Appendix 1 : Data of textual evidence, interview and observation of student one (1)

Table 1
Textual Evidence Data on Student's Draft of Thesis
(Student 1 from Supervisor 1a)

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks
Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	No evidence in the document of student's draft.	-
	Responsibilities of supervisors	The supervisor met the students regularly to provide feedback based on their knowledge and to monitor the student's progress to ensure the completion There were corrections on student's draft of thesis. There was no comment on the strong and weak points of student's work.	The supervisors were responsible to guide students to write the thesis.
	Responsibilities of students	The student drafts showed the intensive meetings with supervisors and improvement of the draft. The improvement could be seen from the drafts in the textual evidence.	The student was responsible.
	Relationship between supervisors and student.	In the document, the relationship was identified that there was open and close communication, and trust relation in the written comments and progress made by the students. The supervisor was as a corrector.	It is implied that the supervisors were as correctors.
Feedback Strategies	Timing	The frequency of the feedback is shown on the different draft and revision brought to the supervision. There is frequent feedback from the supervisors. There are twelve signatures in supervision attendance form.	-
	Amount	There was much feedback, especially on the forms (writing mechanism). Corrections were given almost on every page such as:	There was too much feedback. Not effective.

Feedback Contents (continued)		- writing references (33 underlines) - Using capital (9) crosses - Spelling mistakes (14 circles) - Italics (39 circles and underlines) - Spacing (47 slashes) There was no feedback on chapter 4 and 5.	
	Modes	The feedback was written with red pen. Notes/codes are shown by underlines, crosses, circles, and slashes. There were no comments on the quality.	There should be comments on quality. Less effective.
	Audience	In the student's draft, the feedback was given to cater for individual need. There was no indication that the feedback was given in group.	Effective
Feedback Contents	Focus	The focus was mostly on the work especially the form (writing mechanism) There was no direct indication that the feedback focused on the other aspects such as on the self-regualtion and on the person on the student's draft of thesis.	There was no feedback on the quality (strengths and weaknesses of the work). Not effective
	Comparison	The feedback identified in the student's draft of thesis was compared with the criterion reference (standard rubrics) and self-reference. There was no indication that the feedback was compared to norm-criterion reference.	The feedback followed the standard rubrics. Effective
	Function	The feedback showed every mistake. This is a kind of evaluative or corrective feedback. The corrections were shown in: writing references, using capital letter, spelling mistakes, using Italics, using spaces. There was descriptive feedback that showed the weaknesses.	Descriptive feedback is needed to know the strengths and weaknesses.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

214

		There was formative feedback as the previous draft was always brought to show the revision and progress.	
	Valence	Most of the feedback was positive and suggestive: direct suggestion for corrections or revision. Every problem especially the writing mechanism was shown. **Part 1** Corrections and suggestions In the background such as: - It is assumed that there are complaints as the service has low quality. This influences the satisfaction of guests. - to show initial data from the restaurant about the level of complaints Corrections in the spellings such as: - manjeman > manajemen - kualiltas > kualitas Corrections in the capitalizations such as: - bandung > Bandung - Cipularang > Cipularang - gallery > Gallery - kotler > Kotler - cafe > Cafe - ayam > Ayam - kahaseupan > Kahaseupan - bakar > Bakar - tol cipularang > Tol Cipularang Corrcetions in the spaces such as: - adalahberbagai > adalah/berbagai - negara.Usaha-usaha > Negara./Usaha-usaha - konsumen.Menurut > konsumen./Menurut - operationaldi > operational/di - ekspektasikonsumen > ekspektasi/konsumen	Balanced positive and negative feedback is also needed to make student aware of the work.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

215

		Suggetsions (descriptive): In the objectives of research to drop the objectives and change into the following objectives: a. to develop knowledge and theory about service quality b. to inform the results of the research to the industry Suggetsions (descriptive): To change the write words/phrases: - perception quality into expectation quality - the length of serving the food and the wrong order into the service quality that is not optimal **Part 2** Corrections in the citations such as: Jame Fitzsimmons (2003/… hal?) Drs. Herlan Suherlan ..?? Marsum (2005)/… hal?) Soetjipto (1997)/… hal?) William B. Martin (tahun, hal?) Wyckof (tahun, hal?) Horney (1996, hal?) Valarie A, Zeithaml, dan Leonard L. Berry (tahun, hal?) Corrections to use the right spellings - jasam > jasa - conatac > contact - cafe > Kafe - tampilam > tampilan - kegitan > kegiatan - menignkatkan > meningkatkan - memaai > memadai - jatau > atau - palayanan > pelayanan - praktir > praktik - contac > contact Corrections to use Italics such as: output, intangible, rented good service, food service operation, café, service, delivery system, perceived service zone of tolerance, desired service, adequate service , perceived	

Sutanto, 2015
***THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING***
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

216

		performance, ghost shopping, expected service, perceived service, sandwich, cake, band, Pizza, spaghetti, British standard, word of mouth,	
		Corrections and suggestions to add or use terminologies such as: Pengertian Jasa atau Pelayanan > Konsep Jasa Pengertian Restoran > Konsep dan Definisi Restoran Pengertian Kualitas > Konsep dan Definisi Kualitas Pelanggan > Konsumen	
		Correction in margins using vertical lines such as: - some paragraphs need to be put in the same margins as the others under the sub-heading of Keterampilan Penyedia Jasa until number 7. Tingkat Kontak Penyedia Jasa dan Pelanggan. - some other paragraphs need to be checked the margin such as under the sub-heading of A. Pengertian Restoran, B. Teknik Pengukuran Kepuasan Konsumen, Gambar 3. Model Gap Penyampaian Pelayanan	
		Suggestions to omit underlines -Karakteristik Restoran - Restoran dan Segala Permasalahannya	
		Suggestions to rearrange numbers such as: A, B,C,D > 1,2,3,4; 1,2,3,4 > a,b,c,d under sub-headings: 1. Karakteristik Restoran, 2. Pelayanan Restoran, K. Prinsip-Prinsip Kualitas Pelayanan	
		Corrections in using spaces: - Intagible(tidak terwujud) - konsumsiakan - serviceoperationadalah	

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

217

| | | - Sedangkanadequate
- merupakanelemen
- efektif.Apabila

- merupakanoutput
- servicemasih
- perusahaanjasa
- lagi,servicemenurut
- mendapatkanpelayanan
- smooth-runningsetelah
- baikkepada
- restoranadalah
- sedangkanDeming
- dalamManajemen
- perusahaanmasih
- dapat disimpulkan
- tangible(ketanggapan)
- assurance(jaminan kepastian)
- reliability(kehandalan),
- emphaty(empati)
- kualitaspelayan
- dapatmemenuhi

Corrections to write direct quotations from Fandy Ciptono (2011:232) in order to be in one space with the same font size

Corrections using arrows
- in a table of Model Gap Penyampaian pelayanan
- sub-headings at the bottom line of the pages

Corrections with question marks for
- sources without dates
- a table title

Corrections to change phrases such as:
- Pengertian Jasa atau Pelayanan > Konsep Jasa

Part 3
Corrections in spaces such as:
yang lain./Menurut
manager/apabila
mendapatkan/data | |

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

218

		untuk/mengukur instrumen/yang akan/menghasilkan validitas/dan Operasional/Variabel Konsumsi/akan Sedangkan/adequate service/ialah	
		Corrections in spellings such as: menignkatkan > meningkatkan Mamaai > memadai Palayanan > pelayanan Pelangan > pelanggan	
		Corrections in Italics such as: Service, bill, internet, online, Cake, sandwich, band, pizza, spaghetti British standard, ability, word of mouth	
		Corrections with underlines and a cross: - for sources with book titles and web-site	
		Corrections in written numbers/time: -Rp. 350.0j00 > Rp. 350.000 > -10.00 > 11.00 -10.30 > 9 -90X -40X	
		Suggestions to add more information using arrows such as: - Obyek penelitian: location, map, organisation structure, number of employees. - Table 2 : to add Seating capacity = 700 Seating t/o = 3.0 - Lahan parkir yang memadai > Lahan parkir yang memadai & aman	
		Correction with arrow - for sub-heading the bottom of the page	

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

219

		Correction to enlarge the font size - for the formula of validity and reliability of data	
	Clarity	Most feedback was clear, the codes showed the locations of the problems and the solutions such as 52 underlines, 47 slashes, 9 crosses, 34 circles, 3 interjections, and 4 question marks The codes were not difficult to understand and improvement can be seen in the next draft.	Symbols or signs were given to make the feedback clearer. Rather effective.
	Specificity	The feedback was specific and pointed to the exact parts of the problems such as on the location of the problems, on top, on the margin and at the bottom of the page. Most feedback gave solutions to the problems. Almost every mistake detected was edited.	The feedback was quite specific to show specific parts of the problem.
	Tone	The feedback inspired the student to make improvement. There was no praise or critics on student's work but only corrections. There was no high voice tone of feedback.	However, the last two chapters were not given feedback. Effective.
Sources	Supervisors Tutor Peer	The sources were only supervisors. There were no other sources such as tutors or peers.	

