

**THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY-MEDIATED CORRECTIVE
FEEDBACK IN IMPROVING STUDENT WRITING ACCURACY**

UNDERGRADUATE THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment for Bachelor's degree in
English Language Education
Study Program



By
Fiza Roteca
2000429

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
FACULTY OF LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA**

2024

THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY-MEDIATED CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN IMPROVING STUDENT WRITING ACCURACY

Oleh
Fiza Roteca

Sebuah skripsi yang diajukan untuk memenuhi salah satu syarat memperoleh gelar
Sarjana Pendidikan pada Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra

© Fiza Roteca 2024
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
Agustus 2004

Hak Cipta dilindungi undang-undang.
Skripsi ini tidak boleh diperbanyak seluruhnya atau sebagian,
dengan dicetak ulang, difoto kopi, atau cara lainnya tanpa ijin dari penulis.

APPROVAL PAGE

“THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY-MEDIATED CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN
IMPROVING STUDENT WRITING ACCURACY”

By
Fiza Roteca
2000429

Approved by:

First Supervisor



Pupung Purnawarman, M.S.Ed., Ph.D.
NIP. 196810131998031008

Head of English Language Education Study Program



Prof. Emi Emilia, M.Ed., Ph.D.
NIP. 1966091619900112001

STATEMENT OF AUTHORIZATION

I affirm that this paper entitled “The use of Technology-mediated Corrective Feedback in Improving Student Writing Accuracy” submitted as a requirement of a bachelor’s degree, represents an entirely original work I wrote. I am fully aware of ethical standards in scholarly research, that I cited and quoted several statements and ideas from numerous sources. All of the statements and ideas from other sources are properly cited.

Bandung, August 2024

Fiza Roteca

PREFACE

All gratitude to Allah SWT. His mercy and blessings have given the writer an opportunity to complete this undergraduate thesis entitled “The Use of Technology-mediated Corrective Feedback in Improving Student Writing Accuracy.” Peace and salutation to our prophet Muhammad SAW, who has brought humankind from darkness to this brightness era. This study is submitted as a partial fulfillment of requirements of the Sarjana Pendidikan Degree of English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Language and Literature Education at Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

This study aimed to investigate the use of technology-mediated corrective feedback in the process of students’ writing and teaching-learning activities. I hope the findings in this study will bring advantages to the English language teaching field and contribute to future research regarding technology-mediated learning. I also hope that this study can provide insightful information to the readers. Nevertheless, I am aware of some of this study's limitations. Therefore, any criticism and recommendations will be appreciated.

Bandung, August 2024

Fiza Roteca

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express my gratitude to Allah SWT, the most Gracious and Merciful, for granting me courage, patience, and strength. Peace and blessings will always be upon our noble Prophet Muhammad SAW, his family, his followers, and all Muslims.

While writing this paper, I received infinite support from those around me—whether through affection, motivation, discussion, or references. I extend my heartfelt thanks and appreciation to the individuals mentioned below:

1. My parents, Ibunda Yurnali and Ayahanda Hanserul Teratai, have become the primary source of the reason I believe in myself in every condition. They consistently reassure and support me, and their prayers have been the most impactful factor in paving unexpected paths for me.
2. My siblings, Kak Yoda and Yuk Lisa, were important in helping me finish my studies. Their prayers undoubtedly impacted me and motivated me.
3. Ibu Prof. Hj. Emi Emilia, M.Ed., Ph.D, the Head of the English Language Education Study Program and my academic advisor. She inspired me to consistently learn and be always motivated during my college journey.
4. Bapak Pupung Purnawarman, M.S.Ed., Ph.D., my supervisor, who guided me through the writing process of this paper. His critical insights took a pivotal role in structuring ideas and sentences within this paper.
5. All lecturers at the English Language Education Study Program, your knowledge and motivation would be invaluable for me.
6. Ibu Nine Novianti, S.Pd., English Language teacher at SMK Negeri 1 Kota Bandung, which provided full support and widely opened the opportunity for me to conduct this study in the class she has been teaching in.
7. My lovely colleagues— Adam, Devina, Ghina, Naomi, Tara—supported me and assisted me since day 1 of college to face challenges and difficulties during my study.
8. My beautiful and warm-hearted friends— Devi, Caca, Izza, Mames, Puja, Ina, Mudew, Uci, Aliyah, Sawah—sincerely encouraged me through my ups and downs in finishing this study.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menginvestigasi penggunaan umpan balik korektif yang dimediasi teknologi untuk kelas sebelas di salah satu Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan di Bandung, Jawa Barat. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain penelitian kuasi-eksperimental yang melibatkan 70 siswa akuntansi. Data dikumpulkan menggunakan (1) hasil pretest dan posttest dari kelompok eksperimen dan kontrol dan (2) kuesioner. Semua data dianalisis menggunakan IBM SPSS 29 untuk macOS dengan menguji normalitas dan homogenitas. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa umpan balik korektif tertulis guru menggunakan Showbie dan Google Docs meningkatkan akurasi tulisan siswa karena skor rata-rata kemunculan kesalahan dalam tulisan mereka menurun secara signifikan. Kemudian, umpan balik korektif yang dimediasi teknologi dapat diterapkan menggunakan media apapun, seperti Showbie dan Google Docs, karena skor rata-rata penurunan kesalahan dalam tulisan siswa tidak berbeda secara signifikan. Selain itu, siswa memiliki persepsi positif dan percaya bahwa umpan balik yang diberikan oleh guru menggunakan Showbie dan Google Docs meningkatkan akurasi tulisan mereka.

Kata kunci: *umpan balik korektif yang dimediasi teknologi, umpan balik korektif tertulis guru, Showbie, Google Docs, akurasi tulisan siswa.*

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the use of technology-mediated corrective feedback for eleventh-grade students in one vocational school in Bandung, West Java. This research used a quasi-experimental research design involving 70 accounting students. The data were collected using (1) the pretest and posttest results from experimental and control groups and (2) questionnaire. All the data were analyzed using IBM SPSS 29 for macOS by testing normality and homogeneity. The result of this study showed that teacher written corrective feedback using Showbie and Google Docs improves students' writing accuracy because the mean score of error occurrences in their writing significantly decreased. Furthermore, technology-mediated corrective feedback could be applied using any media, such as Showbie and Google Docs, because the mean scores of errors decrease in students writing was not significantly different. Additionally, students had positive perceptions and believed that feedback provided by teachers using Showbie and Google Docs improved their writing accuracy.

Keywords: *technology-mediated corrective feedback, teacher written corrective feedback, Showbie, Google Docs, student writing accuracy.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL PAGE	i
STATEMENT OF AUTHORIZATION	ii
PREFACE	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Research Questions	3
1.3 Aims of the Study	3
1.4 Scope and Limitations of the study	3
1.5 Significance of the Study	4
1.6 Clarification of Key Terms	5
CHAPTER II	
LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Writing	7
2.1.1 Nature of Writing	8
2.1.2 EFL Students Writing Skills in Indonesia	8
2.1.3 Difficulties in Teaching Writing in EFL Classroom	10
2.1.4 Writing Accuracy	11
2.2 Feedback in Writing	12
2.2.1 Corrective Feedback	12
2.2.1.1 Written Corrective Feedback (WCF)	13
2.2.1.2 Technology-mediated Corrective Feedback	16
2.3 Exposition Text	17
2.4 The Use of ICT/Technology in Writing	18
2.4.1 Showbie	19
2.4.1.1 Showbie User Guide	19
2.4.1.2 Tools for Feedback on the Showbie	21
2.4.1.3 Other Features in Showbie	22
2.4.2 Google Docs	24
2.4.2.1 Google Docs User Guide	25
2.4.2.2 Tools for Feedback on the Google Docs	25
2.4.2.3 Other Features in Google Docs	26
2.5 Previous Studies	28
CHAPTER III	
METHODOLOGY	29
3.1 Research Design	29

