ABS 164

by Icels_2 Abs 164

INTEGRATING FEEDBACK AND PROCESS APPROACH IN

TEACHING PARAGRAPH WRITING IN EFL CONTEXT

Rita Handayani[*], Yumna Rasyid, Ninuk Lustyantie

Language Education Program, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia

ritahandayani_lt16s3@mahasiswa.unj.ac.id

Hp: +628197975795

ABSTRACT

This study investigated how the combination of feedback and process approach was implemented in teaching paragraph writing which focusing on the content and organisation of students' writing and how the students' response to it. This study employed a case study research design which used three data collection including observation, interview, and students' text. The result showed that the provision of feedback in the process writing approach was potential to be applied in teaching writing. Most students considered the provision of feedback in process writing is very important since it can facilitate their learning difficulties, beneficial in organising their ideas and focusing their paragraph writing.

Keywords: Feedback, process approach, paragraph writing, and EFL writing

Introduction

Competing in the industrial revolution of 4.0, higher education students should equipped themselves with some needed skills. One of them is the ability to communicate in English both spoken and written form. Unlike spoken communication, communicating using written English is not an easy skill to mastered since to produce a good piece of writing, ones must be able to

balance multiple issues as content, organization, purpose, audience, vocabulary, punctuation, and other mechanics devices and presenting them following the accepted pattern of organization.

Besides the complexity of writing, the limited time, knowledge of the topic, inadequate practice, and insufficient guidance and feedback given by writing teachers make this skill getting difficult to master. Additionally, many language writing teachers still used product approach and focus their teaching mainly on accuracy and correctness of grammar and mechanics. Students are infrequently given feedback relating to their writing content and the opportunity to revise and improve their pieces of writing. This make many EFL students get difficulties to improve the quality of their writing.

Due to those difficulties, many studies suggested process approach for improving students' ability in writing. Process approach is believe to be appropriate method for teaching writing since it emphasized the importance of developing students´ ability to plan, identify issues and analyze and implement possible solutions (Hyland, 2003). Through this approach, students learn writing through a series of steps to refine and correct their writing rather than rely on one-shot draft (Celce-Murcia, 2001). Students do not write on a given topic in a restricted time, rather they can explore a topic through writing, reread, think about, and redrafting for new ideas (Raimes, 1983). This process is non-linear, exploratory, and generative process whereby writers discover and reformulates their ideas as they attempt to approximate meaning (Kroll, 1990). Through this approach, the students are guided to produce well-organized, adequately developed paragraphs and essays.

Many studies have been proved the effectiveness of process approach. Besides developing students' descriptive paragraphs (Nabhan, 2017), this approach is also efficient for reducing learners' anxieties of pre-service teachers in writing (Arici & Kaldirim, 2015); manifested the positive effect of EFL learners' attitude toward writing skill (Mehr, 2017); and significantly enhance the writing performance of students in an overcrowded EFL writing class (Dokchandra, 2018). Even, through a comparative study, process approach ascertained to be more effective in improving students' ability in writing compared to traditional approach and genre based approach (Hashemnezhad & Hashemnezhad, 2012).

Besides using this approach, many studies also suggested the use of feedback to improve students' writing achievements. Feedback is defined as information that is given to the learner about his or her performance of the learning task with the objective of improving their performance (Ur, 1991). Feedback which is given at the process level is the most beneficial since it provides cues to directions for searching and strategizing which sensitize students to the competence or strategy information in a task or situation which results in higher confidence and greater investment of effort (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). To be more effective, teachers should supplement the provision of written feedback with discussion, questions and answering session; teachers should also include comments of praise and encouragement in their written feedback because positive feedback can boost students' motivation to improve their writing skills (Srichanyachon, 2012). The discussion session will provide time for teacher-students audience so that they can negotiate the meaning for resulting a successful revision in the subsequent draft (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999).

The provision of feedback, according to both students and teachers, is very crucial in the process of learning since it can be used as a guide for students to revise and improve the quality of their

75 writing (Tom, Morni, Metom, & Joe, 2013). Students considered teacher as a fundamental

76 source of feedback who give positive effect on their writing performance (Bijami, Pandian,

77 Kaur, & Singh, 2016). Most students wanted their teachers to focus on all aspects of written

78 texts when they provide written feedback (Omer, Mahfoodh, & Pandian, 2011) as it can help

79 them to improve their writing (Listiani, 2017). So, it is clear that feedback is an essential part

80 in any formal language learning context which significantly affects the students' learning

81 achievement.

