

APPENDIX A
TRADITIONAL COMPOSITION SCORING GUIDE

Traditional Composition Scoring 1

18-20	Excellent	Natural English, minimal errors, complete realisation of the task set
16-17	Very Good	Good vocabulary and structure, above the simple sentence level. Errors non-basic.
12-15	Good	Simple but accurate realisation of task. Sufficient naturalness, not many errors.
8-11	Pass	Reasonably correct if awkward OR Natural treatment of subject with some serious errors
5-7	Weak	Vocabulary and grammar inadequate for the task set.
0-4	Very poor	Incoherent. Errors showing lack of basic knowledge

Traditional Composition Scoring 2

18-20	Excellent	Errors-free, substantial and varied material, resourceful and controlled in language and expression.
16-17	Very Good	Good realisation of task, ambitious and natural in style.
12-15	Good	Sufficient assurance and freedom from basic error to maintain theme.
8-11	Pass	Clear realisation of task, reasonably correct and natural.
5-7	Weak	Near to pass level in general scope, but with either numerous errors or too elementary or translated in style.
0-4	Very poor	Basic errors, narrowness of vocabulary.

APPENDIX B
HOLISTIC SCORING GUIDE BY BAMBERGE (1984)

Holistic Scoring Guide by Bamberg (1984)

Scale	Criteria
<p style="text-align: center;">4 Fully Coherent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - writer clearly identifies the topic - writer does not shift topics or digress - writer orients the reader by creating a context of situation - writer organizes details according to a discernible plan that is sustained throughout the essay - writer skillfully uses cohesive ties such as lexical cohesion, conjunction, reference, etc. to link sentences and paragraphs together - writer often concludes with a statement that gives the reader a definite sense of closure - discourse flows smoothly, few or no grammatical and/or mechanical errors interrupt the reading process
<p style="text-align: center;">3 Partially Coherence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If writer does not explicitly identify the topic, he/she provides enough details so that readers can probably identify the specific subject - Writer has one main topic but there may be minor digression - Writer provides some reader orientation, either by briefly suggesting the context or by directly announcing the topic - Writer organizes details according to a plan, but may not sustain it throughout or may list details in parts of the essay - Writer uses some cohesive ties such as lexical cohesion, conjunction, reference, etc., to link sentences or paragraphs together - Writer does not usually conclude with a statement that creates a sense of closure - Discourse usually flows smoothly although occasional grammatical or mechanical errors may interrupt the reading process

<p style="text-align: center;">2 Incoherent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Writer does not identify the topic and the reader would be unlikely to infer or guess the topic from the details provided - Writer shift topics or digresses frequently from the topic - Writer assumes the reader shares his/her context and provide little or no orientation - Writer has no organizational plan in most of the texts and frequently relies on listing - Writer uses few cohesive ties such as lexical cohesion, conjunction, reference, etc. to link sentences and paragraphs together - Writer creates no sense of closure - Discourse flow is irregular and rough because of frequently interruption in the reading process as a result of mechanical or grammatical errors
<p style="text-align: center;">1 Incomprehensible</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Topic can't be identified - Writer moves from topic to topic by association or digresses frequently - Writer assumes the reader shares his/her context and provide no orientation - Writer has no organizational plan and either lists or follows an associative order - Writer uses very few cohesive ties such as lexical cohesion, conjunction, reference, etc. And sentences do not seem connected or linked together - Discourse flow is very rough or irregular because writer omits structure words, inflectional endings or make numerous grammatical errors that continuously interrupt the reading process
<p style="text-align: center;">0 unscorable</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Writer writes only to reject the tasks

APPENDIX C
TEST OF WRITTEN ENGLISH SCORING GUIDE (Bailey, 1998)

Test of Written English Scoring Guide (Bailey, 1998)

6. *Clearly demonstrates competence in writing on both the rhetorical and syntactic levels, though it may have occasional errors.*

A paper in this category

- is well organized and well developed
- effectively addresses the writing task
- uses appropriate details to support a thesis or illustrate ideas
- shows unity, coherence, and progression
- displays consistent facility in the use of language
- demonstrates a syntactic variety and appropriate word choice

5. *Demonstrates competence in writing on both the rhetorical and syntactic levels, though it may have occasional errors.*

A paper in this category

- is generally well organized and well developed, though it may have fewer details than does a 6 paper
- may address some parts of the tasks more effectively than others
- show unity, coherence, and progression
- demonstrates some of syntactic variety and range of vocabulary
- displays facility in language, though it may have more errors than does a 6 paper

4. *Demonstrates minimal competence in writing on both the rhetorical and syntactic levels*