Table 2
Textual Evidence Data on Student's Draft of Thesis
(Student 1 with Supervisor 1b)

There was no feedback in the textual evidence as Supervisor 1b only gave oral feedback.

Variables	Sub-variables	Indicators
Feedback providers and	Selecting supervisors	-

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

220

	Responsibilities of supervisors	-	
receivers in writing supervision	Responsibilities of students	-	
	Relationship	-	
	Timing	-	
Feedback Strategies	Amount	-	
	Modes	-	
	Audience	-	
	Focus	-	
Feedback Contents	Comparison	-	
	Function	-	
	Valence	-	
	Clarity	-	
	Specificity	-	
	Tone	-	
	Supervisors	-	
Sources	Tutor		
	Peer		

Table 3
Data of interview with student 1
(about the feedback provided by Supervisors 1a and 1b)

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks
Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	At the beginning I proposed my supervisors but the management decided to give the other supervisors. "The supervisors should match with the field of study in order to be able go deep into the contents and theories. They should understand all parts of the thesis and give sufficient suggestions". The supervisors' expertise did not match with my research interest.	Supervisors were chosen as planned. However, their expertise was not as expected. Not effective.
	Responsibilities	My supervisors provided	The supervisors were

	of supervisors	guidance to write my thesis. We met regularly as required. They always reminded me the time of completion. Sp.1b was responsible for the statistics only. My Sp. 1a was responsible for the writing mechanism and a bit theory.	responsible to guide students but they were only able to give certain part of feedback.
	Responsibilities of students	"I don't know, please ask my supervisor but I tried to take initiative and to do my best". I attended supervision regularly as required and finished on time.	The student was active and responsible.
	Relationship	Good relationship and open communication. They were close to me and were like my partner, guide, advisor and supporter.	The relationship between supervisors and student was good.
Feedback Strategies	Timing	I had 12 meetings with supervisor (Sp.) 1a and 9 meetings with Sp. 1b. Sp. 1 provided 120 minutes for writing mechanism. Supervision was given without delay. Only once it was delayed. Sp. 1b provided 90 minutes for statistics and sometimes I was left for smoking.	The timing was about immediate but the length was often too long. The length of time isn't always efficient.
	Amount	I was provided much feedback. Sp. 1a discussed much concept the beginning and much writing mechanism later. Every mistake in the writing mechanism was corrected. Sp. 1b gave no comments on strengths and weaknesses of the paper. Every mistake in the statistics was corrected.	Much feedback was given but too much when every mistake was corrected. Less effective
		Only oral feedback was provided	Both written and

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

222

	Modes	by Sp. 1b and focused on statistics or methodology. No pen or pencil was used.
		    There was no comment on quality (strengths & weaknesses). Every statistics mistake was corrected.
		    Written and oral feedback was given by Sp. 1a, Every writing mechanism mistake was corrected by Sp 1a and red pen was used.
		    There was no conference, workshop and electronic feedback.
		  "Saya pikir kemajuan karena inisiatif saya sendiri" (I think my progress was more on my own initiative).
		  "Saya biasa mengerjakannya, tiga hari berturut-turut kemudian istirahat dan menikmatin waktu istirahat." (I used to work on my thesis in every three full days then I had a break and enjoyed my time).
			spoken feedback was provided.
			
			There should be comments on quality. Less effective

	Audience	Group and individual feedback was given. Mini lesson was given to group at the beginning. Individual student has individual comment and too much time given to individual especially for writing mechanism (Sp.1a) and the statistics (Sp.1b). There was only individual feedback from Sp. 1a with no mini lesson. Sp. 1a was happy with me because I liked to give my opinions.	It is good to have both group and individual feedback. Effective.
	Focus	The focus of feedback was on the work, self-regulation, and on the process. Sp. 2 focused on the work and process especially the statistics from theory,	Sp 1. & Sp. 2 have different focus of feedback. The students did not

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

223

Feedback Contents		application and results. "My Sp. 2 focused on statistics and my Sp. 1 provided more on the writing mechanism and a bit theory" on the works process and self regulation.
		
		    There was no feedback on the strengths but on the correction of the mistakes.
		    There was no feedback on the person.
			get balanced/other opinion of feedback
			
			Less effective

	Comparison	My thesis was compared with the criterion reference (standard rubrics) and other students especially the instruments and the referencing. I also read previous thesis having relevant topics. There was no comparison with the achievement of other students but my superviors compared their feedback with my previous drafts to check my progress.	There was no problem to compare the work with the standard rubrics.

	Function	Much descriptive, but more evaluative, formative and corrective as almost weaknesses were shown.
		    Almost no comments on strengths were provided. No praise and critics.
		    "I like more descriptive because I can have a lot of discussions".
		    I don't know if the feedback fucntiones as formative.
			There should be balanced feedback (descriptive & evaluative) for the strengths and weaknesses.
			Less effective

	Valence	Most of the feedback is positive and suggestive to show the mistakes and to give the corrections. Every mistake is shown and corrected. No praises, critices warnings or punishments.	There was no problem with valence but there was too much feedback when every mistake was corrected. Less effective.
	Clarity	The language used is clear and	

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

224

		can be comprehended.
		
		    Sometimes Sp. 2 was not consistent, he forgot what has been said and changed his idea on the next meeting.
		    Sp. 1 used codes like circles, underlines and crosses given on the margins. Location of the problems was shown and solutions were given. I was able to revise and correct the problems. Sometimes I did not understand the codes and I had to ask for clarification.
			The language used in the communication is good.
			
			Symbols or signs were also given to make the feedback clearer.

	Specificity	The feedback was specific and pointed the exact parts of the problems, on the top, on the margins and at the bottom and student directly corrected them.
		    The feedback is sometimes on the concept. Every mistake is edited.
		    "The 4th & 5th chapters were not corrected at all because Sp. 1 was busy to attend training".
			The specificity is good. However when every mistake is edited it is not good.

	Tone	I feel I had no problems with my supervisors. It was personal and helpful and inspiring but I felt disappointed with my Sp 1, because my chapter 4 & 5 were not given any feedback".
		    There was effort to remind me about the submission date and the exams.
		    There were no sarcastic words or behaviour. I was treated like a partner, friend or student and was respected as a student. At the beginning I felt worried and feared with my Sp. 2, but after some meetings I felt confident. I was inspired.
		    There were no no praises or critics.
			There was an open communication between supervisor and students. The student became confident.
			
			However, the last two chapters were not given feedback.
			
			Effective.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

225

Sources	Supervisors	The sources were only supervisors. The supervisor provided insufficient feedback to improve my thesis writing, to encourage me to engage with the feedback for revision and helped me learn deeply. Sometimes the supervisors asked me to talk to peers. Each supervisor gave different part of feedback.	
	Tutors	No feedback from tutor	
	Peer	Sometimes, I discussed with my friends about our theses projects. I like giving and receiving feedback from friends.	