82

83 The effectiveness of feedback has also been studied widely and various discoveries have been

84 revealed. Ferris (2002) contends that learners benefit more from direct correction when they are

85 at the beginning level of proficiency, when they do not have enough linguistic knowledge to

86 self-correct; and because of its' clarity, direct corrective feedback can guide the students to be

87 more aware of their mistakes on language use and improve their writing (Adisca & Mardijono,

88 2013). Providing direct corrective feedback also brings greater impacts on students'

89 grammatical accuracy in writing (Farjadnasab & Khodashenas, 2017; Zareil & Rahnama,

90 2013).

91

92 Although some studies proved the effectiveness of direct feedback on students writing accuracy,

93 some others studies revealed the contrast result. The study conducted by Hosseiny (2014)

94 indicated that indirect corrective feedback on error helps the learners improve accuracy in their

95 writing since it encourages the learner to take part in the process of repair (Hosseiny, 2014);

96 similarly, indirect feedback strategies which focused on local errors (Jamalinesari, Rahimi,

97 Gowhary, & Azizifar, 2015), simple past tense errors correction (Eslami, 2014), and vocabulary

98 and spelling errors (Goksoy& Nazli, 2016) significantly influence students' accuracy in writing.

99 Many studies have been proved the effectiveness of either process approach or feedback toward

100 the students' writing achievement. However, many earlier studies used these approach and

101 technique separately, and used feedback mainly to improve students' grammatical accuracy in

102 writing. The studies on how process approach and feedback is combined for facilitating

103 students' difficulties in learning writing is still limited. Therefore, this study used the

104 combination of process approach and feedback in teaching writing which focusing on the

105 content and organisation of students' writing. It is suggested that the writing problems of the

106 students' can be lightened through process approach and provision of teacher's feedback to their

107 written work (Gashout, 2014). So, this study was intended to describe the implementation of

108 process approach and feedback in teaching writing and to know how the students response to

109 it.

110

111 **Materials and Methods**

112 ***Setting and Participants***

113 The study took place in one of State University in Serang Banten Indonesia. In this case, English

114 is studied in EFL context. The participants of this study were 35 students (30 females, 5 male)

115 from the second semester who were joining in 'Paragraph Based Writing' subject in academic

116 year of 2018/2019. They were chosen through a purposive sampling technique. The study

117 adopted qualitative approach with a case study design (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).

118

119 ***Data Collection***

120 Three instruments were used to collect the data. First, observations were utilized to see how

121 process approach and feedback was implemented in teaching paragraph writing in which the

122 researcher acted as a participant observer (Creswell, 2012). Second, documents analysis which

123 was taken from the result of students' paragraph writing tasks. And the last is interview with a

124 semi structured designed to know the students response toward the application of process

125 approach and feedback in teaching writing.

126

Data Analysis

128 The analysis on the whole data was organized in such a way to get the findings interpreted

129 precisely. The analysis was conducted by adapting Creswell's theory (2012). It began with

130 organizing and preparing data, followed by reading them to get general senses. Then coding the

131 data, generating description of the whole data, and representing the description based on themes.

132 The last step to do was interpreting data before the data were finally presented.

133

Validity and Reliability

135 The data collected from the three instruments were then validated by triangulation (Cohen,

136 Manion, & Morrison, 2007). Triangulation was regarded crucial as an effort to make sure that

137 the data collected from the observations, documents, and interviews were matched each other.

138

Result and Discussion

140 The implementation of process approach and feedback provision in teaching writing is

141 implemented following the four stages of process writing (Harmer, 2007); (Langan, 2010);

142 (Richards, Jack C. & Renandya, 2002); and (Oshima & Hogue, 2007). Relating to the research

143 questions, the data from each source is presented under two themes: the implementation of

144 process approach and feedback in teaching writing; and the students' response toward it.