A paper in this category

- is adequately organized
- addresses the writing topic adequately but may slight parts of the task
- uses some details to support a thesis or illustrate ideas
- demonstrate adequate but undistinguished or inconsistent facility with syntax and usage
- may contain some serious errors that occasionally obscure meaning

3. *Demonstrates some developing competence in writing, but it remains flawed on either the rhetorical or syntactic level, or both*

A paper in this category may reveal one or more of the following weaknesses:

- inadequate organization or development
- failure to support or illustrate generalizations with appropriate or sufficient detail
- an accumulation of errors in sentence structure and / or usage
- a noticeably inappropriate choice of words or word forms

2. *Suggests incompetence in writing*

A paper in this category is seriously flawed by one or more of the following weaknesses:

- failure to organize or develop
- little or no detail, or irrelevant specifics
- serious and frequent errors in usage or sentence structure
- serious problems with focus

1. *Demonstrates incompetence in writing*

A paper in this category will contain serious and persistent writing errors, may be illogical or incoherent, or may reveal the writer's inability to comprehend the question. A paper that is seriously underdeveloped also falls into this category

APPENDIX D
COHESION SCORING GUIDE

Cohesion Scoring Guide

Syntactic Ties: Referential

Pronouns

- Personal Pronouns: Subjective, Objective & Possessive

Subjective: I, you, he, she, it, we, they

Objective: me, you, him, her, it, us, you, them

Possessive: my, your, his, her, its, our, your, their, mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, yours, theirs

- Demonstrative pronouns

this

that

these

those

one

ones

- Indefinite Pronouns

all

both

each

one

either

neither

some

any

none

many

much
few
a few
somebody
someone
something
somewhere
anybody
anyone
anything
anywhere
nobody
no one
nothing
nowhere
everybody
everyone
everything
everywhere
a lot
lots
a little
little
other
the other
others
the others
the most

- Reflexive / Emphatic Pronouns

myself

yourself
himself
herself
itself
our
selves
yourselves
themselves

- Relative Pronouns

who
that
whom
that
whose
which
that
which
that
whose
of which

Syntactic Ties: Conjunctions

- Objective

to
in order to
so as to
so that
so
as

- Effect
 - as a result
 - as a consequence
 - consequently
 - hence
 - this
 - thus
 - for this reason
 - so
 - therefore
 - because of this
 - thereby
- Causative
 - because
 - as
 - due to
 - due to the fact that
 - since
 - this is because
 - seeing that
 - knowing
- Contrastive
 - although
 - as opposed to
 - but
 - by contrast
 - compared with
 - despite
 - in spite of
 - even so

even though

however

in contrast

on the other hand

otherwise

on the contrary

still

unlike

yet

while

- Comparative

similarly

in the same way

like

as

as much as

just as

likewise

- Additive

after all

and

also

in addition

furthermore

what's more

moreover

besides

likewise

- Exemplified
an example of
an illustration of
as follows
e.g.
especially
for example
for instance
including
like
particularly
such as
to cite
to illustrate
- Time sequence
as long as
after
before
as soon as
till
until
when
whenever
while
as
by the time
- Correlative
not only ... but
as ... as
either ... or

neither ... nor

whether ... or

if ... then

Semantic Ties: Reiteration & Collocation

Reiteration

- Repetition of the same word
- The use of synonyms and near-synonyms
- The replacement of a word which is semantically superordinate or the use of general word

Collocation

- Words drawn from the same ordered series e.g. Tuesday, Friday
- Co-hyponyms of the same superordinate term e.g. chair and table
- Words that always associate with others, like *university*: school, college, teacher, students, etc.

APPENDIX E
RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Section 3: Argumentative Essay Writing

Instructions: Please write an argumentative essay (length, approximately 250 words) on the following topic. You may write in support of or in opposition to the topic.

In modern daily life, purchasing food from fast food chains is more convenient than having food prepared at home.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX F
SAMPLE ESSAY 1

Sample Essay 1
(Holistic Score = 6)

In modern daily life, purchasing food from fast food chains is more convenient than having food prepared at home.

After a long day of hard work, I slammed the door shut and fall into the comfortable sofa. My husband enters the room complaining of human stomach. Indeed, a hungry man is an angry man. There is yesterday's dishes in the sink, a basket of clothes to be washed, food to be laid, wailing children to attend to. Tired, I reach out for the phone and dial 7552525 – the hotline for Pizza Hut.

Purchasing food from fast food chains is a convenient of modern daily life than having food prepared at home. Being a part of today hectic lifestyles, I can only agree with it. Materialism is not everything but it is a necessity to complete our life today. With the increased cost of living, we live in a society where both husband and wife are working. Having dateline to meet and surviving the tough competition, we cannot afford to waste time shopping and laying food on the table. So, we resort to the easy way out – fast food.

