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Abstract
This inquiry addressed students’ perspectives towards the implementation of the Portfolio-Based Timed-Writing Technique (PBTHT) under an international transfer credit (ICT) program at Universitas Muria Kudus. It is to answer the following questions: (1) What are the overseas students’ perspectives towards the PBTHT implementation? (2) How do their perspectives compare to their home counterparts? Using narrative analysis, this study qualitatively revealed that PBTHT is a new technique for overseas students. Their perspectives show their composition strengths cover the use of proper grammar, spelling, and mutually supportive essay elements. Meanwhile, their weaknesses include the content and mechanics. Overseas and home students expressed different perspectives due to different experiences, abilities, and teaching processes in their respective countries. Both groups acknowledged that the PBTHT implementation help them with the improvement of their writing skills.
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INTRODUCTION
This investigation deals with the implementation of the Portfolio-Based Timed-Writing Technique (PBTHT) in Essay Writing Class at English Education Department of Universitas Muria Kudus (UMK) in the second batch of the international credit transfer (ICT) program. This student exchange program belongs to the program of Freedom to Learn, an Independent Campus organized by the Indonesian Directorate of Higher Education. This inquiry is to answer the following questions: (1) What are the Filipinos students’ perspectives towards the PBTHT implementation? (2) How do their perspectives compare to their
home counterparts? Portfolio-Based Timed-Writing Technique (PBTHT) comprises steps of timed handwriting, retyping and self-evaluating the original handwritten compositions, doing reflections, making efforts for the betterment of the composition, and doing revisions in final term portfolio projects.

The participants had to compose essays that ideally consists of three main parts, i.e introductory paragraph with a thesis statement (comprising a topic and controlling ideas), a body with supporting paragraphs, and a conclusion or concluding paragraph (Oshima and Hogue, 2006). With different academic practices and experiences from those of home students, overseas students must have their reflections on PBTHT implementation and such information is still absent in the literature.

For learners of English with its key positions to encounter global life (Kamariah et al, 2018; Nguyen, 2021), writing skill is essential (Klimova, 2012; Listyani, 2019) and it might open a wider chance for students’ success (Anastasiadou, 2010). PBTHT essentially and authentically presents a more student-centered and process-based writing technique. Technically PBTHT provides students a time limit to initially compose an essay with a predetermined topic with handwriting. PBTHT motivated students to achieve their best composing skills (Syafei et al, 2020) and more motivated EFL students developed a greater composing proficiency (Cahyono & Rahayu, 2020).

Portfolio-Based Timed-Handwriting Technique (PBTHT)

The Portfolio-Based Timed-Handwriting Technique (PBTHT) involves typical elements, i.e. time limit, assigned topic, without help, handwriting, and fair play mode. During timed-handwriting practice, students have no access to any assistance from peers, instructors, notes, books, and (smart) gadgets. Timed compositions use handwriting mode which eliminates a copy-paste mode and secures authenticity and originality. A fair play mode among students during timed handwriting is highly maintained (Syafei, 2012, 2014). Practically no cheating happens during timed-writing practice. Timed handwriting mode in writing classes has been implemented at EED of UMK. Students’ original handwritten outputs are collected, assessed, discussed, revised, and finally compiled in a writing portfolio (Lam, 2018; Syafei, 2012, 2021) serving as an EFL assessment alternative (Afrianto, 2018). The PBTHT combine the positive points of handwriting, timed-writing, and portfolio assessment. In the PBTHT, revisions, feedback, and partnership are allowed but they are administered only after handwriting session in which helps are strictly forbidden.

Timed handwriting also improves one’s mental agility, promotes thinking in the L2, develops students’ confidence in composing abilities through practice, partnership, feedback, and revision (Ayotte, 2018). Rogers (2018) claimed that repeated timed writings promote sentence-writing fluency since fluency problems demand more cognitive efforts. The intervention entailed sentence instruction and frequency building to a performance criterion, a type of timed practice emphasizing fluency (Datchuk, 2016). Handwriting in PBTHT has some specific features such as being automatic (Berninger et al, 2010; Berninger, 2012) and brain-compatible (Silver, 2018). Handwriting also serves as a good
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Using portfolio, which is the core element of PBTHT, is commonly valuable to enhance students’ writing (Lam, 2018; Khodashenas & Rakhshi, 2017;) through process-oriented and self-assessed composition (; Omidi & Yarahmadzehi, 2016). More studies also indicated the successful practice of portfolio assessment (Zafirospoulou & Darra, 2019; Farahian & Avarzamani, 2018;). Portfolio relevantly served as accepted assessment practice during the pandemic situation (Syafei, et. al, 2021). Portfolio assessment mostly improved students’ organizational aspects of composition (Ghoorchaei et al., 2010). Berliana et al. (2013) and Tabatabaei & Assefi (2012) indicated that portfolio assessment increased composing skills of students. The portfolio assessment technique also gives a significant positive effect on EFL learners’ vocabulary (Omidi & Yarahmedzehi, 2016).

