

Improving Students' Academic Writing through the Implementation of DRCOFEE (Direct Regulated Corrective Feedback): Prototype Testing

Mutiarani Pionera¹

mutiaranipionera@umpr.ac.id

Tazkiyatunnafs Elhawwa²

tazkiyatunnafs.elhawwa@umpr.ac.id

Lailatul Fithriyah Azzakiyah³

layla.fithri.azzaki@gmail.com

^{1,2,3}Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya

Abstract

This research examined the effectiveness of DRCOFEE in improving students' writing. DRCOFEE is an instructional model designing to teach English writing for academic purposes by considering the existence of constructivism view, self-regulated learning and written corrective feedback method. The subjects involved in this study were 70 students of Faculty of Islam Religion, University of Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya in academic year 2021/2022. Their writing scores as the primary data in this research were analyzed through repeated measure Two-Way Anova with 2x3 Factorial Design. The research findings showed that (1) there is a significant effect from the implementation of DRCOFEE to improve students' writing, (2) students' written compositions based on their level of self-regulated learning (high-low) show no difference, (3) the interaction of DRCOFEE model and students' self-regulation simultaneously gives improvement on students' writing.

Keywords: *Writing, Direct Regulated Corrective Feedback Instructional Model.*

INTRODUCTION

Quality learning activities are a representation of the quality of education, which serves to improve the quality of human resources (Anggraeni, 2019). The quality of learning is related to effective learning where the learning process obtained by students from interactions with lecturers and peers successfully leads them to achieve learning goals (Setyosari, 2014). In helping students achieve these learning goals, lecturers need teaching strategies (Widayati, 2012). In fact, efforts to achieve learning goals as a form of quality learning also need to apply a constructive learning model (Zahroh, 2015). This constructivist learning emphasizes the learning process by students to be able to take the initiative and be active in building their knowledge, where the role of the lecturer here is to guide and motivate them (Zahroh, 2015; Gunduz & Hursen, 2015; Akpan & Beard, 2016).

Constructivism theory views that learning occurs when a person composes concepts, information or knowledge based on the mental experiences he has acquired (Bakar, et.al, 2019). In other words, understanding of a knowledge is constructed through an intrinsic process by each individual who learns, or is referred to as a learner, and is facilitated by someone who teaches it, or is referred to as a learner. The role of the learner as a facilitator is not only to convey knowledge vocally, but also to create creative, exploratory learning and interactive dialogue for students (Kurteš, et.al, 2017). Thus, active learning is the atmosphere applied in this theory (Fernando & Marikar, 2017). Basically, in constructivist learning, problem solving activities will be found which aim to develop ideas, conclusions and integration of students' knowledge so that the nature of 'learning to learn' is realized (Bakar, et.al, 2019).

The current progress of science and technology encourages students to be willing and able to think critically so that constructive learning is important to be applied to higher education. Moreover, the absolute mastery of students to express their ideas in a scientific paper (especially using English) requires conceptual knowledge, one of which can be obtained from learning activities. In relation to the context of writing scientific papers in English, students must understand the linguistic features and other components of writing. The form of learning that has been implemented so far is in the form of the direct corrective feedback method, which according to students' perceptions, this method motivates themselves not to make mistakes in terms of grammar (Erkkilä, 2013; Mahfoodh et.al., 2011; Amara, 2011). 2015; Chung, 2015; Tangkiengsirisin & Kalra, 2016; Westmacott, 2017). The effectiveness of this method can also be seen from the improvement of students' writing skills (Susanti, 2013; Chen et.al., 2016).

Direct corrective feedback in improving students' writing skills using regular practices is very effective (Mubaro, 2012; Wijayanti et.al., 2015), especially in describing students' writing errors grammatically (Al-Bakri, 2015). Based on the results of previous studies, it can be concluded that the implementation of the direct corrective feedback method in the writing process greatly influences students' awareness to use good and correct grammar in accordance with applicable rules.