Table 4
The data of interview with Supervisor 1a

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks

Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	At the beginning students proposed supervisors but then decided by the management. She chose me. I think the topic matched with my interest.	Supervisors were chosen as planned. .
	Responsibilities of supervisors	"I was responsible for the contents and the writing mechanism as my partner only focused on statistics and I gave enough feedback to the student." I met the student regularly and gave feedback to the student from the beginning until the end to ensure the time of completion.	Each supervisor is responsible both the contents and language.
	Responsibilities of students	She was active to ask questions, initiative and a hardworking student and was able to complete their thesis on time. The student met me more than the minimum meetings (8) required.	The student was responsible and active.
	Relationship between the supervisors and the student	"There is an honest collaboration between the student and me". She felt inspired to complete their study. I am close to my student and as student's advisor or supporter.	The relationship between supervisors and student was no problem.
Feedback strategy	Timing	I met more than 8 times, at the beginning our meeting was only 30 minutes but later almost two hours when focusing on chapter 2, 3, 4 and 5. I discussed the theories and methodologies, data collection, etc. Normally I read one day prior to the supervision meeting. Twice, she came late due to	The timing was effective as the feedback was given immediately.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

227

		other arrangements.	
	Amount	There was much discussion on the theories (contents) and a little on the forms. There was comment on strength and weaknesses of the paper. Every mistake in mechanics was corrected. The corrections were indicated by circles, crosses, underlines, slashes, etc.	Much feedback can either be effective or not. It is not effective when every error in mechanics is edited.
	Modes	Written and oral feedback is provided but not recorded. The student wrote a lot of my oral feedback. The feedback is written in red pen in order to be clearly visible. There were no conference, workshop and electronic feedback.	It is good to have provided oral and written feedback.
	Audience	Individual focusing on individual needs. I asked the student the reasons for choosing the title, observation done, the theories read and to be read and writing mechanism. The average time spent for the supervision is 90 to 120 minutes per individual.	Most feedback is given individually to cater individual need. Too much time is not always effective.
	Focus	The feedback focused on process, work and self-regulation but not on the person. In terms of the content, it focused on the concept, organisation and writing	Most feedback focused on the work and process. Comments on strengths and weaknesses are needed to make

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

228

Feedback Contents		mechanism. There are comments on the strengths after being revised and weaknesses especially on the questionnaire and data.	student aware of the work. Less effective.
	Comparison	The draft was compared with the criterion reference (standard rubrics), self-reference and other students. "When the topics are the same I asked the students to compare and discuss each other" I asked my students to bring the previous drafts to compare. There is effort to support student by reminding them the exams schedule and deadline. The feedback was not compared with norm-criterion.	It is good to compare at least with the criterion reference (standard rubrics – school guide book).
	Function	Most feedback is descriptive, evaluative, formative and corrcetive. There are description of the problems and corrections showing the problems/ weaknesses. There is praise but no critics.	Descriptive feedback is provided but mostly on the weaknesses. Less effective.
	Valence	The mistakes were shown and given suggestions for corrections. I gave praises sometimes but I did not give critics. There was no warning as the student was committed to her project.	It is good to have positive and negative feedback. It is not necessary to correct every error.
	Clarity	The language used is simple and clear. The students can	The language used in the communication is

Sutanto, 2015
***THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING***
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

229

| | | comprehend the feedback. Location of the problems is shown by question marks if not clear or not relevant with the reference, interjection if irrelevant and solutions are given.

Students are able to revise and correct the problems. The revisions were checked on the following meetings. | good.

Symbols or signs were also given to make the feedback clearer.

Effective. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Specificity | The feedback is specific and points the exact parts of the problems and solutions are given such as on the top, on the margins and at the bottom of the page. The student could directly correct them.

The feedback is sometimes on the concept. Every mistake is edited. | The specificity is good but it is not good to edit every mistake. |
| | Tone | The student was treated as a student.

I told them that I was fussy because I did not want them to have serious problems in the thesis exams. I always said sorry if my words were annoying.

The student was inspired but there was no praise. The tone of communication does not make students annoyed or down.

There were no critiques but praises. | There is an open communication between supervisor and students.

Effective. |
| Sources | Supervisors | The feedback was only from | Effective. |

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

230

	Tutors	supervisors. I asked to talk with peers only when the topics were similar.	
	Peers		
		I gave sufficient feedback to improve students' thesis writing.	

Table 5
The data of interview with Supervisor 1b

Variables	Sub-variables	Supervisor 1b	Remarks
Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	At the beginning students proposed supervisors but then the supervisors were decided by the management to give balance opportunities to every lecturer. The supervisors matched with the topic of interest.	The supervisor was chosen as planned. It should be effective.
	Responsibilities of supervisors	"I am responsible for the statistics." Actually, I have to be responsible for the whole parts of the paper. I met the student regularly.	Each supervisor must be responsible both the contents and language. Less effective.
	Responsibilities of students	The student attended the meetings regularly and is initiative and able to complete their thesis on time. The student was responsible and active.	The student was responsible and active.
	Relationship between the supervisors and the student	"There is a warm and close relationship and honest collaboration between students and me".	The relationship between the supervisor and student was no problem.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

231

		Students felt motivated and eager to complete their study. I am as student's motivator, friend, and reminder.	
Feedback strategy	Timing	I met my students at least 8 times. Each student took around 60-90 minutes. As students came to me, I talked with them and gave them help. Sometimes I left the students for smoking.	The timing is effective as the feedback was given immediately.
	Amount	There was much feedback, as much as needed. No comment about strength and weaknesses of the paper. Every mistake in the statistics is corrected orally.	Much feedback can either be effective or not. It is not effective when every error in mechanics is edited.
	Modes	Mostly oral feedback is given but student did not record it. Student retyped the correction and the teacher dictated the correction. Sometimes I demonstrated by retyping the corrections on student's laptop. No pen or pencil is used. There were no conference, workshop and electronic feedback.	Oral feedback only is not good as it cannot be checked at a later date if not recorded.
	Audience	Group and individual focusing on group and individual needs. Mini lessons are given to group. Individual student has individual comment and much time given	Most feedback is given individually to cater individual need.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

232

		to individual. The average time spent for the supervision is 60 to 90 minutes per individual.	Too much time is not always effective.
Feedback Contents	Focus	The feedback focused on the work, on the process and on the self-regulation especially the statistics from theory, application and results. "As I am a statistics lecturer, my supervision focuses on statistics only". The feedback does not focus on the strengths but on the correction of the mistakes. There was no feedback on or about the person.	Most feedback focused on the work and process. Comments on strengths and weaknesses are needed to make student aware of the work. Less effective.
	Comparison	The work was compared with the criterion reference (standard rubrics), self-criterion reference The students brought the previous drafts to check the progress. There is effort to encourage reluctant/weak student. The feedback was not compared with norm-criterion	It is good to compare at least with the criterion reference (standard rubrics – school guide book).
	Function	Most feedbak was descriptive, evluative, formative and corrective. I gave corrections and eveluation by showing the weaknesses There were no praise and critics.	Descriptive feedback is provided but mostly on the weaknesses. Less effective.
	Valence	Most of the feedback is positive and suggestive. It showed the	It is good to have positive and negative

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

233

		mistakes and gave the correction. Every mistake is shown and corrected. Sometimes I gave a kind of lecture to the students.	feedback. It is not necessary to correct every error. Not effective
	Clarity	The language used is simple and the students can comprehend the feedback. Location of the problems is shown and solutions are given. Students are able to revise and correct the problems. No symbols or signs as given orally. Sometimes student understanding on the feedback is checked.	The language used in the communication is good. Symbols or signs were also given to make the feedback clearer. Effective.
	Specificity	The feedback is specific and points the exact parts of the problems and student directly correct them. The feedback is sometimes on the concept. Every mistake is edited.	The specificity is good but it is not good to edit every mistake.
	Tone	The respondents are respected as students. At the beginning students felt worried and feared, but after some meetings they feel confident. Students are inspired and curious. The tone of communication does not make students annoyed or down. There were no critiques.	The tone seems to be all right. There is an open communication between supervisor and students. Effective.
Sources	Supervisors	The sources of feedback were supervisors and sometimes peers.	Effective.

	Tutors	There is no feedback from tutors.	
	Peers	Sometimes, there is feedback from peers. Their friends were happy to share the writing project with her.	

Table 6
The data of observation on the supervision of supervisor 1a

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks
Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	Not indicated in the observation. From the discussion, the supervisor matched with the topic of interest.	-
	Responsibilities of supervisors	The supervisor gave comments on concept and writing mechanism. The supervisor met the students more than the minimum number of meetings required and ensured the completion.	The supervisor was responsible to feedback on different parts.

	Responsibilities of students	The student was an active listener asking and writing down what the supervisor said. She met her supervisor more than the minimum number of meeting required. She made progress by showing the revision and completed the thesis on time.	The student was an active learner who discussed a lot of points.
	Relationship	There was open and honest communications. The supervisor read the drafts and showed the problems and suggested the solution. The relationship was like an advisor and advisee.	There was an open and good relationship.
Feedback strategy	Timing	The supervision spent 45 – 120 minutes. The feedback was given one day after submission of the draft. The frequency of the meetings was as required.	The timing was immediate and much. Effective.
	Amount	There is much feedback provided the writing mechanism. Almost every mistake on the writing mechanism was shown and corrected. There was not much feedback on the quality.	Much feedback was given to error corrections. Not effective.
	Modes	The feedback was given oral and written. Red pen was used to make the feedback visible clearly. No black pen or pencil was used. There was no electronic, conference or workshop feedback.	There was oral and written feedback.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

236

| | | The feedback was provided individually. It spent too much time for correction. There was no group feedback. | Individual feedback was mostly provided.