3.2 Population and Sample	30
3.3 Research Instrument	31
3.4 Research Procedures	32
3.4.1 Survey	32
3.4.2 Procedure for Feedback Provision	33
3.4.3 Treatment	33
3.4.4 Questionnaire	34
3.6 Data Analysis	35
3.6.1 Data Analysis on Students' Writing	35
3.6.1.1 Normal Distribution Test	36
3.6.1.2 Homogeneity Variance	36
3.6.2 Data Analysis on Questionnaire	36
3.7 Hypothesis	37
CHAPTER IV	
FINDING AND DISCUSSION	38
4.1 Research Findings	38
4.1.1 Pilot Test Result	38
4.1.2 Pretest Results	39
4.1.2.1 Normality Distribution of the Errors Occurrences in pretest	40
4.1.2.2 Homogeneity of Variance of the Errors Occurrences in pretest	40
4.1.3 Analysis of Students' Writing in Experimental Group	41
4.1.4 Analysis of Students' Writing in Control Group	43
4.1.5 Posttest Result	45
4.1.6 Students' Perceptions	48
4.1.6.1 Teacher Written Corrective Feedback is Important in the Process of Writing	48
4.1.6.2 Teacher Corrective Feedback using Showbie or Google Docs is Beneficial and Helpful	52
4.1.6.3 Features in Showbie facilitate students to improve their writing	54
4.1.6.4 Features in Google Docs facilitate students to improve their writing	57
4.1.6.5 Students' preferences toward the use of Showbie and Google Docs in the classroom activities	58
4.2 Discussion	61
CHAPTER V	
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	63
5.1 Conclusions	63
5.1 Recommendations	64
References	65
Appendices	78

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Showbie Homepage	20
Figure 2.2 Showbie Sign Up Page	20
Figure 2.3 Showbie's User Dashboard	21
Figure 2.4 Features inside the Document Viewer on Showbie	21
Figure 2.5 The feature of due date setting in Showbie	23
Figure 2.6 The feature of red circle and clip icon in Showbie	23
Figure 2.7 The feature of timely notification in Showbie	24
Figure 2.8 Google Docs Homepage	25
Figure 2.9 Features inside Google Docs	25
Figure 2.10 Spelling and Grammar Feature in Google Docs	26
Figure 2.11 Word Count Feature in Google Docs	27
Figure 2.12 Document Translation Feature in Google Docs	27
Figure 3.1 This study procedure	32
Figure 4.1 The Decrease of Grammatical of Students' Writing	45
Figure 4.2 The Decrease of Grammatical of Students' Writing	47
Figure 4.3 The importance of teacher feedback in the process of writing on the experimental group	48
Figure 4.4 The importance of teacher feedback in the process of writing on the control group	49
Figure 4.5 Feedback with highlight allows students in the experimental group to detect the grammatical errors independently	50
Figure 4.6 Feedback with highlight allows students in the control group to detect the grammatical errors independently	50
Figure 4.7 Students' self confidence after receiving feedback in the experimental group	51
Figure 4.8 Students' self confidence after receiving feedback in the control group	51
Figure 4.9 The benefit of teacher feedback on students' writing using Showbie	52
Figure 4.10 The benefit of teacher feedback on students' writing using Google Docs	53
Figure 4.11 The improvement of students' writing in the use of Showbie/Google Docs	54
Figure 4.12 Features in Showbie facilitate students to improve their writing	55
Figure 4.13 Other unique features in Showbie	56
Figure 4.14 Features in Showbie facilitate students to improve their writing	57
Figure 4.15 Other unique features in Google Docs	58
Figure 4.16 Preferred media for learning in the class and working on the assignments of experimental group	59
Figure 4.17 Preferred media for learning in the class and working on the assignments of control group	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Generic Structure of Analytical Exposition Text	18
Table 3.1 Pretest-posttest Control-group Design	30
Table 3.2 Population of students that will be involved in the research	31
Table 3.3 Research Schedule	34
Table 3.4 Questionnaire	35
Table 3.5 Percentage of respondent criterion	37
Table 4.1 Pretest Results	39
Table 4.2 Test of Normality	40
Table 4.3 Tests of Homogeneity of Variances	41
Table 4.4 Analysis of Errors in the First Draft	41
Table 4.5 Analysis of Errors in the Second Draft	42
Table 4.6 Analysis of Errors in the Final Draft	42
Table 4.7 Analysis of Errors in the First Draft	43
Table 4.8 Analysis of Errors in the Second Draft	43
Table 4.9 Analysis of Errors in the Final Draft	44
Table 4.10 Mean of Errors in Errors Occurrences	44
Table 4.11 Posttest Result	46
Table 4.12 Means of Errors in the First Draft and Final Draft	46

