniques can also be used to assess an author's effectiveness in writing. Writers are able to cultivate efficient methods and writing strategies. One way to conceptualize strategies is as a learner's approach to and management of a task. The purpose of these activities is to get the writer involved in the listening process. In Asmita (2023), Jim Collins (2008) asserts that effective writing is a skill that must be developed. Skilled writers use mental processes to arrange their written work. they refer to these thought processes as writing methods (Tarin & Yawiloeng, 2023; Jansen, 2023; Yaumi et al., 2024; 2023). Writing strategies are systematic and focused methods for improving writing abilities and group writing in both Indonesian and English.

Carla (2014) defines collaborative writing as an endeavor in which multiple people cooperate to produce a written work as opposed to working alone. Many projects are developed without oversight, but some are overseen by an editor or group of editors. Collaborative writing is another effective way to teach beginning writers how to write. Language, or collaborative writing, is a human communication system that uses arbitrary signals, such noises, gestures, and written symbols, to transfer ideas thoroughly from one person to another so that others might act in precisely the same way as Nordquist (2002) stated.

A paragraph is a piece of writing. A paragraph is made up of multiple sentences. Siahaan (2008) divides paragraphs into three parts: the introduction, the body, and the end. The first paragraph is referred to as the beginning. Usually, it consists of just one sentence. That is the paragraph's most significant sentence. It serves as the first sentence. In technical terms, the paragraph is also referred to as the topic sentence. The second part is referred to as the body. It is made up of multiple sentences that reinforce one another. Each of these sentences elaborates on the topic sentence. Writers typically classify them according to the many uses for which they are intended. The primary phrases that provide support belong to the first group. It all comes down to how many divisions the topic sentence's major elements have. They are directly related to the central notion. A powerful paragraph must include multiple supporting main sentences. The second type of sentences are minor supporting sentences. The primary supporting sentence may be followed by one or more subordinate supporting sentences. They are all concentrating on explaining the primary supporting

assertion. They are directly related to the primary supporting assertion. They also elucidate on the topic sentence in an indirect manner.

2. Methodology

The study used a quassi experimental design for its design. It implies that two groups were used by the researcher. They were the control group and the experimental group. The Control Group was the class control, while the Experimental Group was the class experiment that used the Collaborative Writing approach to see if the students' writing skills improved.

formula:

$$EG: \quad O_1 \quad X_1 \quad O_2$$
$$CG: \quad O_1 \quad \qquad O_2$$

Notification:

EG: Experimental group

CG: Control group

 O1:   Pre-test both experimental and control group

X1:   Treatment for experimental group using collaborative writing method

O2:   Post-test, both experimental and control group

Gay, et all (2005)

Variables in the study there were two variables that were examined in this study, and they were as follows: 1) The method of collaborative writing served as the independent variable 2) Writing proficiency in terms of vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics was the dependent variable. This research divided to two population and sample. Arikunto (2007) states that the population is the entire topic of investigation. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1990), the population is the sizable group to which the outcome should be applied. In other terms, the population refers to the group that the researcher is interested in and wants to generalize the study's findings to. The entire VIII grade student body of SMA Negeri 1 Sampolawa for the academic year 2023–2024 served as the research population. There were more than 68 students in all. There were three classes in all. According to Arikunto (2007), a sample is a portion of the population that will be injected. The researcher employed cluster random sampling to select a sample from the population for this investigation. That took two classes, and after that the writer divided one class VIII-2 class as experimental group and VIII-1 class as control group.

Intrument of the research by Pretest, posttest, and questionnaires were employed by the researcher to gather data for the study. A pretest and a posttest were utilized to gauge how much the pupils' writing abilities had improved. The three components of the writing assessment were used by the researcher to evaluate the students' progress in writing. The three parts of a writing assessment are mechanics, grammar, and vocabulary. The researcher gave the students an instrument that had choices related to their experiences, and they were asked to select one thing from a list of ten choices to compose a paragraph of narrative text that matched their experiences. Students were asked to complete a questionnaire to gauge their interest in the use of collaborative writing as a teaching strategy for the writing process. The pupils were given a questionnaire consisting of twenty items, ten of which were positive and ten of which were negative.