145

The Implementation of Process Approach and Feedback Provision in Teaching Writing

147 The implementation of process writing approach and the provision of feedback consist of a

148 series of activities which were covered in four sessions. Each session lasted for 100 minutes.

149 The first session was the explanation of teaching material where the teacher gave explicit

150 information needed in order the students were able to write a good paragraph and/or highlight

151 the materials/part of material which still found to be problematize in students' paragraph

152 writing. The process writing was started at the second and the third sessions where the students

153 were guided to follow the steps in writing their paragraph. In the last session, the students were

154 given written feedback and follow-up by giving explanation either for the whole class or

155 individually through written conference and then they were asked to revise again their

156 paragraph based on the feedback given. The activities in each session is explained as follow:

157

158 The first session was an initial step in which students were introduced to the material and the

159 classroom activities. The teacher started by motivating the students to get involved in the

160 learning process followed by explicit teaching of paragraph, the elements of a good paragraph,

161 and how to write an effective paragraph. The writing classroom was conducted mainly for

162 providing overall information and explicit explanation about the elements of a good paragraph

163 and how to write it effectively. To ensure the students understanding on the elements of a good

164 paragraph, they were exposed to several samples of good and weak construct of paragraphs

165 and did the analysis together before they finally asked to read some paragraphs individually and

166 analysed its' elements. The students, then, invited to give their opinion about those paragraphs.

167

168 The second session started by the first stage of process writing – planning/prewriting activities.

169 The students worked in a small group and were guided to find and collect ideas relating to a

170 chosen topic through brainstorming/making a list, clustering/mapping, or making a scratch

171 outline. The guidance was given either for whole class, group, or personally. After finishing

172 the planning stage, students continued to drafting process by writing their first draft individually

173 based on their own outline. The teacher presented herself as a helpful facilitator, prompter, and

174 motivator who always offering support and guidance. Mitigated commentary were also used as

175 a tool to increase student motivation, engagement, and interest. In this activity, students tried to

176 finish writing their first draft, sharing and discussing their ideas or difficulty to both the teacher

177 and their friends.

178

179 Moving to the third stage of the process writing, students were guided to review and revise their

180 paragraph to make the result of their writing stronger. At this stage, the students were guided to

181 check for the paragraph unity, the support, and the organization of their ideas using paragraph

182 checklist provided by the lecturer. At this point, students were asked to analyse their paragraph,

183 add the information needed, cross out unnecessary information or reorganize the ideas. The

184 students did this activity in pair and/or in a small group so they can share the ideas on how to

185 improve the paragraph with their peer. Besides gaining confidence, perspective, and critical

186 thinking, this activities also built a sense of classroom community (Ferris, 2003). The students,

187 then, write the revision based on the result of their friends' review. After the spelling, grammar,

188 and punctuation was edited, this second draft then submitted to the teacher for getting feedback.

189

190 The last session was, once again, the students revised their second draft based on the written

191 feedback given by the teacher. This process is very important since the students can get the

192 information about the strength and weaknesses of their paragraph that need to be improved

193 (Silver & Lee, 2007). Studies in ESL writing also confirmed that teacher's feedback is

194 considered as a valuable tool that can be used to promote students' revision and to foster the

195 learning to write process (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, Hyland, 2003, Hyland & Hyland, 2006)

196

197 Before writing the revision, the teacher discussed the most common feedback written on the

198 students draft for the whole class and continued by discussing specific feedback personally to

199 each student. This activities allow the student to negotiate teacher's feedback and standing up

200 for their ideas, so they can get better understanding on how to use the feedback in writing the

201 revision (L. M. Goldstein, 2004). After all the written feedback were comprehended, students

202 wrote the revision and submit the draft as their final result.

203

204 The combination of process approach and feedback as a technique in teaching writing is proved

205 effective to facilitate students' difficulties in learning writing. The observation result showed

206 that students' comprehension on how to write and organize their ideas are getting better. In

207 prewriting stage/planning process, the students' difficulty in formulating the topic sentence and

208 developing the focus of their paragraph are lessen by the various learning activities done during

209 this process. Small group activity which is used in this stage able to facilitate the student's

210 difficulties in discovering more ideas related to the given topic and finding relevant supports

211 and details for developing the focus chosen for their paragraph.