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix 1 Sample of Students' pretest in Class A (Experimental Group)	78
Appendix 2 Sample of Students' posttest in Class A (Experimental Group)	82
Appendix 3 Sample of Students' pretest in Class B (Control Group)	88
Appendix 4 Sample of Students' posttest in Class B (Control Group)	94
Appendix 5 Questionnaire	103
Appendix 6 Results of the Questionnaire in the class A (Control Group)	111
Appendix 7 Results of the Questionnaire in the class B (Experimental Group)	123

References

- Albalkheel, A., & Bradenburg, T. (2020). Effects of Written Corrective Feedback: A Synthesis of 10 Quasi-Experimental Studies. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 13(7). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n7p97>
- Alfaki, I. M. (2015). University students' english writing problems: diagnosis and remedy. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(3), 40-52. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/123456789/2116>
- Alharbi, Mohammed Abdullah (2020). Exploring the potential of Google Doc in facilitating innovative teaching and learning practices in an EFL writing course. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(3), 227–242.
- Al-Khasawneh, F. M. S., & Maher, S. (2010). Writing for academic purposes: Problems faced by Arab postgraduate students of the college of business, UUM. *ESP World*, 9(2), 1-23. Retrieved from <http://www.esp-world.info>
- Al-Naibi, I., Al-Jabri, M., & Al-Kabani, I. (2018). Promoting Students' Paragraph Writing Using EDMODO: An Action Research. *The Turkish Online Journal of Education Technology*, 17(1).
- Al-Saleh, N. A. (2018). The Impact of Positive and Corrective Feedback via Showbie on Saudi Students' English Writing. Al Imam Muhammad ibn Saud Islamic University, College of Languages and Translation, Department of English Language and Literature, KSA (Master Thesis). Retrieved from *Arab World English Journal* (ID Number: 2215. December, 2018, 1-121. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/th.215>
- Anderson, M. and Anderson, K. (2000). *Text types in english*. Australia: Millan Education Australia PTY Ltd
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). Gatekeeping at an academic

convention. Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication Cognition culture power, 97-116.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 191-205.

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. (2012). *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*. New York, NY: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780203832400

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching (Vol. 4)*: Longman New York. Retrieved from <https://shahroodut.ac.ir/fa/download.php?id=1111148853>.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Longman.

Bramm, C. (2012). *Colin Bramm - CEO Showbie*. LinkedIn. <https://www.linkedin.com/in/colinbramm/>

Budiharto, A. (2023, January). Investigating Mother Tongue Effect in the Acquisition of English Prepositions by Indonesia-Speaking Learners. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7(1).

Burn, Robert B. (1994). *Introduction to Research Methods*. Melbourne: Longman Australia Pty Ltd.

Butt, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., Spinks, S., & Yallop, C. (2006). *Using functional Grammar: An explorer's guide*. Sydney: NSW: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.

- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(3). doi:10.1016/s1060-3743(03)00038-9
- Chang, Y. Y., & Swales, J. (1999). Informal elements in English academic writing: Threats or opportunities for advanced non-native speakers. *Writing: Texts, processes and practices*, 145-167.
- Cook, T. D. (2015). Quasi-Experimental Design. *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management, 11*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118785317.weom110227>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486999>
- Cumming, A. (1990). Metalinguistic and ideational thinking in second language composing. *Written Communication, 7*(4), 482–511.
- Currier, D. (2008). Essay on the importance of writing – need feedback please. *Asian ESL Journal*. Retrieved from Gloria, Essay Writing Feedback/EssayForum.com on 8/17/2010 *Journal 80*, 183-199.
- Damayanti, I. L. (2014). Gender construction in visual images in textbooks for primary school students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 3*(2), 100–116
- Dewi, A. (2017). The English(es) to teach after study and life in Australia: A study of Indonesian English language educators. *Asian Englishes, 19*(2), 128–147.
- Diab, R. L. (2005). Teachers' and students' beliefs about responding to ESL writing: A case study. *TESL Canada Journal, 23*, 28-43.