Data collection technique used pretest, posttest and questionaire. Pre-test was given before treatment. Pre-test aimed to find out the students' skill in writing before treatment. The format of pre-test was based on the form of narrative paragraph. The kind of the test was objectice text. The researcher employed this kind because concentrated upon the reality of the students' experiences. The researcher administered pre-test to the students regarding narrative paragraph that focused on vocabulary, grammar and mechanic. After the researcher provided a selection of ten-sentence topics related to the students' experiences, the students selected a topic to create a narrative paragraph that fit the students' experiences.

Pre- and post-tests were administered in the identical format to the experimental and control groups. Both the control group and the experiment group received the pre-test. Eight sessions were held by the researcher: one for the pre-test, six for the treatment (collaborative writing method), and one for the post-test. After doing the treatment, the researcher gave a post-test to the experimental and control group. The aim of post-test were to find out learners' improvement after joining the treatment to see the effectiveness of using collaborative writing method to develop students' writing skill. After giving the students' post-test, the researcher distributed questionaire to the students. The questionaire gave to the experimental group only to gain information about the students' interest using Collaborative writing method in teaching learning process.

3. Result and Discussions

3.1 Findings

a. Students' ability to write

The classification scores of the pretest and posttest in vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics are used in these findings to describe the research's conclusions. Additionally, it describes the pretest and posttest mean scores and standard deviations for the experimental and control groups.

The students' pre- and post-test classification scores and means
The author provides the frequency and mean score of the students for the experimental and control groups on the pretest and posttest in the tables below. The pupils' ability to write in terms of vocabulary . The following tables show the frequency and percentage of vocabulary-based writing skills among students in the Experimental and Control Groups:

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Writing skill in Term of Vocabulary in Pretest

Score	Classification	Experimental Group		Control Group	
		F	%	F	%
18-20	Excellent to very good	0	0	0	0
14-17	Good to average	15	60	10	40
10-13	Fair to poor	10	40	14	56
7-9	Very poor	0	0	1	4
	Total	25	100	25	100

The experimental group was classified as good to average in the majority in the above table, and fair to poor in the minority. Ten kids, or forty percent, were classified as poor achievers, and fifteen students, or sixty percent, were classified as high achievers for the Experimental Group. In the Control Group, 10 kids, or 40% of the total, were high achievers, while 15 students, or 60% of the total, were poor achievers.

Table. 2 Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Writing Skill in term of Vocabulary in Posttest

Score	Classification	Experimental Group		Control Group	
		F	%	F	%
18-20	Excellent to very good	19	76	1	4
14-17	Good to average	4	16	21	84
10-13	Fair to poor	2	8	3	12
7-9	Very poor	0	0	0	0
	Total	25	100	25	100

According to the above table, following the therapy, the majority of the students in the Experimental group were classified as excellent to very good, while the Control Group was classified as good to average. Within the Experimental Group, two kids, or eight percent, were classified as poor achievers, while 23 students, or 92 percent, were classified as high achievers. In the Control Group, there were only 3 kids, or 12%, in the poor achiever category and 22 students, or

88 percent, in the high achiever category. It is clear that both groups increased as a result of the treatment. The following table displays the vocabulary achievement of the pupils along with its mean score and standard deviation.

Table 3. Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Writing Skill in Term of Vocabulary in Pretest and Posttest

	Group	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pretest	Experimental Group	13.84	1.68
	Control Group	13.28	1.9
Posttest	Experimental Group	15.84	1.46
	Control Group	15.64	1.47

The posttest results for the students in the Experimental and Control Groups showed an increase in vocabulary, as seen in the table above. It is evident from the fact that, for the Experimental Group, the mean score on the pretest was 13.84 and the mean score on the posttest was 15.84, while, for the Control Group, the mean scores on the pretest and posttest were 13.28 and 15.64, respectively. Conclusion: The experimental group's posttest mean score on the vocabulary term was greater than the control group's.