Ideally, students need an effort to make self-improvement, especially in terms of constructing their knowledge, by regulating and controlling their behavior in the learning process or what is called self-regulated learning (self-regulation) (Hastuti et.al., 2019). Generally, someone with a high level of self-regulated learning tends to be in line with the high achievement of learning outcomes (Atmojo et.al., 2020). However, even someone with a low level of self-regulated learning still has the same potential to improve the quality of his learning (Pionera et.al., 2020), as long as there is significant support and contribution from the application of the learning model by the learner. In other words, the ability to regulate basically can be improved through the habit of applying learning systems that are both

cognitive and metacognitive (Tran & Hasegawa, 2020).

The changing times have made many things change, one of which is the rapid development of information and communication technology where at first information technology was still analog. Analog is a form of electronic communication which is the process of sending information on electromagnetic waves, and is variable and continuous or also called analog signals (Muqsith, 2021). Over time, information technology has innovated to become digital. Digitization tends to be automated operating systems with computer-readable formats (Aji, 2016).

These changes have had a huge impact in the world of writing and typing where at first the technology used in typing was a manual typewriter. The typewriter is no longer the main tool used in the world of writing, because now it has been replaced by a digital tool called a computer. The use of computers in the world of writing has quite an impact on writers in the preparation of their writings, namely in terms of neatness and the use of various letters so that they give a different impression on each word that is written.

Basically, writing is an ability where each implementation and the results are obtained gradually, which indicates that good writing needs to be done many times to get the best results. Therefore, in writing, you must always pay attention to every element in it is used properly such as words, sentences, paragraphs and others. Writing is an activity of delivering messages (communication) through written language as a medium or tool by assembling letters into words or sentences that are conveyed to others so that others can understand them (Dalman, 2016).

Having the ability to write means that you must be skilled in communicating in spoken and written languages (Juanto, 2020). Writing is a result of one's efforts in the process of pouring thoughts into written language through sentences that are arranged completely and clearly so that they can be communicated to the reader successfully (Yulilistio, 2020). Therefore, writing requires experience, understanding, vocabulary,

diction selection, accuracy, ingenuity, mentoring, and a varied learning process both through regular practice and practice and requires a relatively short time to master (Haliatunisa & Oktaviani, 2020).

At the student level, writing skills are needed to express ideas and write them down in academic writing. Through writing, students are able to cultivate critical thinking and be more thorough in processing more information so that their insight and knowledge is increasing. The more often you write, the more you can generate new and creative ideas, and can be used as a problem-solving tool (Hamzah, 2021).

Furthermore, language ability is an interpretation of communication skills. These abilities which consist of reading, writing, listening and speaking competencies are very important aspects for college students to have as their maturity in conveying all forms of ideas, ideas and knowledge (Wahyuni, 2015). Ideally, self-maturation in communication needs to be supported by the acquisition of learning experiences that pay attention to how students, as communicators, are able to systematically organize their ideas to reach their communicants in a formal scope, both verbally and in writing.

One of the ways to communicate for academic purposes is to write a scientific paper. Although writing is often done, according to Nirwana and Ruspa (2020) students still have difficulty in expressing their ideas into writing as an empirical-objective study with standard vocabulary and grammar. In addition, Darmuki et.al. (2021) also revealed that students need to be encouraged to be more active because it is not uncommon to find boring scientific writing lessons, especially through online classes nowadays.

Writing is not a skill that is obtained instantly but through various guidance and direction in the learning process in the world of formal and non-formal education. In the world of education, student status is the highest status of a learner. Therefore, students are required to have good writing skills so that through their writing they are able to convey information correctly and have good communication. In addition, according to

Marbun (2021), students' writing skills become their main capital in conducting future research.