- Dudeny, G., & Hockly, N. (2007). *How to Teach English with Technology*. Pearson/Longman.
- Dudley-Evans, T. (1997). "Genre models for the teaching of academic writing to second language speakers: Advantages and disadvantages". In T. Miller (Ed.), *Functional Approaches to Written Text: Classroom Applications*. Washington, D.C./USA.: United States Information Agency (English Language Programs).
- Emilia, E. (2011). Teaching genre-based writing: Theory and classroom applications. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(2), 156-167.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT J.* 63, 97–107. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccn023
- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2016). Supporting second language writing using multi-modal feedback. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(1), 58–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan>.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36, 353-371.
- Elsayed, A. S. A., & Hassan, S. M. A. (2020). Handwritten vs. Digital feedback: Which Is the Most Effective in Improving the Writing Accuracy of Kuwaiti Undergraduate University Students? *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 7(1).
- Erkan, G. (2022). The The Impact of Teacher E-feedback on Students' Writing: A Waste of Time or a Road to Success? *Focus on ELT Journal*, 4(1).

- Fageeh, A. (2011). EFL students' readiness for e-learning: Factors influencing e-learners' acceptance of the Blackboard in a Saudi university. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 7 (1), 19-42.
- Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 33-53.
- Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (1994). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ghoorchaei, B., & Khosravi, M. (2019). On the relationship between Iranian EFL students' writing strategies and writing ability. *Journal of Linguistics and Education Research*, 2(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.30564/jler.v2i1.377>
- Hang, N. (2021). Vietnamese upper-high school teachers' views, practices, difficulties, and expectations on teaching EFL writing. *Journal on English as Foreign Language*, 11(1).
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. Longman: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Hartshorn, K. J., Evans, N. W., Merrill, P. F., Sudweeks, R. R., Strong-Krause, D., & Anderson, N. J. (2010). Effects of Dynamic Corrective Feedback on ESL Writing Accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44(1).
- Hatch, E., & Farhady, H. (1982). *Research design and statistics for applied linguistics*.
- Heift, T., & Nguyen, P. (2021). Technology-Mediated Corrective Feedback. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 226–250). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hepplestone, S., Parkin, H., Holden, G., Irwin, B., & Thorpe, L. (2009). Technology, Feedback, Action!: The impact of learning technology upon students' engagement with their feedback.

- Hidayati, K. H., (2018). Teaching Writing to EFL Learners: An Investigation of Challenges Confronted by Indonesian Teachers, 4(1), 21-31.
- Hinkel, E. (2002). Second language writers' text: Linguistic and rhetorical features: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 255-286.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2). DOI:10.1017/S0261444806003399
- Irmalia, M. (2016). Indonesian Interference in Students' Writing. *English Education Journal*, 7(4), 496-508.
- Javadi-Safa, A. (2018). A Brief Overview of Key Issues in Second Language Writing, Teaching and Research. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 6(2).
- Jeon, M., & Kang, I. (2005). Investigating student preferences in error correction in Korean-language teaching. *American Association of Teachers of Korean*, 5 (10).
- Joo, Y. J., Lim, K. Y., & Kim, E. K. (2011). Online university students' satisfaction and persistence: Examining perceived level of presence, usefulness and ease of use as predictors in a structural model. *Computers & Education*, 57(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.02.008>
- Keh, C. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, (44). 10.1093/elt/44.4.294

- Klimova, B., & Pikhart, M. (2022). Application of corrective feedback using emerging technologies among L2 university students. *Cogent Education*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2132681>
- Koll, S. v., & Rietz, C. (2016). Effects of Web-Based Feedback on Students' Learning. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 28(3).
- Kulhavy, R. W., & Wager, W. (1993). Feedback in programmed instruction: Historical context and implications for practice. In J. V. Dempsey, & G. C. Sales (Eds.), *Interactive instruction and feedback* (pp. 3–20). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology.
- Lavolette, E., Polio, C. & Kahng, J. (2015). The accuracy of computer-assisted feedback and students' responses to it. *Language Learning & Technology*, 19(2), 50–68.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 203-218.
- Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in system. *System* 84, 93–109. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Mamad, A. (2020). The role of written corrective feedback in EFL writing. *Opus Et Educatio*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.3311/ope.376>
- McCargar, D. (1993). Teacher and student role expectations: Cross-cultural differences and implications. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77,192-207.