PBTHT combines manually timed and handwritten initial compositions without assistance to students and digitally computerized and revised compositions (Syafei, 2014). It secures students’ output of PBTHT composition to be more student-centered, authentic, and process-based. Philosophically, PBTHT follows constructivism that advocates a shift from product-oriented to process-oriented writing assessment as well as instructor-oriented to learner-oriented strategies (Schreurs & Dumbraveanu, 2014; Emiliana, 2017). Procedures in PBTHT also adapt process-oriented learning for particular skills and strategies (Laksmi, 2006; Agesta & Cahyono, 2017; Ferdiansyah et al., 2020). Portfolio projects along with their positive washback (Syafei, 2012) and self-assessment benefits (Purwanti, 2015) belong to process-oriented assessment.

**METHOD**

**Design**

In the context of improving students’ writing skill, this study employed a narrative inquiry (Clandinin & Huber, 2010; Creswell, 2009; Wijayatilake, 2012; Listiyanto & Fauzi, 2016; Chan, 2017) in students’ perspectives toward PBTHT implementation. Examining students’ complete digital portfolio of Essay Writing class, this study reflectively uncovered the written narrations of five CBSUA student participants during the application of PBTHT at EED of UMK. The 90 minute online classes involving CBSUA and UMK students took place fourteen times. Before the session the students got theoretical briefing on how to
compose a good essay. The topic for the composition was provided just at the beginning of the timed-handwriting sessions.

The participants provided their informed consent in that their completed portfolios could serve as data sources in addition to final evaluation of the course. They took part intensively in Essay Writing Course implementing PBTHT. They did all steps of handwritten composition, retyping, reflection, betterment of the composition, analysis-evaluation, and revisions. The participants confirmed and verified the narrations through their portfolios of PBTHT for triangulation and trustworthiness. Permission to conduct this investigation had also been issued by the faculty administrator.

Data Source and Collection
This investigation, which took place via online classes during the Covid-19 pandemic, collected ‘the naturally occurring data’ (Isingoma, 2021) of reflective narrations of five overseas students on their experience, weakness, strength, efforts, and initial analysis in their computerized PBTHT projects which hold the following features of students’ works: a. Scanning/photoing the original handwritten timed composition which must be sent to the lecturer via WA in not more than two minutes. b. Retyping handwritten composition in word format for ease of analyses, checks, and revisions. c. Doing Reflection: (1) experiences while doing timed handwriting. (2) Weakness of the original paragraph. (3) Strengths of the original paragraphs. d. Presenting narrations of efforts to improve the original handwritten essays. e. Doing self-evaluation with available scoring rubrics and providing word count. The essay scoring rubrics cover the essay format, mechanics, content, organization, and grammar, and f. Completing revisions by addressing all feedbacks based on the scoring rubrics elements, self-check, peer check, group check, and instructor/lecturer.

Data Analysis
A qualitative analysis was administered by identifying and classifying their perspectives, particularly those associated with the PBTHT implementation (Syafei, 2012). Initial data reduction was administered by selecting, simplifying, and transforming the narrative data without altering the content and meaning of the narrative protocols from students’ PBTHT projects. Next, data display to structure and manage information was completed to discover valid information. Highlighting and categorizing essential points were administered accordingly. Using a holistic-content analysis without any preliminary categories (Zakarias, 2010), the participants’ reflections were classified. Based on each participant's narrations, the researchers scrutinized them by using “categorical-content analysis” (Lieblich et al, 1998) to find out their reflections, efforts to improve their composition, and self-evaluation of their initial handwritten essays. Finally, a conclusion over the narrative data was achieved by attending the data several times to secure a valid one. The researcher carefully identified the students’ perspectives by reading their portfolio over and over again to make sure that the researcher’s conclusion truly reflected the students’ perspectives. Direct clarifications to the students were done when necessary.
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
The narrative inquiry shows the following results of overseas students’ reflections and their comparison with their home counterparts towards the PBTHT implementation in the following.