Based on the results of the needs analysis conducted by the researchers, it is known that students of the Faculty of Islamic Religion, University of Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya tend to really need the guidance of lecturers in writing scientific papers in English when learning takes place or outside of learning. In this case, the lecturer provides corrections/notes to student writings and the revisions they make will indirectly lead them to construct their own understanding so that the results of subsequent writings can be even better. To direct students to carry out these constructions, a learning model in the form of DRCOFEE (Direct Regulated Corrective Feedback) was designed which in this study will be tested.

DRCOFEE is a model that is specifically intended for learning to write English scientific papers at the student level. This model is included in constructivist learning in terms of its characteristics which encourage students to actively examine lecturer corrections in improving their scientific writings. The review of these corrections, which is influenced by the level of self-regulated learning of each student (high or low), will have implications for the responsiveness of students to construct information from lecturers to improve their writing. Through the phases in this model, all students have the opportunity to be able to manage their self-regulated learning potential to support their scientific writing activities.

Direct Regulated Corrective Feedback (DRCOFEE)

DRCOFEE is a model especially developed for instructional English writing in producing academic papers. This model is based on the constructivist approach in which students are encouraged to actively examine lecturer's corrections in improving their writings. This ability to review the corrections from the lecturer is influenced by the level of self-regulated learning of the students themselves. In other words, their self-regulation implicates their responsiveness to construct information from lecturers to improve

their writing. Through the phases in this model, all students have the opportunity to be able to manage their self-regulation as well as possible to support their writing.

Based on a study of several related literatures, learning to write essays can be optimized through the direct corrective feedback method. This method is feedback given by the teacher by showing the correct form of language (Ellis, 2009) by crossing out the error and then giving the correct form around the error (Ferris, 2006). Direct feedback is a procedure to provide explicit information and guidance to correct errors directly (Ellis, 2009). Ferris & Roberts (2001) suggest using direct feedback on low-ability learners. However, Ellis (2009) points out that direct feedback requires minimal maintenance (ability to improve) by the learner himself. This can be attributed to students with low levels of self-regulated learning who have the same potential as students with high levels of self-regulated learning to improve their learning quality (Pionera et al., 2020), as long as there is significant support and contribution from the implementation of learning strategies by lecturer. Given that corrective feedback plays an important role in improving language development in writing (Elhawwa et al., 2018), the DRCOFEE learning model needs to be developed to optimize the understanding and practice of writing English essays, as mentioned earlier, and to manage self-regulated potential. student learning to support its realization.

Direct Regulated Corrective Feedback (DRCOFEE)

DRCOFEE is a model especially developed for instructional English writing in producing academic papers. This model is based on the constructivist approach in which students are encouraged to actively examine lecturer's corrections in improving their writings. This ability to review the corrections from the lecturer is influenced by the level of self-regulated learning of the students themselves. In other words, their self-regulation implicates their responsiveness to construct information from lecturers to improve their writing. Through the phases in this model, all students have the opportunity to be able to

manage their self-regulation as well as possible to support their writing.

Based on a study of several related literatures, learning to write essays can be optimized through the direct corrective feedback method. This method is feedback given by the teacher by showing the correct form of language (Ellis, 2009) by crossing out the error and then giving the correct form around the error (Ferris, 2006). Direct feedback is a procedure to provide explicit information and guidance to correct errors directly (Ellis, 2009). Ferris & Roberts (2001) suggest using direct feedback on low-ability learners. However, Ellis (2009) points out that direct feedback requires minimal maintenance (ability to improve) by the learner himself. This can be attributed to students with low levels of self-regulated learning who have the same potential as students with high levels of self-regulated learning to improve their learning quality (Pionera et al., 2020), as long as there is significant support and contribution from the implementation of learning strategies by lecturer. Given that corrective feedback plays an important role in improving language development in writing (Elhawwa et al., 2018), the DRCOFEE learning model needs to be developed to optimize the understanding and practice of writing English essays, as mentioned earlier, and to manage self-regulated potential. student learning to support its realization.