Effective. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Feedback Contents | Audience | | |
| | Focus | The feedback focused on student's work, on the self-regulation and process especially the writing mechanism. There is not much feedback on the quality but mostly on the forms.

There are almost no critics or negative comments on the student's work. There was no feedback on the person. | The focus was on the student's work especially the writing mechanism. |
| | Comparison | The feedback was compared with criterion reference (school rubrics/guide book) and self-criterion reference.

Sometimes the supervisor asked the student to have a look and to compare her work with other students who have similar topics.

The feedback was not compared with the norm-criterion | The student's work was compared mainly with school guidebook. |
| | Function | Most feedback is descriptive, sevaluative, formative and corrective.

There were no comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the student's work. The problems are shown and the suggestions or solutions are given.

There is a little praise and critics. The supervisor always reminded the student to be aware with the | The feedback functioned as evaluative and corrective.

Less effective. |

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

237

		deadline for the submission and exams.	
	Valence	Most of the feedback was positive, suggestive and a little negative.

Every mistake was shown. Student was encouraged to revise and correct their mistakes. There were no warning, critics and praises. | Suggestions were given but mostly corrective (negative) feedback.

Less effective. |
| | Clarity | The words and sentences used were simple and understood by the student.

The locations of the problems were indicated either on the margins or on the exact parts of the problems. | The communication is clear. The locations of the problem were clearly shown.

Effective. |
| | Specificity | The feedback was specific and pointed the exact parts of the problems and provided solutions on the margins, on the top and and the bottom of the page.

There was slight feedback on concept and strategy. Every mistake was shown and edited. | The feedback was specific to point the exact parts of the problems.

Less effective. |
| | Tone | The respondent was respected as a student and sometimes like a friend. Student felt inspired to go forward with the work.

The supervisor used good word choice and never made student discouraged. There no critiques and praises. | The tone of the communication was able to create openness.

Effective. |
| Sources | Supervisor | The sources of feedback were | In the observation, |

	Tutors	supervisors only.	only supervisor provided feedback.
	Peers		

Table 7
The data of observation on the supervision of supervisor 1b

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks
Feedback providers and receivers	Selecting supervisors	No indication in the observation.	-
	Responsibilities	The supervisor gave corrections on	The supervisors

in writing supervision	of supervisors	the statistics only. He was not responsible for the whole part of the student's work. The supervisor met the students more than the minimum number of meetings required.	were responsible to give feedback on different parts.
	Responsibilities of students	The student attended, listened and typed the corrections -revisions dictated by the supervisor. The student was initiative and tried to complete the thesis on time.	The student was an active learner who discussed a lot of points.
	Relationship	There was open communications. The problems ware shown and discussed with the students. The relationship is sometimes like a friend, motivator and guide.	There was an open and good relationship.
Feedback strategy	Timing	It took at least 60 minutes per meeting. Sometimes students were left for smoking. The feedback is directly given.	The timing was immediate and much. Effective.
	Amount	Much feedback was given on the statistics only. Almost every mistake in sttistics including the wording is shown and corrected orally. No comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the paper.	Much feedback was given to error corrections.
	Modes	The feedback was given orally. Sometimes the supervisor typed directly the correction on student work using student's laptop. No pencil or pen is used. There was no electronic, conference or	There was more oral corrective feedback than written feedback. Less effective.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

240

		workshop feedback	
	Audience	The feedback was given individually although the supervisor sat with three, four or five students at the same big table when supervising the students. Almost every student spent too much time for correction. Sometimes the same comments are given to different students.	Individual feedback was mostly provided. Effective.
Feedback Contents	Focus	The feedback focused on student's work, process and self-regulation especially the statistics. There is no feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the students. There are no critics or negative comments on the student's work.There was no feedback on the process, self-regulation and on the person.	The focus was on the student's work especially the statistics.
	Comparison	Criterion reference and self-reference are used. Sometimes, student's work is compared with other students' work. The feedback was compared with the students' previous drafts of thesis.	The student's work was compared mainly with school guidebook.
	Function	The feedback was mostly evaluative and corrective. There was slight descriptive and formative feedback There were no comments on the strengths but mostly weaknesses of the student's work. The problems were shown and the suggestions or solutions are given.	The feedback functioned as evaluative and corrective. Less effective.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

241

		There was no praise or critics. There is effort to encourage students who are weak or reluctant.	
	Valence	Most of the feedback was positive and suggestive Almost every mistake in statistics was shown. It encouraged student to revise and correct their mistakes. There were no critics or praises.	Suggestions were given but mostly corrective (negative) Less effective.
	Clarity	The language used is simple and clear. The locations of the problems are shown. The corrections were often dictated and the students retyped them.	The communication is clear. The locations of the problem were clearly shown. Effective.
	Specificity	The feedback was specific and pointed the exact parts of the problems but orally only. There is almost no general feedback. Every mistake is edited.	The feedback was specific to point the exact parts of the problems. Less effective.
	Tone	The respondent is treated like a student and sometimes like a customer. Students felt inspired to revise their work. The supervisor is not bossy but lectured more. There no critiques and praises.	The tone of the communication was able to create openness. Effective
Sources	Supervisor	In the observation, only supervisors provided feedback.	Effective
	Tutors		
	Peers		

Appendix 2 : Data of textual evidence, interview and observation student two (2)

Table 8
Textual Evidence Data on Student's Draft of Thesis
(Student 2 from Supervisor 2a)

Variables	Sub-variables	Indicators
Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	It was not seen in the textual evidence.
	Responsibilities of supervisors	The feedback was provided to guide the student. There was comment from the first chapter until the last chapter especially on the contents and organisation. Continuous feedback provided was to ensure the completion.
	Responsibilities of students	The student attended the meetings and made progress that could be seen from the drafts in the textual evidence. The student completed the thesis within the allocated time.
	Relationship	It was identified from the comments and progress of student's draft of thesis.
Feedback Strategies	Timing	The amount of timing is not detectable in the student's draft but the frequency can be seen from the progress of revisions made. Eight signatures are found in the supervision attendance form.
	Amount	Much feedback on the contents and organisation and a very little on the forms. Not every page was given feedback. Not every mistake on the form was shown. The amount of problem was shown by codes or symbols such as question marks (2), underlines (4) and circles (3).
	Modes	The feedback was mostly written in black pen. At the beginning, once the feedback was in colour pen to highlight the structure/framework of the proposal.
	Audience	The feedback was given individually.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

243

Feedback Contents	Focus	The feedback focused on the work, self-regulation and process especially on the concept/content. There was almost no feedback on the forms (writing mechanism).
	Comparison	It is compared to criterion-reference (school rubrics) and self-criterion reference.
	Function	The function is mostly descriptive and evaluative. The feedback showed the problems of the content and organisation. The problems were shown and given solutions by writing the suggestions. There were no critics or praises.
	Valence	The feedback was positive, evaluative and formative but mostly suggestive.

The feedback was positive, evaluative and formative but mostly suggestive.

Part 1
Suggestions to add information:
a. to mention the source (reference) of community tourism.
b. to move Social assessment definition, the theory and Table 1. Social assessment to Chapter 2
c. The profile of community and stakeholders to support the development of Jelekong village as rural cultural tourism. To develop community based rural cultural tourism.

The suggestions to improve the contents (on the margin and separated paper) are as follows:
a. Less focus on: the development of rural tourism in Indonesia, criteria of rural tourism, rural tourism,
b. Develop the background information
c. Add the indication of participations
c. Add definition of social assessment
d. Add the importance of participation
e. Assume the cause of the problem
f. Limit the scope of the study
g. Explain the SWOT analysis
h. Focus on the development of rural tourism in Indonesia, requirement of rural tourism, rural vs. village tourism
i. The indicators of problem in Jelekong village is not clear.