The grammar-related writing skills of the pupilsThe following table displays the frequency and proportion of the students' grammar in the experimental and control groups:

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage of the students' Writing Skill in Term of Grammar in Pretest

Score	Classification	Experimental Group		Control Group	
		F	%	F	%
18-20	Excellent to very good	0	0	0	0
14-17	Good to average	3	12	3	12
10-13	Fair to poor	22	88	21	84
7-9	Very poor	0	0	1	4
	Total	25	100	25	100

The majority of the students in the Experimental and Control Groups fell into the poor achiever category, as can be seen from the table above. In the Experimental Group, 22 students, or 88 percent, were classified as low achievers, categorized as fair to poor, and 3 students, or 12 percent, were classified as high achievers, categorized as good to average. In contrast, in the Control group, 22 students, or 88 percent, were classified as low achievers, categorized as fair to poor and very poor, and only 3 students, or 12 percent, were classified as high achievers, categorized as good to average. It is clear from the above chart that more has to be done to improve the pupils' grammar skills, since they still need to be improved.

Table 5. Frequency and Percentage of the students' Writing Skill in Term of Grammar in Posttest

Score	Classification	Experimental Group		Control Group	
		F	%	F	%
18-20	Excellent to very good	2	8	0	0
14-17	Good to average	14	56	14	56
10-13	Fair to poor	9	36	11	44
7-9	Very poor	0	0	0	0

	Total	25	100	25	100

Most of the table indicates that the Experimental group was rated as excellent to very excellent. Average to good ratings were seen in the control group. Following treatment, both groups had a tendency to fall into the high achiever category. Within the experimental group, 16 kids, or 64 percent, were classified as high achievers, and 9 students, or 36 percent, were classified as low achievers. In the control group, 11 kids, or 44% of the total, were in the low achiever category and 14 students, or 56%, were in the high achiever category.It is also evident in the following table, which shows the mean score and standard deviation of the students' grammar achievement:

Table 6. Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Writing Skill in Term of Grammar in

Pretest and Posttest

	Group	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pretest	Experimental Group	15.08	2.55
	Control Group	14.4	2.36
Posttest	Experimental Group	18	1.87
	Control Group	16.92	2.03

The table above indicates that there was an increasing on the students posttest in term of Grammar of the experimental and control group. It can be seen in the mean score of the students' pretest was 15.08 and the mean score of students' posttest 18.00 for experimental group, while for control group the mean score of the students' pretest was 14.40 and the mean score of students posttest was 16.92. in fact, the mean score of posttest in term of Grammar in experimental group was higher that control group.

b. Analysis of Questionnaires

Students were given a questionnaire to fill out in order to get their opinions about the things that help them become better writers. The questionnaire consists of 20 items. Based on the result of tabulating data of questionnaire items it showed the total score of questionnaire (1) 111 with the mean score 4.44, the total score of questionnaire (2) 77 with the mean score 3.08, the total score of questionnaire (3) 107 with the mean score 4.28, the total score of questionnaire (4) 108 with the mean score 4.32, the total score of questionnaire (5) 107 with the mean score 4.28, the total score of questionnaire (6) 94 with the mean score 3.76, the total score of questionnaire (7) 82 with the mean score 3.28, the total score of questionnaire (8) 87 with the mean score 3.48, the total score of questionnaire (9) 69 with the mean score 2.76, the total score of questionnaire (10) 100 with the mean score 4.0, the total score of questionnaire (11) 104 with the mean score 4.16, the total score of questionnaire (12) 112 with the mean score 4.88, the total score of questionnaire (13) 109 with the mean score 4.36, the total score of questionnaire (14) 116 with the mean score 4.64, the total score of questionnaire (15) 76 with the mean score 3.04, the total score of questionnaire (16) 95 with the mean score 3.8, the total score of questionnaire (17) 98 with the mean score 3.92, the total score of questionnaire (18) 109 with the mean score 109, the total score of questionnaire (19) 66 with the mean score 2.64, and the total score of questionnaire (20) 110 with the mean score 4.4.