Table 1. Syntaxes of DRCOFEE Model

Phases	Activity
Demonstration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presenting the theory of English writing for academic purposes • Finding idea to start writing
Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing the process of writing
Reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoring and reviewing the composition

The DRCOFEE learning model pays attention to the influence of students' self-regulated learning levels in understanding how to

systematically write scientific papers in English. As an assumption, students with low levels of self-regulated learning will tend to require more complex and detailed direct corrective feedback content from lecturers, while students with high levels of self-regulated learning only require simple direct corrective feedback content. It should be underlined that the content here is in the form of notes or corrections given by the lecturer to improve the draft composition of essays written by students.

This difference in content, on the one hand, will allow for more intense written interactions between lecturers and students with low levels of self-regulated learning so that they are able to construct an understanding of how to compose an English scientific paper and find the best way to learn. On the other hand, students with high levels of self-regulated learning still maintain their study habits without being hampered by the generalization of learning evaluations from lecturers. In fact, he can become a peer teacher for his colleagues in need. Thus, both students with low self-regulated learning and high self-regulated learning are both activated to want and continue to self-regulate in improving their scientific writing skills.

The direct corrective feedback method that has been implemented so far in learning to write scientific papers tends to contain the same corrections between one student and another. This generalization allows students to fail to achieve the goal of correction or improvement, especially for those who have a low level of self-regulated learning. It is necessary to realize that the contribution of self-regulated learning can be seen from how students are able to understand the corrections given by the lecturer and how they respond to the learning process they are facing. By classifying the level of self-regulated learning before the method is given, lecturers can monitor these two things so that all students have the same opportunity to improve their writing skills in English scientific papers.

Through this model, students' progress in writing a scientific paper can be monitored from the beginning to the end of learning. More guidance from lecturers is carried out for students with low self-regulated learning in the writing

process, coupled with the abilities shown by students with high self-regulated learning in the same process can provide stimulation and acceleration of regulation of colleagues with low self-regulated learning.

Regarding the mechanical aspect of writing scientific papers in English, the main focus of lecturers is to anticipate the obstacles that students often encounter, such as difficulties in selecting and organizing ideas, developing thesis statements, adding or removing details for unity, rearranging ideas for coherence, using transition signals, and made some mistakes in spelling, articles, pronouns, run on sentences, plural forms, missing words, verb tenses, prepositions, capital letters, and punctuation. This anticipation is easier to do if the lecturer knows the potential level of student self-regulated learning in advance so that the direct corrective feedback provided is effective.

In terms of assessment procedures, this model requires both process and product assessments. Process assessment is focused on assessing student progress in three cycles (pre – whilst – post writing). In assessing student progress during the writing process (whilst), the lecturer uses a consultation journal owned by each student. To evaluate the writing of student scientific papers, there are three methods used, namely holistic, primary nature, and analytic assessment. Because the focus of this writing assessment is on developing ideas, namely how students develop thesis statements into compositional paragraphs, the main trait assessment method is suitable to be used. In this method, the score is given holistically based on certain features of the writing that are emphasized. This method checks whether the subject's writing shows evidence of certain features that the researcher wants students to demonstrate in writing. The assessment method applied in this study was adapted from O'Malley & Pierce (1996) and the assessment standards of the University of Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya. This was done to produce the right criteria for assessing aspects of the development of student writing ideas.

The scoring rubric used consists of four aspects: score, level, score range, and criteria. Each

aspect is divided into five levels with the criteria for each level starting from the highest to the lowest. The scores are classified into A, B, C, D, and E. A is called very good; B means reasonable; C refers to the average; D means low; and E is called failed. Thus, the score range is divided into five levels and each level contains a score of nine points. For this method, the score depends on the degree to which the student's writing criteria are met. The more posts that meet the criteria, the higher the score will be.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Quasi-experimental with design treatment by level 2x3 was used in this research, as the independent variables consisted of two dimensions of self-regulated learning (high-low) and three dimensions of students' written composition as the implementation of DRCOFEE model (original script, revision-1, revision-2). The subjects involved in this study were 70 students of Faculty of Islam Religion, University of Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya in academic year 2021/2022.