Part 2
Suggestions to add information:

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

244

		a. the plan of Jelekong village as rural tourism
		b. Assessment of :
		- community profile > social mapping (social, economy and culture)
		- stakeholder analysis > the pro & cons of the community
		c. What is rural tourism? Which theories?
		d. Tourist activities: the life of the village as destination > what activities are there in the village with or without out tourism activities
		e. Tourism destinations:
		1. various lives of the village
		2. based not only on the village culture
		3. the combination between the two (1 & 2)
		4. identify the objects of the destination
		5. stake holder participations, community and certain people
		f. Do not include too general information.
		g. Pay attention to citations of tourism products (OVAR)
		h. OVAR is completed with clear parameter and the conceptual framework is provided with descriptions.
		j) to add definition of rural tourism; to add rural revolution theory; k) to include definition of social assessment; l) to complete further information of demographic factors, to add stakeholder analysis including identification, stakeholder interest, and participation, to add tourism activities, to complete with the conceptual framework.
		Corrections to include pages in references are as follows: Goeldner & Ritchie, 2009, Roberts & Hall, 2001, and Mann dalam Smith, 2003.
		Corrcetion in spellings include: daoat > dapat, merujuka > merujuk
		Part 3 Comments, suggestions and corrections to add information :
		a) The quantitative and qualitative research methods should be separated,
		b) the number of samples and who they are,
		c) to add matrix of stakeholder, importance and influnce, d. to add SWOT analysis.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

245

		e) to change the word 'method' into design.
		There are questions asking if :
		a) the data were collected from library (review of literature)
		b) the SWOT analysis is needed
		Part 4
		Comments and suggestions:
		a) to use one table for the same data (table or pie chart),
		b) to use graphic instead of table,
		c) to put the table of cross tabulation of education, occupation and income,
		d) to use a table of community value and need, add information,
		e) to check a missing part 'stake holder analysis',
		f) to use horizontal table for stakeholder, interest, importance and influence groups,
		g) to give line spaces for Gajahdepok, Jampana, aminities and tourism facilities,
		h) to place a table title on the next page 'Table 17. KAFI Matrix',
		i) to add a point for 'number 3. Socialisation' and table 20. SWOT.
		There are some questions asking:
		a) the data of resident occupation,
		b) the data of residents' and data of social politic community;
		Correction to use spaces:
		- kemarau.Iklim >kemarau./Iklim.
		Part 5
		Comments and suggestions:
		a) to give a sub-chapter title (A. Conclusion),
		b) to change the positions by placing number one (1) into number two (2) and number two (2) into number one (1),
		c) to change number A into number B (Recommendations or Suggestions),
		d) to add another aspect for number e. monitoring,
		e) to add evaluation for number nine (9),
		f) to ask questions if before Organization (number 1), there are other aspects related to communities, after number eight (8), there is additional number

		'evaluation for number nine (9). Corrections to use spaces: - samapartisipatif > sama/partisipatif
	Clarity	a. Most feedback was clear, it showed the location of problems by codes or symbols such as question marks (2), underlines (4) and circles (3). Solution to the problems were also provided. b. A little feedback was not clear as shown by question marks.
	Specificity	a. The feedback was specific. It showed specifically on the problems of the content and organisation. b. The locations of the problem were also shown by using codes such as pointed by using question marks, underlines and crosses. c. Not every mistake in the form was corrected.
	Tone	The suggestions inspired the students. The student showed her progress to respond the feedback. There were no critiques or praises.
Sources	Supervisors	Supervisor 2a gave the feedback. There was no feedback from tutor or peer.
	Tutor	
	Peer	

Table 9
Textual Evidence Data on Student's Draft of Thesis
(Student 2 from Supervisor 2b)

Variables	Sub-variables	Indicators
Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	It was not seen in the textual evidence. The match of the supervisor with the topic could not be predicted from the comments.
	Responsibilities of supervisors	The feedback was provided both for the contents and writing mechanism. There was continuous feedback to ensure the time of completion.
	Responsibilities of students	The student met the supervisors regulalry. The student's drafts showed that there was progress. The thesis was completed on time.
	Relationship	There was clear and intensive communication through comments from the supervisor and revision of drafts made by the student.
Feedback	Timing	The immediacy of feedback did not appear in the textual evidence but the frequency was seen from the progress of revisions of the drafts. Eleven signatures are found in the form.

Strategies	Amount	There was not much feedback. Some feedback provided was on the contents and a little on the writing mechanism. The amount of writing mechanism was shown: a. Spelling mistakes (7 circles), italics (11 underlines), spacing (5 slashes) b. Reference dates & pages (6 crosses) c. Terminologies (3 underlines) d. Unclear statement (4 question marks)
	Modes	The feedback was written with pencil and black pen. There was no electronic feedback.
	Audience	The feedback was provided for individual needs.
Feedback Contents	Focus	The feedback focused on the work, self-regulation and process more on the concept/content. There was also feedback on the forms. Contents: a) to add an opening sentence in the background, b) to find data strategic tourism area in Bandung regency, c) to revise the title, d) to give more explanation about the limitation of the study and for focus, and e) The significance/objectives of the study should focus on the theoretical and practical significance
	Comparison	It is compared to school rubrics (criterion-reference) and self-reference criterion.
	Function	The function is mostly descriptive, evaluative formative and corrective. a. Showing problems and giving solutions by writing the suggested ideas. b. Showing problems by underlining and crossing them without solutions Check the guidebook to write references.
	Valence	The feedback was positive, a little negative and mostly suggestive. Part 1 The suggestions and corrections: a) to add an opening sentence in the background, b) to find data strategic tourism area in Bandung regency,

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

249

| | | c) to revise the title,
d) to give more explanation about the limitation of the study and for focus, and
e) The significance/objectives of the study should focus on the theoretical and practical significance

Corrections to add information such as:
a) Mengetahui kondisi > Mengetahuai dan menganalisa kondisi,
b) Mengetahui peran > Mengetahui dan menganalisa peran.

Corrections in spelling problems such as:
a) pembatsan > pembatasan,
b) berparuh > berpengaruh

Correction in using words/terminologies such as:
as:
b) pengembangan > pembangunan,
c) pihak terkait > stakeholder,
d) assessesment > analysis

Corections in using Italics in Table 1 such as:
a) stakeholder analysis,
b) social assessment, etc.;

Corrections in the sources of citations such as:
a) Goeldner & Ritchie, 2009,
b) Rietbergen – McCracken & Narayan, 1998, c) Bernstein, 2004.

Part 2
Comments, suggestions and corrections:
a) to erase too general information,
b) to include pages in the references for direct quotations,
c) to include definition of rural tourism,
d) to add definition of social assessment (not clear),
e) to add factors of social assessment such as demography, socio-economy, local values, analyses stakeholder, etc.,
f) to add tourism product such as natural attractions, cultural attractions, cultural activities, facilities, and accessibility,
g) to change tourism object into tourism attractions.

Corrections in spellings: |

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

250

		a) persfektif > perspectif, b) funginya > fungsinya, c) mewakli> mewakili, d) meningatkan > meningkatkan, e) include > includes, f) involvd > involve, g) memungknkan > memungkinkan, Correction in using Italics: - community Corrections in using spaces: a) population(multi ethnicgroup) > population/(multi-ethnicgroup), b) Butinthelocalcontext > But/in/the/local/context/, c) thepopulationthat >the/population/that, d) ofculture > of/culture, e) ofthe local> of/the local, f) toleransidanpenerimaan>toleransi/dan/penerimaan, g) meningkatkankebanggaan>meningkatkan/kebang-gaan Part 3 Suggestions to add information: a. to give further explanation about the population and sampling, b) to write data collection method and instruments and to complete with the matrix. Correction in writing reference: - Creswell, 23: 2009. There is a questions about what is to be observed. Part 4 Comments, suggestions and corrections: a. The contents of Chapter 4. Findings and analysis has been about complete but few tables still need completion. The part on stakeholder assessment is not complete. b) to erase an overlapping table of residents (table 2), c) to complete the data of residents' age (table 7), d) to give more detail analysis for table of cross tabulation of education, occupation and income (table 8), e) to give line spaces for Local Socio politics, f) to include table of community value and needs, g) to analyse community value and needs in more

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

251

		detailed,
		h) to check missing numbers by asking if farmer group is number nine (9) or number six (6),
		i) to check missing part in letter C, as after letter B. Community Social analysis … is directly followed by number D. General Information (Where is number c?),
		j) to add photos or pictures of tourism attractions,
		Corrections to give line spaces for:
		a) Sisingaan(number 6),
		b) Gajahdepok, Jampana, Activity(number e.),
		c) Aminities (number 3),
		d) tourism facilities (number a),
		e) Clean water facility (number 2).
		f) to erase number d. after Jampana (number 8)
		Corrections to use the right spellings:
		a) masyarakata > masyarakat,
		b) kekeluaargaan > kekeluargaan.
		Part 5
		Comments, suggestions and corrections:
		a) The conclusion should be arranged in line with the research questions,
		b) the sub-chapter title is arranged on the basis of the chapter title 'A. Conclusion and B. Recommendations',
		c) to add community participation before Organisation (number 1)
		Correctins to use the right spaces such as:
		a) kerajina/lukisan,
		b) sama/partisipatis,
		c) di dasarkan > didasarkan,
		d) di dengar > didengar;
		Corrections to use the right spellings such as:
		a) menyempurnkan > menyempurnakan,
		b) mengrakkan > menggerakkan,
		c) pengebangan > pengembangan,
	Clarity	a. Some feedback was clear, it showed the location of problem by using codes or symbols on the locations of problem such as underlines, crosses, circles and question marks.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