Based on the result of tabulating each questionnaire items, the graded score of each questionnaire was described in the following table:

Table 7. The Classification of Graded Score of Each Questionnaire

No	Score	Frequency	Classification
1	4.20-5.00	9	Very High
2	3.40-4.19	6	High
3	2.60-3.39	5	Average

| 4 | 1.80-2.59 | - | Low |
| 5 | 1.00-1.79 | - | Very Low |

Based on the table above, the writer found the classification of students' perception towards factors that cause the students' in improving their writing skill on the items of questionnaire was very high perception towards that factors where the score of 9 questionnaire items had score was 4.20-5.00 and classified very high, 6 questionnaire items had score was 2.60-3.39 and classified high, and 5 questionnaire items had score was 2.60-3.39 and classified average. Where the average of the means score was 3.87 which was classified very high.

3.2 Discussion

a. Writing Skill

Based on the finding above, the comparison of the improvement of students' skill of Experimental and Control group can be proved by analyzing the posttest result. The result showed that the mean score of the students' posttest both the groups increased after giving the treatment. It can be seen through the mean score of the students score of the students' pretest was 65.97 becoming 77.23 for the experimental group, while the students' pretest for control group was 63.26 becoming 73.91. In this case, both of the groups increased after giving a treatment, but experimental group was higher that the control group (77.23>73.91). The result of posttest indicated that the use of Collaborative Writing gave significant progress on students' skill.

Comparing with the students pretest and posttest, the result of the pretest for both of the groups, Experimental and Control group were almost the same level. The differences between the two groups can be seen from the mean score of pretest and posttest. The mean score of pretest and posttest which was obtained from Experimental group were 65.97 and 77.23. While, the mean scores of pretest and posttest for the control group were 63.26 and 73.91. It means that students' pretest and posttest scores for both groups are statistically different, where the mean score of pretest for both groups were in the same level before being given a treatment. However, after treatment, there was a significance difference.

In addition, the score between pretest and posttest of Experimental group was 65.97<77.23. The students' skill increased about 11.26. It indicates that there is significant progress before and after treatment by using Collaborative Writing Method. While, the pretest and posttest score of control group was 63.26<73.91. It means that the students' skill increased about 10.65. It could be stated that than the control class.

After seeing the result of data analysis, the writer found that the P-Value was higher than α (0.045>0.05) where the P-Value (0.045) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom 48. It indicated that the alternative hypothesis (H1) was accepted and null hypothesis (H0) was rejected

Based on test results, showed that the students could write for the researcher using collaborative writing method. It was because they have a lot of vocabulary that made them could understand what the collaborative writing which using narrative paragraph. Based on the data collected, the researcher gave them 10 topics about experiences and then the students chose one of list items. After that, the students wrote their experiences of each group.

The researcher found that the research significance, it supported by Christopher (2011) In examining the positive comments provided by students, we noticed that they could be placed clearly into five discrete categories.

b. Analysis of questionnaires

Based on the study's findings, the majority of students believe that certain elements contribute to their ability to write better on all of the questionnaire's items. The majority of students' opinions, according to the researcher, strongly agree with the elements that lead to students' improvement of their writing abilities. It was demonstrated by the classification of the questionnaire items' positions, which was quite high. Nine questionnaire items had scores between 4.20 and 5.00, and six questionnaire things had scores of 3.87. Test findings demonstrated that the students could use the collaborative writing method to write for the researcher. It was their extensive vocabulary that allowed them to comprehend what the collaboration.

4. Conclusion

Based on the research finding and discussion in the previous chapter, the writer concludes the result of this research as follows: 1)The use Collaborative Writing improving students' writing skill, it was proved by the mean score of the students' posttest in Experimental Group is higher than Control Group. It can be seen from the students' mean score of posttest was 77.23 for Experimental Group, while for Control Group the students' mean score of posttest was 73.91, and T- Test of the students' writing skill in Experimental and Control Group in posttest was higher than α (0.06>0.05). 2) The goal of the questionnaire was to determine the variables that contributed to students' improvement of their writing abilities when they enrolled in the writing program. The author has identified the factors that influenced students' perceptions of the factors as explained by the questionnaire items. The questionnaire items were categorized with scores ranging from 4.20 to 5.00, which indicates a very high position. Six questionnaire items were classified as high, with scores between 3.40 and 4.19, and five questionnaire items were classified as average, with scores between 2.60 and 3.39. where the mean score as a whole was 3.87.