Students’ Perspectives towards the PBTHT Implementation
This section presents perspectives of overseas students (CBSUA) towards the PBTHT implementation. They all admitted that it was their very first writing experience under time pressure that required it to be finished in just 30 minutes. For them, the PBTHT experience was new and unfamiliar. "It was my first experience to write a 600-words essay that was required to be finished in just 30 minutes. I was pushed to work under pressure. The whole experience is new to me" (CBSUA Student 2). In line with their first impression about the PBTHT activity, what they felt was also similar; feeling nervous and being pressured at the same time. Some of them also said they were surprised to write a composition in a limited time which gave them the rushed feeling and added pressure. "While waiting for the starting time, I didn't avoid feeling nervous and pressured at the same time. Panicking is my initial reaction as I grasped what we had to do. Writing an essay for a certain topic in 30 minutes sounds surreal at first, and I did not expect to write a substantial essay given that it is timed handwriting" (CBSUA Students 3, 4, and 5). Being new to this activity, a student thought his output was not very good. "Being a novice in this kind of activity is somehow one of the reasons why I think my output is not that too excellent" (CBSUA Student 3).

Most students experience difficulties are due to several factors, such as not being confident in using the words and sentences, not organizing their thoughts properly, and having difficulty recalling the right word to use in their sentences. Furthermore, they were worried because they were used to preparing themselves before writing an essay, such as looking for reference articles. "I had a hard time recalling the right word to use in my sentences; that's why some meanings are unclear. Besides, I could hardly recall the words that would suit the meaning I want to convey. I was so rattled and wasn't able to organize my thoughts properly. And I am not used to creating an essay without reading related articles ahead" (CBSUA Students 1, 3, and 4).

Additionally, they also expressed their experience as follows, "The moment I run out of time, I knew I missed some salient points and failed to elaborate my ideas. Knowing that I only have limited time to write made me worry about the content of the essay that I am writing since I have always been critical of what I write" (CBSUA Students 3, 4, and 5). Surprisingly, as time went by, they felt get used to this activity and slowly understood how it worked. They considered PBTHT as a challenge and an opportunity to go beyond their limitations. "...as soon as I start writing some words, the ideas flowed naturally. I still consider this as a challenge and an opportunity for me to go beyond my limitations. Overall, it was challenging but fun at the same time" (CBSUA Students 1, 4, and 5).

They acknowledged detecting weaknesses in their writing. The first weakness is the grammar and sentence formation stated by a student. "There are few mistakes on the use of verb tenses, I was not able to comply with the subject-verb agreement. There are wrong spelling words, and there are lapses in
the sentence formation" (CBSUA Student 1). Moreover, they also revealed, "One of its weaknesses is in technicalities. My indentions after each line are not on the same length which is not necessary for writing an essay" (CBSUA Student 3).

The subsequent weakness which was the most addressed is the content. Because there was not sufficient time for preparation, some were not satisfied with the results and felt that their content was not credible. Furthermore, they said that the essay could confuse its readers since the overall thought was not complete. The ideas were scattered around, and the statements were not well-supported, which made the essay lose its impact upon reading. "I am not satisfied with the flow of thoughts and their impact. Considering that there's not ample time for preparation given, my content is not that credible since related articles which could serve as evidence aren't encouraged. The essay could confuse its readers since the overall thought is not complete" (CBSUA Students 1 and 3). "The ideas are all scattered around. The statements are not well-supported that made the essay lost its impact upon reading" (CBSUA Student 4).

Most students also claimed their essays did not initially reflect a characteristic of a good essay. They assumed they had failed to create an introduction part containing a clear thesis statement and could not properly elaborate on the main idea. In addition, they also felt that their original essay was too short and did not reflect a reasonable conclusion. "The introduction lacks with strong thesis statement. I have failed to recognize the importance of creating an introduction to hook the readers through the first few sentences. Also, the body of most of my essay did not properly elaborate on the main idea and lacked the necessary content. My original compositions were too short and did not end in a good concluding manner" (CBSUA Student 2).