252

		b. A little feedback was not clear as it showed location of the problems using question marks (?) without giving explanations what to do with them.	
	Specificity	a. The feedback was specific and pointed to the exact parts of the problems. b. Some feedback gave solutions to the problems some did not. c. Not every mistake in writing mechanism was corrected.	
	Tone	There was inspiration how the student had to improve the thesis. There was progress and improvement. There were no critiques or praises.	
Sources	Supervisors	Supervisor 2b gave the feedback. There was no feedback from tutor or peer.	
	Tutor		
	Peer		

Table 10
Data of interview of Student 2
(About supervisor 2a and 2b)

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks
Feedback providers and	Selecting supervisors	I gave my title with the supervisors to the department. The supervisors were decided by the management to match the title with the expertise	Supervisor was decided by the management to be

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

253

receivers in writing supervision		of the supervisors. They were not my choice. They were the right persons to help me on the topic. Supervisor 2a's background is anthropology and communities. My title dealt with tourism communities. I liked the way Supervisor 2a gave the feedback, he did not dictate me. He gave general picture or frame of my thesis, not detailed picture. I liked it. Supervisor 2b gave both concept and writing mechanism.	matched with the title.
	Responsibilities of supervisors	The supervisors guided me with the whole parts of the thesis, met me regularly and pushed me to complete on time. The supervisor 2a guided me on the concept (content and organisation) of my interest. He never gave feedback on writing mechanism. He has done what has been expected. Supervisor 2b was responsible for the content and writing mechanism.	The supervisor was responsible to guide students and monitor student's progress.
	Responsibilities of students	I attended supervisions regularly and did my revision as fast as I could, there should be progress on the next day. The theories I wrote were not sharp and were not balanced. I put more balanced theories on the tourism than the theory on the community. I tried to complete my thesis within the allocated time.	The student was responsive and responsible.
	Relationship	Supervisor 2a was like an advisor, lecturer and guide. Supervisor 2b was more close and friendly than Supervisor 2a.	The relationship was like a teacher and a

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

254

				student.
			There was open and honest communication. They all were very inspiring.	
Feedback Strategies		Timing	I met my supervisors as frequent as required. I had open and close relationship with my supervisors. I left my draft with Supervisor 2a to be read, and the feedback was given on the following day or two days after. At the beginning, the length of the meeting was about 45-60 minutes, later 15-30 minutes with supervisor 2a. I met him eight (8) times with Sp. 2a. and eleven times with Supervisor 2b. It is about enough. Supervisor 2b read and discussed my draft directly. It took longer time to meet.	The feedback was given immediately; sometimes the draft of thesis was left one day or two for reading.
		Amount	The amount of feedback provided by Supervisor 2a was not enough. It was on the concept only and less detailed. Supervisor 2a was mostly on content and never on writing mechanism. His comment was too short; there was only one statement or question in one chapter. Supervisor 2b gave more detailed feedback than supervisor 2a. He gave around fifty percent for the content and organisation and another fifty percent on the writing mechanism.	There was not much feedback, not every mistake was corrected.
		Modes	Both supervisors gave written and oral feedback. There was electronic hp feedback , but no conference or workshop feedback. The written feedback was shown in black pen by supervisor 2b at the early times but later the feedback was mostly oral. I wrote more notes when attending his supervision. Oral feedback was	There oral and written comments were mostly on the quality.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

255

		also provided including to use electronic device such as hand phone but it was not detectable in the textual evidence. When I had problems I also called or sent message to him. The written feedback is not much; it focused on the contents and organisation. At the beginning Supervisor 2a used four different colours: black, blue, green and red. They are to highlight the information. Supervisor 2a used colour pen at the beginning to highlight the frame of the concept. The oral feedback was mostly discussion.	
	Audience	Most feedback was given individually to provide individual need. There was a group feedback once with Supervisor 2a but the feedback was given one by one in turns. The feedback given was similar and focused on the concept for students having similar topics. Supervisor 2b always gave individual feedback.	The feedback was to cater individual need.
Feedback Contents	Focus	Both Supervisors gave feedback on the process of writing, on the work and self-regulation. Supervisor 2a focused more on the contents and organisation while Supervisor 2b gave feedback both on the contents and writing mechanism. There was no feedback on the self-regulation and on the person. There was no critic or negative feedback and almost no correction on the writing mechanism from Supervisor 2a.	It was a good focus on the quality.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

256

	Comparison	The feedback was compared with the school rubrics (criterion reference) and with previous drafts I brought. Supervisor 2a suggested me to read previous thesis having similar topics to compare but 'I could not find the previous similar topic to her thesis.' The feedback was not compared with other students (norm-criterion reference).	It was compared with the standard rubrics and supervisor's perception.
	Function	The functions of feedback were descriptive, formative and evaluative and corrective. Supervisor 2a gave more evaluative feedback, supervisor 2b gave descriptive but not corrective. Supervisor 2a gave corrective feedback in the form of statement and question such as "Gali lebih dalam lagi" (Go deeper) and "Apakah bahasannya sudah mewakili masyarakat" (Does the discussion already represent community?). 　　Supervisor 2b gave statement such as "Anda sudah bisa mengumpulkan data" (You can collect data now). 　　There was indirect praise but no critics. There was a little comment on the strengths.	The descriptive and evaluative feedback was provided with less correction.
	Valence	The feedback was mostly positive and suggestive. Supervisor 2a suggested me to go deeper in the concept and asked if this part has represented community profile. I got confused with this suggestion but I did not ask for clarification. 　　There was a little warning from Supervisor 2b such as "Ke mana saja kamu, tidak pernah kelihatan?" (Where were you? You did not appear for a while?).	The supervisor did not give much pressure.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

257

		Supervisor 2b did not give suggestion to every mistake.	
	Clarity	The feedback provided by Supervisor 2a and 2b was clear. The location of the problems and solution were given. There was only a little problem with the meanings of the codes used. Codes or signs such as arrows, circles, crosses, questions and underlines were used by both supervisors. Not every mistake was shown or corrected.	Symbols or signs were also given to make the feedback clearer.
	Specificity	Supervisor 2a gave general and specific feedback on the concept and organisation only. Supervisor 2b gave more specific feedback on both concept and writing mechanism. The feedback pointed to the exact parts of the problems. Not every mistake was edited.	The specificity is good.
	Tone	I felt motivated and inspired with the feedback provided. Sometimes I felt nervous as if I made a big mistake. There was direct praise when the supervisor said "Ini sudah oke, kamu dapat mulai mengumpulkan data" (It is okay, you can start collecting data). There were no critiques at all. I felt satisfied but once I was not confident with the theories and data analysis.	There was an open communication between supervisor and students.
Sources	Supervisors	The feedback was from supervisors. Supervisor 2a should be more detailed. Supervisor 2b should read the draft prior to the meeting.	
	Tutors	There was feedback from a tutor. He knew a lot about the locus, I	

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

258

		also asked him about the concept	
	Peers	There was no feedback from peers	

Table 11
Data of interview
(Student 2 from Supervisor 2a)

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks
Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	I don't know how she chose me. He came and told me that I was her supervisor. My field is partly suitable. I teach anthropology and environment and her title was about community and environment.	Supervisor was decided by the management to be matched with the title.

	Responsibilities of supervisors	She came with proposal and discussed her proposal.
		  I guided her to focus on her interest about tourism community and environment.
		  This is for S1; there is a different treatment, more than 4 times meetings before seminar proposal.
		  I have met her 9 times. The student made very good progress and completed on time.
			The supervisor was responsible to guide students and monitor student's progress.

	Responsibilities of students	Compared to others, the student was good, responsive and progressive.
		  The concept was done quite fast but the data collection was long.
		  The student was active and able to complete on time.
			The student was responsive and responsible.