212

213 In the reviewing stage, the students were assisted with peer review activity where they can help

214 each other by correcting and sharing opinion on how to make the paragraph more coherent and

215 improved. As Keh (2015) mentioned that peer review activity can make the students learn more

216 about writing through critically reading others' papers (Keh, 2015). Besides gaining a greater

217 sense of audience at the student's own level of development, the ability gained through this

218 practice is also transferred when writing and revising their own paper (Lundstrom & Baker,

219 2009). Additionally, this practice makes students ability in writing gradually improved

220 (Rollinson, 2005, Min, 2005).

221

222 Furthermore, written conference which was conducted personally after the students got written

223 feedback from the teacher facilitates the students with a chance for having clarification and

224 standing up for their ideas (Gilliland, 2014). This session also mediate both student and teacher

225 to negotiate the intended meaning of their own writing which at the end can give clearer clue

226 for the student in making the revision. The successful negation during this activities lead the

227 students to produce successful revision in their subsequent draft (L. Goldstein, 2017). Besides,

228 the interactional activities during the feedback session create positive relationship between

229 teacher and students without deviating from their instructional objectives (Shvidko, 2018). This

230 activity also help the students to improve their knowledge and understanding on how to make

231 their writing more effective.

232

233 The analysis on the result of students' final draft also showed that students' paragraph has well

234 developed. All the students can formulate the topic sentence of their paragraph, develop the

235 focus of the paragraph with sufficient supports and details, organize the ideas systematically,

236 write different types of sentences and put connectors and punctuation appropriately. So it can

237 be concluded that the application of process approach and the provision of feedback has

238 effectively facilitate students' learning and improved students' understanding and performance

239 in writing an effective paragraph.

240

241 **Students' Response toward the Implementation of Process Approach and Teacher's**

242 **Feedback Provision**

243

244 The data showed that the students give positive and various responses towards the application

245 of process approach and feedback in teaching writing. The result of interview revealed that most

246 of the students considered the application of process approach and the provision of feedback in

247 their writing class is very important since it can facilitate their learning difficulties and

248 beneficial in organising their ideas and focusing the ideas in their paragraph.

249

250 Most of students, which were at the beginning - before the method applied – didn't know how

251 to write a good paragraph, how to specified and focused their paragraph, are now can write a

252 better paragraph. As confessed by R#2 that this approach is very important in learning writing

253 because it help me in finding, planning and generating ideas, specifying/focusing idea, and

254 making my writing more organized. Another opinion was given by R#5. She said that this

255 approach is very important for learning writing since it teach the students writing through some

256 steps that make the process of writing easier. The similar opinion as confessed by R#2 and R#5

257 were also expressed by all the interviewee. This finding is also supported by data from

258 documents analysis. One of the area improvement is the student can specified and focused

259 his/her paragraph. It can be seen from the students' paragraph which was written before, during

260 the implementation of the approach, and after the provision of teacher's feedback.

261

262 Before the implementation of process writing approach and feedback, most of students' wrote

263 paragraphs which did not have focus and many new ideas were only introduced without having

264 detail explanation or supports. There was no topic sentence stated and there were also some

265 ideas presented but lack of appropriate supports/details. As it is mentioned that a good

266 paragraph should begin by making a point which is also known as topic sentence, and the point

267 should be develop with appropriate supports/evidences (Raimes, Ann & Jerskey, 2011); (Yarber

268 & Yarber, 2010). The similar result was also seen in most students' paragraphs. Most of the

269 students were used to write anything cross in their mind without planning what he is going to

270 write.

271

272 However, there was a progress during the implementation of this approach and technique. The

273 students became more responsive and had better understanding about the characteristics of a

274 good and effective paragraph and tried to apply it into their writing. Students started writing a

275 topic sentence in the beginning of their paragraphs and the points have supported with

276 appropriate details although it still need to reorganise. Most of students get better understanding

277 on how to start, generating, focusing, and organising their ideas in their paragraph writing.

278

279 The better improvement is seen the third draft which were written after the provision of

280 teacher's feedback. Most students has started their paragraph by writing a clear topic sentence,

281 used various types of sentences; their paragraphs became more focused, well developed, flow

282 smoothly and all the ideas has been arranged systematically.