Dealing with, the third strength of their essay, it was found that the student experienced fewer grammatical errors and use the proper capitalization words. The improvement were superficially observed from week to week of the PBTHT administration. See Appendix 1 Besides, the students have used the punctuation marks correctly, and they are quite sure of how they use morphemes and arrange each sentence into a proper sentence structure. "Thankfully, I have fewer grammatical errors spotted, and I was able to consider the proper capitalization of words" (CBSUA Student 4). "I am partially confident that the way I utilized morphemes and arranged each sentence is following proper sentence structure. I also utilized punctuations and placed them properly, which made my output understandable" (CBSUA Students 1 and 3).

Moreover, they stated the main point in every paragraph was linked well to the thesis statement of their essay. Also, the essay was supported by details found in the body parts. The supporting facts were well-organized, and the details could support the main points. "The essay conveys a meaning that is supported by the details which can be found in its body. The main points are connected to the thesis statement of the essay. Facts are well-organized. Details are well-organized to support the main points" (CBSUA Students 1 and 3). The last but not least, the essay also contained some important ideas that made it still relevant to the given topic. "The essay also contains some important ideas about the topic. In addition, the essay as a whole is still relevant to the given topic" (CBSUA Student 4).
The next point is about the efforts. Students expressed several answers regarding the efforts they made during the implementation of PBTHT. The first point is their effort to correct grammar and sentence formation errors. "I have to work on improving my use of the subject-verb agreement and the verb tenses. I have to avoid the mistakes I committed to using verb tenses. I have to improve my sentence formation, and I have to expand my vocabulary range" (CBSUA Student 1). Students' second effort was to read more readings and look for articles that support their essay so the resulting essay could be more credible. "One of the efforts I should make to better my essay is through reading it again and again. Through this, I'll become more aware of its mistakes either in grammar, content, or other technicalities. Then, using the internet to search for related articles and support each claim makes it more credible for the readers" (CBSUA Student 3). The next effort is to seek additional knowledge from traditional and digital sources such as using a dictionary, using grammar-related apps for verification and enhancement, or asking their peers for feedback to further establish the quality of the essay. "Lastly, I also asked my colleagues for them to check my output. It is also important to use grammar-related apps for verification and enhancement of terms used to avoid redundancy" (CBSUA Students 3 and 4).

From the results of scoring rubrics and revisions, it was seen that their revision essays have increased in terms of the number of words. Most all CBSUA students thought their original essays still needed improvement in some aspects. Despite an increase in the number of words after revision, they expressed concerns about the minimum words requirement for original handwritten composition. "In terms of word count, I'm afraid I was not able to meet the minimum words there is. A revision is a must to at least suffice the low number of words. When it comes to the rubrics, the original composition lacks in some aspects" (CBSUA Student 4). Please kindly see the appendix for a partial illustration of a PBTHT implementation episode.

The above narrative findings show that their reflections of PBTHT have addressed organized procedures of timing, handwriting, retyping, doing reflection, making efforts to improve the composition, conducting analysis and evaluation of the original handwritten composition, and making revisions for the best version. PBTHT supports the idea that students should be provided with direct feedback and various delivery technique in learning writing (Soedjatmiko & Taloko, 2003), and also process-based approach made students express their ideas more confidently (Laksmi, 2006). PBTHT also conforms with Hadiyanto (2019) to improve students’ creative and imaginative capacity. The use of portfolio assessment is in agreement with Lua and Kim (2021) in that varied assessment tools can be administered to measure L2 writing procedures and outputs.

Overseas students emphasized their experience in adapting to PBTHT for the very first time. Various weaknesses of their essays cover grammar, content, and mechanics. Meanwhile, several strengths include the use of more proper grammar, spelling, and mutually supportive essay parts. They tried to improve their essays over time.
Comparison of Overseas and Home Students’ Perspectives

There are two participating groups in the essay writing class applying PBTHT: the UMK group and CBSUA. From the collected data, it was found that the reflections of the two were different yet similar in some aspects. The differences and similarities are summarized as follows.

Initially, the UMK participants revealed that this was not the first time they had experienced the PBTHT activity. Previously, they also got the PBTHT for Paragraph Writing course in the previous semester. Since they had received a similar course, they stated this activity was pretty familiar for them. Furthermore, the UMK group said that the implementation of the PBTHT was quite a thrilling moment. "It was a nervous time, although it was not my first time writing the essay. In semester 2, I have a paragraph-writing course. It is quite helpful in this essay-writing course. Since I had received a similar course, I thought I was pretty familiar with this activity" (UMK Students 1, 2, and 4). In contrast, the CBSUA group exposed that PBTHT was their very first time to write an essay in such a short time. For them, the whole process was something new and unfamiliar. It was not surprising that they experienced panic and stress simultaneously, especially since they did not have the slightest similar experience. "It was my first experience to write a 600-words essay that was required to be finished in just 30 minutes. I was pushed to work under pressure. The whole experience is new to me" (CBSUA Student 2). "I didn't avoid feeling nervous and pressured at the same time. Panicking is my initial reaction as I grasped what we had to do. Writing an essay for a certain topic in 30 minutes sounds surreal at first, and I did not expect to write a substantial essay given that it is timed handwriting" (CBSUA Students 3, 4, and 5).