Data Collection

Data collection in this research were divided into two types, primary and secondary data. Primary data were collected in the second phase of DRCOFEE. It was students' writing scores based on their compositions taken in three times; *Original script* was the composition taken before getting any correction from the lecture, *Revision-1* was the revised composition accordance with the first correction, *Revision-2* was the final composition after getting the second correction. These data were then analyzed to find out whether or not there was a significant progress towards students' writing as the success in implementing DRCOFEE model.

Besides that, secondary data was the result of self-regulated learning questionnaire given for the subjects (students) before the instruction with DRCOFEE was conducted. It was intended to be lecturer's additional reference in determining the

content of correction according to the student's self-regulation level.

Data Analysis

The research data was analyzed by using two-way repeated measure Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to test the following hypotheses:

1. The implementation DRCOFEE model in English instruction affected students' writing
2. The level of students' self-regulated learning (SRL) affected students' writing
3. The interaction of DRCOFEE model and self-regulated learning affected students' writing

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In order to determine the feasibility of parametric before testing the hypotheses. it is necessary to test the requirements of univariate analysis. This analysis includes normality and homogeneity test to determine the main effect and interaction effect between research variables.

Test of Normality

This research used Kolmogorov Smirnov normality test because of its advantages that it does not cause differences in perception of observations as well as the use of graphs for normality tests. Data is said to be abnormal if there is a significant difference between the tested data and standard normal data (significant value $p < 0.05$).

Table 2. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		7
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	.000000
	Std. Deviation	11.2150274
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.09
	Positive	.07
	Negative	-.09

Test Statistic	.091
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.200 ^{c,d}
a. Test distribution is Normal.	
b. Calculated from data.	
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.	
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.	

It can be seen from table 2 that the significance Asymtop value is 0.200 (>0.05). This means that the data is normally distributed.

Test of Homogeneity

This research used Levene's test. to examine whether the variance value of writing scores individually is homogeneous among the three-time conditions. Based on the criteria of this test, the data is homogeneous only if the $p > 0.05$.

Table 3. Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Based on Mean	.580	1	68	.449
Based on Median	.451	1	68	.504
Based on Median and with adjusted df	.451	1	67.957	.504
Based on trimmed mean	.554	1	68	.459

Based on table 3. it can be seen that the significance value (Sig.) of based on Mean is 0.449 (> 0.05). This means that the research data is categorized as homogeneous.

Two-way Repeated Measure ANOVA with 2x3 Factorial Design

Since the data was distributed normally and homogeneous. then the two-way repeated measure ANOVA could be conducted. This test

examined 2 main variables and 1 interaction which were assumed to affect the improvement of students' writing.

The first hypothesis tested is accepted. Table 5 shows that the probability based on the implementation variable of the DRCOFEE learning model is 0.009 (< 0.05). It meant that there is a significant effect from the implementation of the DRCOFEE learning model on students' writing. This finding was also strengthened by the significant difference of average scores among the three compositions as it was presented in table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Written Compositions

	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Original Script	70	59.185	15.3974
Revision-1	70	73.671	13.9893
Revision-2	70	84.871	7.8977
Valid N (listwise)	70		

The second hypothesis is rejected. The probability based on the SRL level variable on table 5 is 0.813 (> 0.05). It means that there is no significant effect of the students' self-regulated learning level on their writing.