283

284 Although all students admitted the importance of process approach and feedback in learning

285 writing, they showed various responses toward the provision of teachers' written feedback on

286 their draft. Some of them felt surprised as confessed by the following students:

287

288   StM : "I feel surprised seeing the notes on my draft. I did it

289   carefully and followed all the instruction in fact there were

290   still many parts need to be revised"

291   YnR: "It surprised me. I have checked it over before I submitted

292   my paper. I thought I have done all correctly.

293

294 While, other students said they felt sad and disappointed as admitted below:

295

296   PpT: "I feel a little sad. In fact I still did many mistakes in my

297   writing"

298   DNA: "I feel sad. I have given the maximum effort but in fact it

299   still need many revision"

300   LdY: "I disappointed to myself, I realized I need to learn more"

301

302 However, some others students mentioned that they felt challenged after receiving their draft

303 from the teacher. As confessed by the following students:

304

305   YnT : "I feel like challenged. I have to do better and learn more"

306   DfF : "I realized the my writing was not good yet. So, I have to

307   try hard and do better"

308

309 Referring to the easiest and the most difficult feedback to comprehend, most students expressed

310 similar responses. Most students mentioned the suggestion and correction were the easiest

311 feedback to comprehend since they just did revision based on the correction given or revised it

312 by using clue or guidance from the teacher's suggestion. While feedback in form of questions

313 were considered difficult as students felt confused and did know how to make the revision.

314 However, it was comprehended clearly after they had the written conference personally with

315 the teacher.

316

317 Another importance finding referring to the students' response toward the provision of teacher's

318 written feedback is the students concession which mentioned if the feedback in form of

319 suggestion which were written right to the place where it need revision is very favourable for

320 them since it guide them in making the appropriate revision. Although the students show

321 various responses when seeing the teacher's note, all students acknowledged that praise which

322 were written in the beginning of teacher's note makes the students happy and motivated because

323 they hard work were appreciated.

324

Conclusion

326 The result of this study showed that the process writing approach and the provision of teachers'

327 feedback is potential to be applied in teaching writing. Most students considered the provision

328 of feedback in process writing is very important since it can facilitate their learning difficulties,

329 beneficial in organising their ideas and focusing their paragraph writing. The written conference

330 which were accompanied the provision of teacher's written feedback facilitates the students

331 with a more clear understanding and clear guidance on how to revise and improve their writing.

332 Furthermore, feedback in form of suggestion which were written right to the place where it need

333 to be revised is very favourable for the students while praise which were written in the beginning

334 of teacher's note makes the students happy and motivated because they hard work were

335 appreciated. Thus it is suggested for writing teacher to use the combination of this approach and

336 technique in teaching writing, apply various learning activities, and give maximum effort and

337 guidance to support students' learning achievement.

338

References

Adisca, F. A., & Mardijono. (2013). *Written Corrective Feedback and Its Effects on English Department Students' Writing Drafts*.

Arici, A. F., & Kaldirim, A. (2015). The effect of the process-based writing approach on writing success and anxiety of pre-service teachers. *Anthropologist*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2015.11891883

Bijami, M., Pandian, A., Kaur, M., & Singh, M. (2016). The Relationship between Teacher's Written Feedback and Student's' Writing Performance: Sociocultural Perspective. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, *4*(1). https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.4n.1p.59

Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Retrieved from https://openlibrary.org/publishers/Heinle_&_Heinle_Publishers

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007a). *Research Methods in*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007b). Research methods in education. In *Professional Development in Education* (Vol. 38). https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2011.643130

Conrad, S. M., & Goldstein, L. M. (1999). ESL student revision after teacher-written comments: Text, contexts, and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(2), 147–179. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80126-X

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. In *Educational Research* (Vol. 4). https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Dokchandra, D. (2018). *The Effects of Process Writing Approach on Performance of an Overcrowded EFL Writing Class at a University in Thailand*. *2018*, 191–206. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i4.1931

Eslami, E. (2014). The Effects of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback Techniques on EFL Students' Writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.438

16

Farjadnasab, A., & Khodashenas, M. (2017). *The Effect of Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Students' Writing Accuracy.* https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.2.30

Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to Student Writing: Implication for SecondlLanguage Students.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Gashout, M. A. S. (2014). Incorporating the facilitative feedback strategies together with the process approach to improve students' writing. *International Journal of Education and Research, 2*(10). Retrieved from www.ijern.com

Gilliland, B. (2014). *Academic Language Socialization in High School Writing Conferences.* 303–330. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.1753

Goksoy& Nazli. (2016). *The Effect Of Direct And Indirect Written Corrective Feedback On Students' Writing.*

Goldstein, L. (2017). *Feedback and Revision in Second Language Writing: Contextual, teacher, and student variables.*

Goldstein, L. M. (2004). Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and student revision: Teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(1), 63–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.006

Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/57.4.401

Hashemnezhad, H., & Hashemnezhad, N. (2012). A Comparative Study of Product, Process, and Post-process Approaches in Iranian EFL Students' Writing Skill. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.4.722-729

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). *The Power of Feedback.* 33. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hosseiny, M. (2014). The Role of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Improving Iranian EFL Students' Writing Skill. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.466

Hyland, K. (2003). Second Language Writing. In *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling.* https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, *39*(2), 83–101. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399

Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H., & Azizifar, A. (2015). The Effects of Teacher-Written Direct vs . Indirect Feedback on Students ' Writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 192*, 116–123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.018

Keh, C. L. (2015). *Feedback in the Writing Process: a model and method for implementation*. (April). https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/44.4.294

Kroll, B. (1990). *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom* (p. 246). p. 246. Cambridge University Press.

Langan, J. (2010). *Exploring Writing: Sentences and Paragraphs*. McGrall-Hill.

Listiani. (2017). Students' Perception toward Teacher's Written Corrective Feedback in Writing 3 class. *Advanced in Social Science, Education, and Humanities Research (ASSEHR), 109*, 164–167.

Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). *To give is better than to receive : The benefits of peer review to the reviewer ' s own writing*. *18*, 30–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002

Mehr, H. S. (2017). *The Impact of Product and Process Approach on Iranian EFL Learners ' Writing Ability and Their Attitudes toward Writing Skill*. *7*(2), 158–166. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n2p158

Min, H. (2005). *Training students to become successful peer reviewers*. *33*, 293–308. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.11.003

Nabhan, S. (2017). *The Process Approach To Improve Students' Writing Ability In The Process Approach To Improve Students' Writing Ability In English Education Department University Of PGRI ADI BUANA SURABAYA*. (June 2016), 0–15.

Omer, M., Mahfoodh, H. A., & Pandian, A. (2011). *A Qualitative Case Study of EFL Students' Affective Reactions to and Perceptions of Their Teachers' Written Feedback*. *4*(3). https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p14

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to Academic Writing*.

424 https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

425 Raimes, Ann & Jerskey, M. (2011). *Keys For Writers*. Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

426 Richards, Jack C. & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An*

427 *Anthology of Current Practice*. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/58.1.80

428 Rollinson, P. (2005). *Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class*. *59*(January), 23–30.

429 https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci003

430 Shvidko, E. (2018). Writing conference feedback as moment-to-moment affiliative

431 relationship building. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *127*, 20–35.

432 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.01.004

433 Silver, R., & Lee, S. (2007). *What does it take to make a change? Teacher feedback and*

434 *student revisions* RITA SILVER. *6*(1), 25–49.

435 Srichanyachon, N. (2012). Teacher written feedback for L2 learners' writing development.

436 *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts*, *12*(1), 7–17.

437 Retrieved from www.journal.su.ac.th

438 Tom, A. A., Morni, A., Metom, L., & Joe, S. (2013). Students' Perception and Preferences of

439 Written Feedback in Academic Writing. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*.

440 https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n11p72

441 Ur, P. (1991). *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

442 Yarber, M. ., & Yarber, R. E. (2010). *Reviewing Basic Grammar: A Guide to Writing*

443 *Sentences and Paragraph*. pearson Education Inc.