Other differences covered the difficulties experienced by both groups. The majority of the UMK group indicated that their main problem was to understand the given title. "I didn't understand the meaning of the title given at that time. I was really sad and didn't know what the title meant then what topics should I raise" (UMK Student 3). As opposed to the CBSUA group, the difficulty they face was that they were afraid about the content because some were very critical of writing. "I was so rattled and wasn't able to organize my thoughts properly. And I am not used to creating an essay without reading related articles ahead" (CBSUA Students 1, 3, and 4).

However, apart from the differences expressed in the experience, there is one similarity, both groups were concerned with the words and the ideas they had to write. "When I wrote this composition, I had a little trouble. There are many words in my mind, but I'm confused about how to pour it into written form, I'm a bit difficult to compose sentences" (UMK Student 2). "The moment I run out of time, I knew I missed some salient points and failed to elaborate my ideas" (CBSUA Students 3, 4, and 5).

The second comparison is about the weakness in their essay composition. For the UMK group, there were two statements for weakness. The first point indicated that these weaknesses included the wrong spelling or typos, grammatical errors, and improper punctuation. "I get some typo in my essay when I retype it in computerizing. I wrote the wrong spelling word. The essay has not used articles (a the) and verb tenses. The grammar is incorrect, information is
imperfect and incomplete, and error in using punctuation" (All UMK Students). The second point was the difficulty of combining ideas between paragraphs, mentioning too many reasons, and using a monotonous passage that makes the essay look boring. "I also repeated the same idea, and it is boring to read" (UMK Student 4).

Meanwhile, for the CBSUA group, there were three experiences regarding weakness. The first weakness included the grammar, sentence formation, and technicalities stated by the students. "There are few mistakes on the use of verb tenses. There are wrong spelling words, and there are lapses in sentence formation. One of its weaknesses is in technicalities. My indention after each line are not on the same length" (CBSUA Students 1 and 3). The second weakness was about the content. "Considering that there’s no ample time of preparation given, my content is not that credible since related articles which could serve as evidence isn’t encouraged. The essay could confuse its readers since the overall thought is not complete" (CBSUA Students 1 and 3). The last weakness narrated was that their essays did not reflect a characteristic of a good essay. "The introduction lacks with strong thesis statement. I have failed to recognize the importance of creating an introduction to hook the readers through the first few sentences. Also, the body of most of my essay did not properly elaborate on the main idea and lacked the necessary content" (CBSUA student 2).

Despite the differences, both groups indicated that they were quite concerned about grammar, spelling, and sentence formation errors in their writing. The third comparison is about the strength of their essay composition. The same as weakness, there were some tendencies of different answers from the two groups. For the UMK group, there are three trends in strength. The first trend, their topic fits the assignment well and was engaging because it had weight content with thought and care. "The essay fits the assignment, is interesting to read, motivates the readers, and has a weight content to read. It consists of thought and care. Also, my essay can motivate the reader to practice the effort I had been sharing" (UMK Students 1, 2, 4, and 5). The second trend was the students used more expressions and did not use monotonous words and terms. "The strength of my essay maybe, the way I use more expressions in my writing. I try to avoid monotonous words and terms to make them accessible and understandable" (UMK Student 4). While the third trend was their handwriting was neat and easy to read. "My handwriting is very neat and easy to read, not cluttered and best impressed of all my writing he was above" (UMK Student 5).