	Relationship	Good relationship, it is like student and lecturer relationship in formal communication. I am not a permanent lecturer; I am not very close to the student.	The relationship was like a teacher and a student.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

259

	Timing	The feedback was given immediately. At the beginning, the length of the meeting was about 60 minutes or more to talk about the proposal to develop research frame work, later 15-30 minutes. Nine times altogether. It is about enough. The feedback was given immediately; sometimes the draft of thesis was left one day or two for reading.	The time was not much but effective.
Feedback Strategies			
	Amount	There is much feedback on the contents (structure, organisation and concept) and the structure of writing, where and what to put in the background. The student was responsive and fast, she did not need much time and amount. No detailed corrections for the writing mechanism. Only slight ambiguous statement and writing mechanism were commented and the rest was suggested to be consistent.	There was not much feedback, not every mistake was corrected.
	Modes	The feedback was written and oral feedback. The written feedback was not much; it focused on the contents and organisation. The written feedback at the beginning used four different colours: black, blue, green and red. They were to highlight the information. Red pen did not mean 'angry' or 'supervisor' The oral feedback was mostly discussion. There were no electronic, workshop and conference feedback.	There oral and written comments were mostly on the quality.
	Audience	Most feedback was given individually to provide individual need. At the beginning, there was once given in-group having similar	The feedback was to cater individual need.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

260

		topics to give general concept of thesis writing but they got the feedback in term.	
Feedback Contents	Focus	The feedback focused on the process, self-regulation and work especially on the contents and organisation. There was no feedback on the person. The student curiosity was high and able to comprehend the feedback fast. There was no critic or negative feedback and almost no correction on the writing mechanism.	It was a good focus on the quality.
	Comparison	Starting from student interest, the draft was compared with the criterion reference (school guide book) and also the previous drafts brought by students. I was suggested to read previous theses having similar topics to compare.	It was compared with the standard rubrics and supervisor's perception.
	Function	The feedback functioned descriptive, evaluative, formative but less corrective. I did not force the student to follow my idea. There was direct praise but no critics, like "Oke bagian ini sudah oke" (Okay, this part is okay). There was a little comment on the strengths.	The descriptive and evaluative feedback was provided with less correction.
	Valence	I am not a permanent lecturer of STP, I did not give pressure like my own students at Unpad. My feedback was mostly persuasive, positive and suggestive. Every mistake was not shown or corrected. There were no warnings or punishments.	The supervisor did not give much pressure.

Sutanto, 2015
***THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING***
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

261

	Clarity	The feedback was clear and the locations of problems and solution were shown. The language used is simple and can be comprehended. Not every mistake is shown or corrected. To make it clear, I showed ambiguous sentence and gave the correction. I also used codes such as arrows, circles, crosses, and underlines.	Symbols or signs were also given to make the feedback clearer.
	Specificity	The feedback was general and specific on the contents and organisation and pointed the exact parts of the problems. Not every mistake was edited.	The specificity is good.
	Tone	The feedback was inspiring to motivate the student. It was persuasive and inspiring. There were no direct praises and there were no critiques at all. I was satisfied as she was fast and better than the other students in my supervision.	There was an open communication between supervisor and students.
Sources	Supervisors	The feedback was only from supervisors. The supervisor gave me enough feedback to improve my thesis writing and helped me learn deeply.	
	Tutors	There was no feedback from tutors.	
	Peers	There was no feedback from peers	

Table 12
Data of interview
(Student 2 from Supervisor 2b)

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks
Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	At the beginning, the student proposed a topic to the study program. The study program recommended the supervisors to be approved by Head of Students Academic and Affairs. The research topic matched with my interest dealing with tourism community.	Supervisors were decided by the study program.
	Responsibilities of supervisors	My responsibility was to give guidance, to bring the student to go to the right direction. I did not force the student to follow my concept or ideas. I felt that I was not fully able to supervise due to the high demand of other study program activities. I have met her more than 8 times and she made very good progress.	The supervisor was responsible to guide students and monitor student's progress.

	Responsibilities of students	The student attended the meetings regularly. She was very enthusiastic and showed a great progress with her thesis and finished the thesis on time. The student first came to me with the research title but I asked her to come with problems to be researched and how to give solution to the problems.	The student was enthusiastic and responsible.
	Relationship	I considered the student as my student, patient, and customer. She came to me when she had problems and I tried to give solution to her problems. I am a permanent lecturer; I was close to the student. She was honest and open-minded. She sometimes called me or sent message to me when she got stuck.	The relationship was like a teacher and a student, patient and customer.
Feedback Strategies	Timing	I gave immediate feedback. At the beginning, the length of the meeting was about 30 -45 minutes, later 15-20 minutes. I spent more time on the concept, methodology, data collection and analysis The student met eight (8) times altogether as required. I read the draft before I met the student to make sure the problems she had. I gave the draft back after the meeting.	The time was not much but effective.
	Amount	I gave much feedback in chapter 1 (introduction), data collection and analysis. Much feedback was on the concept There were no detailed corrections for the writing mechanism because her language has met the standard.	There was much feedback on the concept. There was little feedback on the writing mechanism.
		At the beginning the feedback was	

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

264

	Modes	written, but later I gave more oral feedback and the student wrote my comment a lot. The oral feedback was mostly discussion. The written feedback used pencil and black pen. There was electronic feedback through handphone but no workshop and conference feedback.	There was written feedback at the beginning but mostly oral feedback was provided later.
	Audience	The feedback was given individually to cater for individual need. There was no mini class or group feedback. The same feedback about the research concept was given to other students writing similar topics.	The feedback was given individually.
Feedback Contents	Focus	The feedback focused on the self-regulation, process and work especially on both the contents and writing mechanism. There was no feedback on the person. There was constructive criticism feedback such as "Analisanya bagus tapi kamu perlu fokus pada pertanyaan penelitian" (your analysis is good but you need to focus your analysis on your research questions) and "Rekomendasinya baik tapi kamu perlu pikirkan rekomendasi yang lebih operasional" (the recommendation is alright but you need to think more operational recommendation). There was very little correction on the writing mechanism.	The feedback focused more on the quality.
	Comparison	The draft was compared mainly with the criterion reference (school guide book). I asked the students to bring the previous drafts to compare (self-reference). I also compared it with my own perception.	It was compared with criterion reference and supervisor's perception.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

265

		So it did not fully follow the school rubrics or personal perception.	
	Function	The feedback functioned descriptive, evaluative, formative and corrective. The strong and weak points were shown. There was direct praise such as "Kamu cepat merevisinya" (You revised so fast), "Ini bagus" (It is good). There was no critic.	The evaluative and corrective feedback was provided sufficiently.
	Valence	My feedback was mostly positive and suggestive. Not every mistake was shown or corrected. There was slight warning such as "Ke mana saja kamu?" (Where have you been?); Saya sudah lama tidak lihat kamu" (I did not see you for long time)	The valence is effective.
	Clarity	The feedback was clear. The student could catch the whole points in the discussions. Not every mistake is shown or corrected. To highlight the problems and solutions, I used codes such as circles, question marks, arrows, and underlines. The notes were put on the margins, on top or at the bottom of the page.	Symbols or signs were also given to make the feedback clearer.
	Specificity	The feedback was specific on the contents and slightly on the writing mechanism. It pointed the exact parts of the problems. Not every mistake was corrected.	The specificity is good.

	Tone	The feedback was inspiring because the student was enthusiastic to ask questions and discuss her problems.
		   She sometimes telephoned or sent message (sms) to me to get some consultation about research methodology, etc.
		   There were direct praises and constructive critiques. I was
			There was an open communication between supervisor and students.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

266

		satisfied with the result of the supervision with her. She was very responsive.	
Sources	Supervisors	The feedback was only from supervisors.	
	Tutors	There was feedback from a tutor. I happened to know him and he knows a lot about the locus.	
	Peers	There was no feedback from peers.	