444 Zareil, A. A., & Rahnama, M. (2013). The Effect of Written Corrective Feedback Modes on

445 EFL Learners' Grammatical and Lexical Writing Accuracy: from Perceptions to Facts.

446 *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, *1*(3), 1–

447 14. Retrieved from www.arcjournals.org

ABS 164

Publication

21 revistas.unal.edu.co
    Internet Source   1%

22 Submitted to Higher Education Commission
    Pakistan
    Student Paper   1%

23 www.ccsenet.org
    Internet Source   1%

24 katakita.petra.ac.id
    Internet Source   1%

25 Kang, EunYoung, and Zhaohong Han. "The
    Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in
    Improving L2 Written Accuracy: A Meta-
    Analysis", Modern Language Journal, 2015.
    Publication   1%

26 Submitted to University of Huddersfield
    Student Paper   <1%

27 journal.ipts.ac.id
    Internet Source   <1%

28 Submitted to Gesthotel Sarl
    Student Paper   <1%

29 Submitted to University of Leeds
    Student Paper   <1%

30 journal.um.ac.id
    Internet Source   <1%

| 31 | Submitted to Flinders University Student Paper | <1% |

| 32 | Submitted to Universiti Putra Malaysia Student Paper | <1% |

| 33 | Submitted to International American University Student Paper | <1% |

| 34 | researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz Internet Source | <1% |

| 35 | Submitted to University of Liverpool Student Paper | <1% |

| 36 | ejournal.umpwr.ac.id Internet Source | <1% |

| 37 | jurnal.unissula.ac.id Internet Source | <1% |

| 38 | www.starjournal.org Internet Source | <1% |

| 39 | etheses.whiterose.ac.uk Internet Source | <1% |

| 40 | academicjournals.org Internet Source | <1% |

| 41 | eprints.uny.ac.id Internet Source | <1% |

| 42 | www.eajournals.org | |

Internet Source

<1%

43   Surya Darmawan, Irma Savitri Sadikin, Yanuarti Apsari. "THE EFFECT OF MINIMAL MARKING FEEDBACK FOR TEACHING PARAGRAPH WRITING", PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education), 2020
Publication

<1%

44   garuda.ristekbrin.go.id
Internet Source

<1%

45   Submitted to Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi
Student Paper

<1%

46   Submitted to University of the Arts, London
Student Paper

<1%

47   Submitted to University of Leicester
Student Paper

<1%

48   Submitted to Pasundan University
Student Paper

<1%

49   digilib.iain-palangkaraya.ac.id
Internet Source

<1%

50   Icy Lee. "Classroom Writing Assessment and Feedback in L2 School Contexts", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2017
Publication

<1%

www.bib.irb.hr

51 Internet Source

<1%

52 journal.ikippgriptk.ac.id
Internet Source

<1%

53 Submitted to University of Brighton
Student Paper

<1%

54 Manijeh Hosseiny. "The Role of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Improving Iranian EFL Students' Writing Skill", Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2014
Publication

<1%

55 "PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED", Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2015
Publication

<1%

56 knepublishing.com
Internet Source

<1%

57 repository.unilibre.edu.co
Internet Source

<1%

58 dergipark.org.tr
Internet Source

<1%

59 docobook.com
Internet Source

<1%

60 Leila Kordi, Samaneh Hasheminejad, Reza Biria. "Do We Care? Investigating How a Caring

<1%

Relationship Might Influence Comments and Responses in EFL Writing Classes", Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2012
Publication

61 Maria L. Cabral. "Portuguese Higher Education Graduates' Views on Academic Writing", International Journal of Education, 2020
Publication

<1%

62 www.iiste.org
Internet Source

<1%

63 benjamins.com
Internet Source

<1%

64 www.e-iji.net
Internet Source

<1%

65 knowledge.library.iup.edu
Internet Source

<1%

66 www.tesl-ej.org
Internet Source

<1%

67 karyailmiah.unipasby.ac.id
Internet Source

<1%

68 ejournal.ihdn.ac.id
Internet Source

<1%

69 Carmen Candel, Eduardo Vidal-Abarca, Raquel Cerdán, Marie Lippmann, Susanne Narciss. "Effects of timing of formative feedback in

<1%

computer-assisted learning environments",
Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 2020
Publication

70 Daphnée Simard, Michael Zuniga. "Chapter 13. Exploring the mediating role of emotions expressed in L2 written languaging in ESL learner text revisions", John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2020
Publication

<1 %

| Exclude quotes | Off | Exclude matches | Off |
| Exclude bibliography | Off | | |