References

Arikunto, S. (2007). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik* (6th ed.). Rineka Cipta.

Collins, J. (2008). *Writing for success: Methods and strategies for effective writing*. Learning Express.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (1990). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2005). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (8th ed.). Pearson.

Handley, A. (2013). *Everybody writes: Your go-to guide to creating ridiculously good content*. Wiley.

Hasnia, H., Andini, C. ., Tahir, M. D. ., Hunaeni, H., Zulfikariandi, Z., & MT, M. . (2022). The Ability of 1st Class Students of SMAN 11 Enrekang to Arrange Verbal and Nominal Sentences. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 5*(3), 539-550. https://doi.org/10.34050/elsjish.v5i3.23171

Hulon, W. (1981). *The art of writing: Crafting compelling communication*. XYZ Publishing.

Jansen, L. S. (2023). *Writing In Engineering: Teaching Higher-Order Writing Techniques To Engineering Students In An Extended Degree Programme* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria).

Junaid, S., Nahdhiyah, N., Dahlan, D., Andini, C., & Muh. Dzulhijjah, A. (2024). The Portrayal of African Woman's Struggle Reflected in the Novel "How Beautiful We Were" By Imbolo Mbue (2021). *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 7*(2), 275-284. https://doi.org/10.34050/elsjish.v7i2.34882

King, C. (2014). *The art of collaborative writing*. Collaborative Writing Press.

Levine, M. (2002). *A mind at a time: America's top learning expert shows how every child can succeed*. Simon & Schuster.

Malecki, W. P. (2023). Rorty's Kind of Writing: Style, Genre, and Rhetoric. *In Handbuch Richard Rorty* (pp. 119-136). Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.

Nordquist, R. (2002). *Language and writing systems: The keys to communication*. Random House.

Prihandoko, L. A., Anggawirya, A. M., & Rahman, F. (2021, December). Students' perceptions towards autonomous learners concept in academic writing classes: Sequential mixed-method. *In International Joined Conference on Social Science* (ICSS 2021) (pp. 487-491). Atlantis Press.

Prihandoko, L. A., Al Ahmad, A. S. M., Fredy, F., & Rahman, F. (2022). Multi-regression analysis of factors influencing perceived academic writing competence (PAWC) of Vocational School Students. *OKARA: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra, 16*(2), 329-348.

Rahman, F., Abbas, A., Hasyim, M., Rahman, F., Abbas, A., & Hasyim, M. (2019). Facebook group as media of learning writing in ESP context: A case study at Hasanuddin University. *Asian EFL Journal Research Articles, 26*(6.1), 153-167.

Siahaan, S. (2008). *The essentials of writing: A practical guide for students and teachers*. ABC Educational Press.

Suma, M., Rahman, F., Dalyan, M., Andini, C., & Wajadi, A. M. F. (2024). Cultural Aspects of Character Education found in Comic" Pelayaran Ke Dusung": An Ecranization through the Application of Augmented Reality. *Journal of Ecohumanism, 3*(4), 739-753.

Syafira, D. A. (2023). *Effective writing strategies: Insights from expert writers.* XYZ Publications.

Tarin, S., & Yawiloeng, R. (2023). *The Effects of Using Mind Maps to Enhance EFL Learners' L2 Writing Development* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Phayao).

Yaumi, M. T. A. H., Rahman, F., & Sahib, H. (2024). Bridging Language and Technology through Semiotic Technology. *International Journal of Social Science Research and Review, 7*(1), 52-61.

Yaumi, M. T. A. H., Rahman, F., & Sahib, H. (2023). Exploring WhatsApp as Teaching and Learning Activities during Covid-19/New Normal era: A Semiotic Technology Analysis. I*nternational Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 6*(12), 7627-7634.