Table 5. Test of between-Subject Effects by ANOVA

Dependent Variable: writing skill

Source	Type III		F	Sig.
	Sum of Squares	df		
Corrected Model	6546.238	3	172.26	2.47
Intercept	268877.7		268877.7	3856.
DRCOFEE	4312.39	2	172.49	2.47
SRL	3.98		3.98	.05
DRCOFEE* SRL	2404.52	1	200.37	2.87
Error	2161.13	3	69.71	
Total	377080.0	7		
Corrected Total	8707.37	6		

a. R Squared = .752 (Adjusted R Squared = .448)

The third hypothesis is accepted. For the interaction. the probability used on the line DRCOFEE*SRL on table 5 shows 0.009 (> 0.05). It means that there is a significant effect of the interaction between the implementation of the DRCOFEE learning model and the student's self-regulation on writing.

DISCUSSION

DRCOFEE is an instructional model designing to teach English writing for academic purposes by considering the existence of constructivism view, self-regulated learning and written corrective feedback method. Its goal to help students improve their writing was proven based on the test result of hypothesis 1. Students' writing progress was significantly affected by the implementation of this model. Because of student engagement and the relevance of learning are the precedence considerations in designing an effective and efficient instruction (Reigeluth and Carr-Cheliman, 2009), DRCOFEE reliably adopts

this principle on its structure to lead the students achieve their writing improvement.

As the assumption stated before, all students are equally activated to want and keep continue to self-regulate improving their scientific writing skills through the implementation of DRCOFEE model depending on their own treatment needed. Based on the test result of hypothesis 2, the phases of DRCOFEE succeeded to manage their different self-regulation thoroughly. In other words, the difference in the level of SRL actually makes their learning complete. That is what causes self-regulation as a single factor here did not give any significant effect on writing.

Moreover, the test result of hypothesis 3 shows that students' writing improvement occurred as an interaction between DRCOFEE implementation and their self-regulation. Although this model determined the contribution of SRL by categorizing the correction given as well as their SRL level, it did not mean that they were extremely differentiated. The learning activities through DRCOFEE had been designed to manage this diverse level of self-regulation.

CONCLUSION

The research found that there is a significant effect from the implementation of DRCOFEE to improve students' writing, although students' written compositions based on their level of self-regulated learning (high-low) show no difference. However, the interaction of DRCOFEE model and students' self-regulation simultaneously gives improvement on students' writing.

As the part of research and development program, this research tested the prototype of DRCOFEE instructional model on small-scale samples. In order to disseminate the usage of the model, further research involving the larger ones is called for.

REFERENCES

- Aji, R. (2016). Digitalisasi. Era Tantangan Media (Analisis Kritis Kesiapan Fakultas Dakwah dan Komunikasi Menyongsong Era Digital).