- Mertaprawati, W. (2021). The Use of Technology-mediated Teacher's Corrective Feedback in Teaching Writing Narrative Text.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia. (2022). Learning outcomes in early childhood education, basic education, and secondary education in the Merdeka Curriculum. In [kemdikbud.go.id\(008/H/KR/2022\)](http://kemdikbud.go.id(008/H/KR/2022)).
- Moffet, J. (1979). Integrity in the Teaching of Writing. *PHI Delta Kappa International*, 61(4), 276-279.
- Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: the writing process and error analysis in student texts. *TESLEJ*, 6(2).
- Muamaroh, Mukti, V. C., & Haryanti, D. (2020). The Process and Problems of EFL Learners in English Writing: A Case Study in International Class. *Ethical Lingua*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.215>
- Nanayakkara, C. (2007). A Model of User Acceptance of Learning Management Systems. *The International Journal of Learning: Annual Review*, 12(12), 223-232. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18848/1447-9494/cgp/v13i12/45146>.
- Narciss, S. (2004). The impact of informative tutoring feedback and self-efficacy on motivation and achievement in concept learning. *Experimental Psychology*, 51, 214e228. doi:10.1027/1618-3169.51.3.214.
- Natalia, K., Sukraini, N. W., & Sukraini, N. (2021). Pendekatan Konsep Merdeka Belajar dalam Pendidikan Era Digital. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional IAHN-TP Palangka Raya*, 3, 22–34.
- Nelson, M. M., & Schunn, C. D. (2008). The nature of feedback: how different types of peer feedback affect writing performance. *Instructional Science*, 37. DOI 10.1007/s11251-008-9053-x

- Neumann, Kalianne L, & Kopcha, Theodore, J (2019). Using Google Docs for peer-then-teacher review on middle school students' writing. *Computers and Composition*, 54, Article 102524.
- Nguyen, H. H. T. (2009). Teaching EFL writing in Vietnam: problems and solutions - a recount from the outlook of applied linguistics. *VNU Journal of Science, Foreign Languages*, 2.
- Ngoc, N. (2021). Challenges of Teaching Academic Writing Skills in EFL Classroom. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies (IJPSAT)*, 26(1).
- Nozim, B., & Nusratovich, K. U. (2023). ADDRESSING COMMON GRAMMAR MISTAKES IN EFL WRITING. *Pedagog*, 6(11).
- O' Brien, Teresa. (2004). "Writing in a foreign language: Teaching and learning". *Language Teaching* 37: 1-28.
- Pasand, P. G., & Zibakenar. (2013). Process-Product Approach to Writing: the Effect of Model Essays on EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 2(1).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.2n.1p.75>
- Plonsky, L., & Mills, S.V. (2006). An exploratory study of differing perceptions of error correction between a teacher and students: Bridging the gap. *Northern Arizona University Applied Language Learning*, 16, 55–77.
- Polio, C. G. (1997). Measures of linguistic accuracy in second language writing research. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 101-143.
- Purnawarman, P. (2011). *Impacts of Different Types of Teacher Corrective Feedback in Reducing Grammatical Errors on ESL/EFL Students' Writing* [Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Tech].