On the other hand, the CBSUA group had three different statements about strengths in their composition. First, the students had fewer grammatical errors and used the proper capitalization words. Besides that, the students used the punctuation marks and morphemes correctly, and they arranged each sentence into an appropriate sentence structure. "Thankfully, I have fewer grammatical errors spotted, and I was able to consider the proper capitalization of words" (CBSUA Student 4). "I am partially confident that the way I utilized morphemes and arranged each sentence is following proper sentence structure. I also utilized punctuations and placed them properly" (CBSUA Students 1 and 3). Moreover, they stated the main point in every paragraph was linked well to the thesis statement of their essay. "The essay conveys a meaning that is supported by the
details which can be found in its body. The main points are connected to the thesis statement of the essay" (CBSUA Students 1 and 3). The third statement was that their essay contains some essential ideas that were still relevant to the given topic. "The essay also contains some important ideas about the topic. In addition, the essay as a whole is still relevant to the given topic" (CBSUA Student 4).

The fourth comparison addresses the efforts to improve the essay. Both groups from UMK and CBSUA had the same opinion about the efforts in PBTHT. The first efforts made by the two groups were they double-checked or at least did the revision twice. "My efforts revise at least twice for developing my essay. I read my revision over and over again to see if it is good enough or not" (UMK Students 1 and 4). "I have to avoid the mistakes I committed to using verb tenses. I have to improve my sentence formation, and I have to expand my vocabulary range" (CBSUA Student 1).

The second effort was to read more readings and look for articles to support their essay. "I look for some inspiration through Quora and apply it to my essay. I read several articles on how to improve our writing skills. I also watched a few posts on Instagram about writing advice" (UMK Student 4). "One of the efforts I should make to better my essay is through reading it again and again. Then, using the internet to search for related articles and support each claim makes it more credible for the readers" (CBSUA Student 3).

The third effort was to seek additional knowledge from traditional and digital sources such as using a dictionary, grammar-related apps for verification and enhancement, or asking their peers. "I use the dictionaries (Google translate, Kamusku application, and Merriam-Webster) to look for the meaning of some words that I don't know, recheck my grammar with Grammarly. To fix it, I need a point of view from 3 people besides me, like my new friends in class, they come from the Philippines to study with us" (All UMK Students). "Lastly, I also asked my colleagues for them to check my output. It is also important to use grammar-related apps for verification and enhancement of terms used to avoid redundancy" (CBSUA Students 3 and 4).

The narrative voices from both groups indicate that, based on results of scoring rubrics and revisions, the revision essays of both groups have increased in terms of the number of words and self-scoring over their compositions.

Home and overseas students have several different yet similar reflections. These differences were narratively caused by several factors, such as experience, implementation of the teaching process in their respective country, and variability in students' ability.

PBTHT for both home and overseas students in writing accomplishments of drafting, receiving feedback from peers or instructors, and performing revisions (Hasan & Akhnan, 2010). PBTHT similarly suggested planning, drafting, editing (reflecting and revising), and writing the final version. This product-oriented process for both participating groups did reflect the comprehensiveness of their writing process. Students' reflections on PBTHT also support reflective procedure promotion in writing development (Ong, et al, 2021).
The findings are also in line with Brown (2004) and Johnson, et al (2012) who supported PBTHT in that the progression of composition always involves prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing. The process writing approach showed an effective process writing approach towards the students' writing skills. PBTHT is beneficial for both groups for EFL writing is a complex language skill to master for students. PBTHT required students not only to write well-organized compositions with the appropriate format, mechanics, content, organization, and grammar but also to give them a chance to improve and revise the composition for their best version. PBBTH is also in line with a demonstration of cooperative learning techniques (Yuliasri, 2014).

CONCLUSION
The perspectives of overseas students in the implementation of PBTHT are qualitatively diverse. They emphasized that PBTHT implementation was the very first time experience for them. Various weaknesses of their essays are expressed in terms of grammar, content, and mechanics. Several strengths are mentioned, such as the use of more proper grammar, spelling, and mutually supportive essay parts. They tried to improve their essays over time. The results show that the overseas students were trying to adapt and follow the flow of activities during the PBTHT implementation. Home and overseas students have several different yet similar statements. Even though they have differences, it does not mean that one group is better or worse than another. These differences could be caused by several factors, such as previous experience with PBTHT, implementation of the teaching process in their respective country, and a variety of students’ abilities. For both home and overseas participating students, the reflective aspects in PBTHT implementation are in agreement with Ong et al (2021) in that for further professional growth teacher educators should discover a dialogic or collaborative mindset. The findings suggest that PBTHT was welcomed by both home and overseas students for the writing process. Both groups narratively agreed that their essays can be improved in the future with PBTHT implementation. Further studies should address wider participants and settings.
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Appendix 1: Partial Screenshooting Illustration of the PBTHT Implementation