Fast food is not only convenient. It is the time saving, energy saving and money saving in the long run. Besides, it tastes great. Children love fast food. Why bother to cook when all today's children ... do is complain? Some people say that fast food is unhealthy, but we can always resort to healthier fast food, Kenny Roger' and Dave's Delies being some examples.

Which is more healthy, a balanced three course meal from Dave's Delies or a bowl of home-cooked porridge served with salted fish, salted eggs and prickles? One top of that, the kids would be picking out the vegetables, segregating them to the 'I don't want to eat this because they taste terrible' pile! Being consumer smart, we should learn to choose a more healthy fast-food, which is also convenient to us.

Purchasing food from fast food chain is a convenience of modern daily life than having food prepared at home.

APPENDIX G
SAMPLE ESSAY 2

Sample Essay 2
(Holistic Score = 1)

In modern daily life, purchasing food from fast food chains is more convenient than having food prepared at home.

I have bipolar ideas about this sentences. First, I m get along with that the “purchasing food from fast food is more convenient” because of the fact that the world today is in a hurry time that everyone endeavour to manage themselves rapidly in order to have more storage times to do anything else. As the result of the fact that it seem like everyone has pay less attention in food dietary. On the contary just only have some food for this lunch are acceptable for themselves then we will see many responsiveness from many marketing companies which will serve many menus of fast food moreover than that it have progressed to intrends life styles for teenagers nowadays. Second, I’m oppose to the ways of fast food be. I mean the effect that will affect to your health in long terms such as cancer, higher Cholesterol, heart failure, etc. I think the slogan that stated that “You are what You eat” is something classics and always true. So the main points that I would declare and remark to everyone is try to awareness yourself in good conditions which expect to be high quality of value lifestyles.

APPENDIX H
COMPOSITE SUMMARY OF COHESION ANALYSIS OF MALAYSIAN
NARRATIVE ESSAYS

**Composite Summary of Cohesion Analysis
of Malaysian Narrative Essays**

Student	Reference	Conjunction	Lexical cohesion	Total
1	82	33	10	125
2	80	24	12	116
3	40	14	8	62
4	69	22	16	107
5	37	10	10	57
6	38	23	14	75
7	49	24	9	82
8	60	17	16	93
9	30	5	14	49
10	58	27	13	98
11	35	12	13	60
12	32	13	20	65
13	28	21	7	56
14	28	25	23	76
Total	666	280	185	1131

Mean 80.07

SD 24.183

APPENDIX I

COMPOSITE SUMMARY OF COHESION ANALYSIS OF THAI

NARRATIVE ESSAYS

Composite Summary of Cohesion Analysis of Thai Narrative Essays

Student	Reference	Conjunction	Lexical cohesion	Total
1	33	21	14	68
2	48	21	15	84
3	59	22	8	89
4	40	27	8	75
5	20	13	4	37
6	40	14	6	60
7	42	15	3	60
8	23	5	3	31
9	32	14	11	57
10	17	25	3	45
11	49	15	20	84
12	70	22	12	104
13	31	22	4	57
14	39	20	11	70
Total	543	256	122	921

Mean 65.79

SD 20.498

APPENDIX J
COMPOSITE SUMMARY OF COHESION ANALYSIS OF MALAYSIAN
ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAYS

**Composite Summary of Cohesion Analysis
of Malaysian Argumentative Essays**

Student	Reference	Conjunction	Lexical cohesion	Total
1	37	16	18	71
2	49	34	28	111
3	32	16	15	63
4	27	32	22	81
5	25	21	20	66
6	25	17	10	52
7	23	24	26	73
8	28	18	19	65
9	12	8	9	29
10	25	22	13	60
11	18	16	10	44
12	30	20	4	54
13	24	15	13	52
14	33	20	12	65
Total	388	279	219	886

Mean 63.25

SD 18.927

APPENDIX K
COMPOSITE SUMMARY OF COHESION ANALYSIS OF THAI
ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAYS

**Composite Summary of Cohesion Analysis
of Thai Argumentative Essays**

Student	Reference	Conjunction	Lexical cohesion	Total
1	29	20	12	61
2	28	13	7	48
3	44	22	14	80
4	32	15	4	51
5	44	18	19	81
6	31	13	7	51
7	32	13	6	51
8	21	12	6	39
9	38	21	11	70
10	40	17	14	71
11	23	13	7	43
12	44	13	12	69
13	30	11	3	44
14	29	9	11	49
Total	465	210	133	808

Mean 57.71

SD 14.046