- Islamic Communication Journal*. 7(1).
<https://doi.org/10.21580/icj.2016.1.1.1245>
- Akpan, J. P. & Beard, L. A. (2016). Using constructivist teaching strategies to enhance academic outcomes of students with special needs. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*. 4(2).
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1089692>
- Al-Bakri, S. (2015). Written direct corrective feedback: Teachers' beliefs, practices and challenges in an Omani context. *Arab Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 1(1). 44–73.
[http://www.hct.edu.om/pdf/elc/news-files/Sawsan%20Al-Bakri-\(2015\)-Written%20corrective%20feedback-Teachers-%20beliefs-practices-challenges-Omani-context.pdf](http://www.hct.edu.om/pdf/elc/news-files/Sawsan%20Al-Bakri-(2015)-Written%20corrective%20feedback-Teachers-%20beliefs-practices-challenges-Omani-context.pdf)
- Amara, T. (2015). Learners' perceptions of teacher written feedback commentary in an ESL writing classroom. *International Journal of English Language Teaching the University of Zawia, Libya*. 3(2). 38–53.
<http://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/Learners---Perceptions-of-Teacher-Written-Feedback-Commentary-in-an-ESL-Writing-Classroom.pdf>
- Anggraeni, N.E. (2019). Strategi pembelajaran dengan model pendekatan pada peserta didik agar tercapainya tujuan pendidikan di era globalisasi. *ScienceEdu*. 2(1).
<https://doi.org/10.19184/se.v2i1.11796>
- Atmojo, S., Muhtarom, T., & Lukitoaji, B. (2020). The Level of Self-Regulated Learning and Self-Awareness in Science Learning in the Covid-19 Pandemic Era. *Jurnal Pendidikan IPA Indonesia*, 9(4), 512-520.
<https://doi.org/10.15294/jpii.v9i4.25544>
- Bakar, M.A., Mukhtar, M. & Khalid, F. (2019). The development of a visual output approach for programming via the application of cognitive load theory and constructivism. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*. 10 (11). 305–312.
<https://doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2019.0101142>
- Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written direct corrective feedback: A case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*. 1(5).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-0160010-y>
- Chung, B. (2015). Written direct corrective feedback: The perception of Korean EFL learners. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*. 19(2). 75–88.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1092436.pdf>
- Dalman, H. (2016). *Keterampilan Menulis*. PT. Rajagrafindo Persada. ISBN: 978-979-769-440-1
- Darmuki, A., Hariyadi, A., & Hidayati, N. A. (2021). Peningkatan Kemampuan Menulis Karya Ilmiah Menggunakan Media Video Faststone di Masa Pandemi COVID-19. *Jurnal Educatio FKIP UNMA*. 7(2). 389-397.
<https://doi.org/10.31949/educatio.v7i2.1027>
- Elhawwa, T., Rukmini, D., Mujiyanto, J. & Sutopo, D. (2018). The learners perceive of written direct corrective feedback in writing multicultural class. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*. 247. 537-542. <https://doi.org/10.2991/iset-18.2018.108>
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*. 63(2). 97–107.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>
- Erkkilä, M. (2013). Teacher written feedback: Teachers' perceptions of given feedback. *Unpublished thesis*. University of Jyväskylä Department of Languages English.
<https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/42213/1/URN%3ANBN%3Afi%3Aju-201309252348.pdf>
- Fernando, S.Y.J.N & Marikar, F.M.M.T. (2017). Constructivist Teaching/ Learning Theory and Participatory Methods. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*. 6 (1).
<https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v6n1p110>
- Ferris, D. & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes how explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 10(3).161–184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X)

- Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. *Feedback in second language writing: contexts and issues*. 81–100. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547.008>
- Gunduz, N. & Hursen, C. (2015). Constructivism in teaching and learning: content analysis evaluation. *Procidia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 191. 526-533. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.640>
- Haliatunisa, Y., Oktaviani, V. (2020). Upaya Meningkatkan Kemampuan Menulis Puisi Melalui Penggunaan Teknik Akrostik Pada Pembelajaran Tematik. *Didaktika Tauhidi: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*. 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.30997/dt.v7i2.2847>
- Hamzah., Tambak, S. & Hayati, M. (2021). Pengembangan Keterampilan Menulis Akademik Mahasiswa: Pengaruh Jenjang Kelas dan Latar Belakang Orang Tua. *JKIP: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu pendidikan*. 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.55583/jkip.v2i1.125>
- Hastuti, R., Rahman, U. & Muchlis. (2019). Pengaruh regulasi diri (self-regulation) dan motivasi belajar terhadap hasil belajar Biologi pada peserta didik kelas XI MIA MAN 1 Bulukuma. *Jurnal Al-Ahya*. 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.24252/al-ahya.v1i2.8074>
- Juanto, A. (2020). Hubungan antara Penguasaan Kosakata dengan Kemampuan Menulis Catatan Harian pada Siswa Kelas VII MTs Mathla'ul Anwar Pusat Menes Kabupaten Pandeglang. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pedagogik*. 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.51499/cp.v4i2.139>
- Kurteš, S., Larina, T. & Ozyumenko, V. (2017, July). Constructivist approach to intercultural communication teaching and learning. In *EDULEARN17 Proceedings. 9th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies*. 591-597. <http://lib.uib.kz/edulearn17/proceedings/papers/1127.pdf>
- Mahfoodh, O. & Pandian, A. (2011). A qualitative case study of EFL students' affective reactions to and perceptions of their teachers' written feedback. *English Language Teaching*. 4(3). 14-25. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p14>
- Marbun, P. (2021). Desain Pembelajaran online pada Era dan Pasca Covid-19. *Jurnal SCRID*. 12(2).
- Mubarok, H. (2012). The use of peer feedback strategy to motivate students in narrative text writing. *English Education Journal EEJ*. 2(2). 162-168. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej/article/view/677>
- Muqsith, M.A. (2021) Teknologi Media Baru: Perubahan Analog Menuju Digital. *LP2M Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Syarif Hidayatullah*. 5(2).
- Nirwana & Ruspa. A. R. (2020). Kemampuan Menulis Karya Tulis Ilmiah Mahasiswa Prodi Informatika Universitas Cokroaminoto Palopo. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*. 6(1). 557-566. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v6i1.277>
- O'Malley, J.M. & Pierce, L.V. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learner: Practical approach for teacher*. Addison-Wesley.
- Pionera, M., Degeng, I.N.S., Widiati, U. & Setyosari, P. (2020). Instructional methods and self-regulated learning in writing. *International Journal of Instruction*. 13(3). 43-60. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.1334a>
- Reigeluth, C. & Carr-Cheliman, A. (2009). *Instructional-Design Theories and Models: Building a Common Knowledge Base*. Volume III. Routledge.
- Setyosari, P. (2014). Menciptakan pembelajaran yang efektif dan berkualitas. *Jurnal Inovasi dan Teknologi Pembelajaran*. 1 (1). 20-30. <http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/jinotep/article/view/2103/1239>
- Susanti, R. (2013). Students' perceptions towards the effective feedback practices in the large EFL writing class based on participants, gender, and English proficiency level. *Unpublished thesis*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Students-Perceptions-Towards-the->

- [Effective-in-the-Susanti/febc98de2a05772e236b288f8253064e27a8555](https://doi.org/10.21831/jpai.v3i1.836)
- Tangkiengsirisin, S., & Kalra, R. (2016). Thai students' perceptions on the direct vs. indirect written direct corrective feedback: A Thai university context. *Arab World English Journal Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*. 7(33). 161–176. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.2859253>
- Tran, M. & Hasegawa. S. (2020). Self-regulated learning recognition and improvement framework. *The Asian Conference on Education 2020 Official Conference Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.22492/issn.2186-5892.2021.40>
- Wahyuni, E. (2015). Hubungan *Self-efficacy* dan Keterampilan Komunikasi dengan Kecemasan Berbicara di Depan Umum. *Jurnal Komunikasi Islam*. 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.15642/jki.2015.5.1.51-82>
- Westmacott. A. (2017). Direct vs. indirect written direct corrective feedback: Student perceptions. *Íkala. Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura* 22 (1). 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n01a02>
- Widayati, A. (2012). Metode mengajar sebagai strategi dalam mencapai tujuan belajar mengajar. *Jurnal Pendidikan Akutansi Indonesia*. 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.21831/jpai.v3i1.836>
- Wijayanti, P., Bharati, B.A. & Mujiyanto, J. (2015). The use of written feedback technique to improve the practice of grammar for sentence writing competence. *English Education Journal*. 1-6. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej/article/view/6846>
- Yulistio, D. (2021). Kemampuan Menulis Teks Cerita pada Mahasiswa Program Sarjana Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Bengkulu. *Jurnal Ilmu Kebahasaan dan Kesastraan*. 19(2). 188-206. <https://doi.org/10.26499/mm.v19i2.3776>
- Zahroh, A. (2015). *Membangun kualitas pembelajaran melalui dimensi profesionalisme guru*. Yrama Widya.