- Raimes, Ann. (1983). *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. (pp.1-30). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Raimes, A. (1991). Errors: Windows into the mind. *College ESL*, 1(2), 55-64.
- Reid, J., & Byrd, P. (1998). *Looking ahead-developing skills for academic writing*: Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers
- Riyanti, D. (2017). *Teacher identity development: A collective case study of English as a foreign language pre-service teachers learning to teach in an Indonesian university teacher education programme* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nebraska, Lincoln, USA.
- Saeed, M. A., & Qunayeer, H. S. A. (2020). Exploring teacher interactive e-feedback on students' writing through Google Docs: factors promoting interactivity and potential for learning. *The Language Learning Journal*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2020.1786711>
- Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal*, 11(2), 46-70.
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 343-364.
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Columbia. *Modern Language Journal*, 85,244-258.
- Semeraro, J., & Moore, N. S. (2017). The Use of Google Docs Technology to Support Peer Revision. *Literacy Research, Practice and Evaluation*, 7(203-220). doi:10.1108/S2048-045820160000007013

- Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37, 556-569.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.09.002>
- Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: Developments, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.) *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*. (pp.11-36). New York: Cambridge University Press
- Sukyadi, D. (2015). The teaching of English at secondary schools in Indonesia. In Spolsky, B., & Sung, K. (Eds.), *Secondary school English education in Asia: From policy to practice* (pp. 123–147). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Suleiman M. F. (2000). The process and product of writing: Implications for elementary school teachers. *ERIC Digest*, ERIC Identifier ED 442299, 2000.
- Sundayana, W. (2015). Readiness and competence of senior high school English teachers to implement Curriculum 2013. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 29–36.
- Steele, V. (2004). Product and process writing. <http://www.englishonline.org.cn/en/teachers/workshops/teaching-writing/teaching-tips/product-process>
- Sudrajat, W. N. A., & Purnawarman, P. (2019). STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE USE OF GOOGLE DOCS AS AN ONLINE COLLABORATIVE TOOL IN TRANSLATION CLASS. *Lingua Cultura*, 13(3).
<https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v13i3.5969>
- Sulistianingsih, Dwi Elis (2017) *A TEACHER'S WRITTEN FEEDBACK ON*

STUDENTS' WRITING: A Descriptive Study at One Public Junior High School in Bandung. S1 thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

- Sun, F. (2010). Pedagogical implications to teaching English writing. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(6), 867 – 870. <https://doi.org/doi:10.4304/jltr.1.6.867-870>
- Sutton, L. A. (2001). The principle of vicarious interaction in computer-mediated communications. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, 7(3), 223–242.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125–144). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2002). Talking it through: Two French immersion learners' response to reformulation. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37, 285–304.
- Syafii, M. L., & Miftah, M. Z. (2020). Venn-diagram strategy in EFL class to enhance learners' writing skill and motivation. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 10(1), 141-162. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v10i1.1556>
- Syaputra, A. F., Hidayati, D., & Maya, N. (2023). DIGITALISASI PENDIDIKAN PADA IMPLEMENTASI KURIKULUM MERDEKA. *Journal Syntax Admiration*, 4(11). <https://doi.org/10.46799/jsa.v4i11.908>
- Tangpermpoon, T. (2008). Intergraded approaches to improve students writing skills for English major students. *ABAC Journal*, 28(2), 1-9.
- Toba, R., Noor, W. N., & Sanu, L. O. (2019). The Current Issues of Indonesian EFL Students' Writing Skills: Ability, Problem, and Reason in Writing Comparison and Contrast Essay. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1).

<http://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506>

- Qi, D. S., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Exploring the role of noticing in a three-stage second language writing task. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 277–303.
- White, Fred D. (1986). *The Writer Art*, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company
- Widodo, H. P. (2016). Language policy in practice: Reframing the English language curriculum in the Indonesian secondary education sector. In Kirkpatrick, R. (Ed.), *English education policy in Asia* (pp. 127–151). New York, NY: Springer.
- Williams (2005) Williams, B. T. (2005). Leading double lives: Literacy and technology in and out of school. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48(8), 702-706.
- Yunus, M. M., Salehi, H., & Chenzi, C. (2012). Integrating Social Networking Tools into ESL Writing Classroom: Strengths and Weaknesses. *English Language Teaching*, 5(8). 10.5539/elt.v5n8p42
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79-101.
- Zein, M. S. (2016a). Government-based training agencies and the professional development of Indonesian teachers of English for Young Learners: Perspectives from complexity theory. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 42(2), 205–223
- Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. *Assessing Writing*, 37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.03.001>