Table 13
Data of observation
(Student 2 with supervisor 2a)

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks
Writing Supervision	Selecting supervisors	Whether the supervisors were selected in planned or unplanned manner, there was not evidence in the observation. From the observation, the communication showed the supervisors matched with the topic.	
	Responsibilities of supervisors	The supervisor was responsible for guiding the student to focus on her topic of interest, met the students	Guiding the student to focus on her research interest.

		regularly and ensured the time of completion. The supervision was mostly on the research concept (contents and organisation)	
	Responsibilities of students	The student was responsible for attending the meetings and responding to the supervisor's feedback and for making progress to complete her thesis.	The student was responsive and responsible.
	Relationship	There was good relationship and open communication although they were not very close. The student shared her problems such as in finding references, data collection and analysis and the supervisors suggested the solutions. They were just like a teacher and a student.	The relationship between supervisors and student was good.
Feedback Strategies	Timing	The feedback was provided immediately and the time was longer at the beginning but the average was around 35 minutes. The supervisors and student met frequently.	It is about reasonable time.
	Amount	There was much feedback on the concept (contents and organisation). There was almost no feedback on the writing mechanism.	There was much feedback on the quality.
	Modes	The feedback was written with colour pen once at the beginning. The following feedback was mostly oral and the student wrote the comments.	The feedback was mostly oral.
	Audience	The feedback was given individually at the most times.	The feedback was to cater individual need.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

268

Feedback Contents	Focus	The feedback focused on the work, self-regulation and on the process especially the contents and organisation. There was almost no feedback on the forms. There was no feedback on the person.	The feedback focussed on the work and on the process.
	Comparison	The feedback was compared with the school guide book (criterion reference) and self-reference. It was not compared with norm-criterion reference.	The feedback was compared with the school guidebook.
	Function	The feedback was descriptive , formative and evaluative. There was feedback on the strengths and weaknesses. There was almost no corrective feedback.	Descriptive and evaluative feedback was provided.
	Valence	Most of the feedback was positive (persuasive) and suggestive. The persuasion and suggestion were given especially on the contents and organisation. There were no warnings or punishments.	The student was given persuasive and suggestive feedback.
	Clarity	The feedback was clear. The student could follow the supervisor. It could be seen from their discussion. There was no interruption asking for clarity.	The feedback was clear.
	Specificity	The feedback was specific to the content and organisation. The problem locations were shown, discussed and given solution. There was no feedback on the writing mechanism.	The feedback was specific to show specific parts of the problem.
	Tone	There was an open communication. The student felt inspired and motivated. It could be seen from the student's enthusiasm and her	There was an open communication.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

269

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks
		progress shown to the supervisor. There was direct praise but no critiques on student's work.	
Sources	Supervisors	Only the supervisors gave the feedback.	
	Tutors	There was no feedback from tutors.	
	Peers	There was no feedback from peers.	

Table 14
Data of observation
(Student 2 with supervisor 2b)

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks

Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	In the observation, the evidence of manner of selection was no evidence. From the observation, the communication showed the supervisors matched with the topic.	
	Responsibilities of supervisors	The supervisor was responsible for guiding the student both on the concept and writing mechanism. He monitored the progress regularly and gave solution to the problems. He ensured the time of completion.	The supervisor responsibility was good.
	Responsibilities of students	The student was responsible for attending the meeting, discussing the problems and responding the feedback and making progress. The student was able to complete on time.	The student was responsive and made good progress.
	Relationship	There was good relationship and open communication. There was discussion on the problems, the student responded. The supervisor treated the student as customer, patient and student.	The relationship between supervisors and student was good.
Feedback Strategies	Timing	The feedback was provided immediately. At the beginning the time was longer. The average of following meetings was around 20 to 25 minutes. The frequency was enough as required.	It is about enough time.
	Amount	There was much feedback on the concept especially chapter 1. Introduction, Chapter 3. Research method, chapter 4. Findings and discussion. There was a little feedback on the writing mechanism.	There was much feedback on the contents and a little on the writing mechanism.
	Modes	The mode of feedback was written and oral but mostly oral (discussion with the student). The written feedback was not	The comments were on quality and writing mechanism.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

271

		much, some with a black pen and some other with a pencil.	
	Audience	The feedback was given individually to cater individual need.	The feedback was individual.
Feedback Contents	Focus	The focus mostly on the work, self-regulation and on the process especially the concept (contents and organisation of the thesis) and a little on the writing mechanism. There was no feedback on the person.	The feedback was on the work and on the process.
	Comparison	The feedback was compared with the criterion reference (school rubrics) and the students' previous drafts of thesis. There was no comparison with norm criterion.	The feedback was compared with criterion reference and self-perception.
	Function	The feedback was descriptive, formative and evaluative. There was discussion on the contents and organisation of the thesis. It gave a little correction and showed the strengths and weaknesses both in the concept and the forms.	The feedback was descriptive and evaluative.
	Valence	Most of the feedback was positive, negative and suggestive. Suggestions were given to improve the quality of the thesis draft. There were a few suggestions on the writing mechanism.	There was positive and negative feedback.
	Clarity	The feedback was clear. The student could understand the entire message from the supervisor. The problems and solutions were indicated. There was an open discussion showing that all information is well understood.	Their communication was clear.

Sutanto, 2015
***THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING***
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

272

	Specificity	The feedback was specific on the concept and writing mechanism. The feedback pointed to the exact parts of the problems. The supervisor discussed and gave solution to them. Not every problem in writing mechanism was discussed.	The feedback was specific to focus on the specific parts of the problem.
	Tone	The student was enthusiastic and inspired by the feedback. There was an direct praise, such as "Bagian in sudah okay" (This part is okay). There were also constructive critiques on student's work, such as 'The recommendation is okay but you'd better provide more operational one.'	There was good communication.
Sources	Supervisors	The feedback was only from the supervisor.	
	Tutors	There was no feedback from tutors.	
	Peers	There was no feedback from peers	

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

273

Appendix 3 : Data of textual evidence, interview and observation student three (3)

Table 15
Textual Evidence Data on Student's Draft of Thesis
(Student 3 from Supervisor 3a)

There was no feedback in the textual evidence as Supervisor 3b only gave oral feedback.

Variables	Sub-variables	Indicators
Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	-
	Responsibilities of supervisors	-
	Responsibilities of students	-
	Relationship	-
Feedback Strategies	Timing	-
	Amount	-
	Modes	-
	Audience	-
Feedback Contents	Focus	-
	Comparison	-
	Function	-
	Valence	-
	Clarity	-
	Specificity	-
	Tone	-
Sources	Supervisors	-
	Tutor	
	Peer	

Table 16
Textual Evidence Data on Student's Draft of Thesis
(Student 3 from Supervisor 3b)

Variables	Sub-variables	Indicators
Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	Not applicable in the textual evidence.
	Responsibilities of supervisors	Giving guidance by providing feedback. Regular comments on student's drafts to ensure the completion of the thesis on time.
	Responsibilities of students	The responsibility was shown in the progress of the draft after being revised. The progress was seen by the regular meetings with the supervisor.
	Relationship	There was an intensive communication through comments from the supervisor and revision of drafts made by the student.
Feedback Strategies	Timing	The immediacy was not seen in the textual evidence. The frequency was indicated by each progress shown in the student's draft. There are eight signatures in the attendance form.
	Amount	There was much enough feedback. In the textual evidence, the feedback mostly on the writing mechanism. There were different kinds of symbols used to show the problems.
	Modes	There was oral and written feedback in red ink. The feedback used a lot of symbols/codes such as circles, slashes, ticks, crosses, arrows, interjections, underlines, double arrows, linking lines
	Audience	Individual feedback based on the comment in the textual evidence.
Feedback Contents	Focus	The focus was on self-regulation, process and student's work especially the writing mechanism.

		There was no feedback on the personality.
	Comparison	The feedback was compared with standard rubrics (criterion- reference) and I was asked to bring my previous drafts of thesis to compare (self-reference). There was no comparison with the norm-criterion reference.
	Function	The function was mostly evaluative, formative and corrective. Every writing mechanism problem was corrected using codes or symbols: circles (33), slashes (12), ticks (4), crosses (14), arrows (2), interjections (2), underlines (36), double arrows (2), linking (3), and question marks (9). Part 1 Corrections to use capital letters such as: - Latar belakang > Latar Belakang - Tujuan dan kegunaan penelitian > Tujuan dan Kegunaan Penelitian - Secara teoritis >Secara Teoritis - Secara praktis > Secara Praktis - Bagi Penulis - Bagi Perusahaan - Bagi Akademisi To use Italics such as - broadless world - turbulence - Customer Relationship Management - continuity marketing, one to one marketing dan partnering program - Senior Manager Public Relation Contact and Account Management - Sales - corporat - Marketing and Fulfillment - email,facebook Correction and suggestions to write pages in references Sheth, Pravatiyar dan Shainesh (2001), Shoemaker dan Lewis (1998) Kotler dan Keller (2009) Brown (2008), Corrections using slashes to give spaces such as: - global/pada/masa/sekarang

		- reguler/domestik./Berdasarkan
		- dan/efektivitas/pemasaran
		- tanggap/akan/sangat
		- meliputiemail,/facebook,
		- bahwa/loyalitas/merupakansuatu
		- Indonesia/akan/lebihfokus
		Correction to use the right words/phrases
		- Akibat – dampak
		- kompetisi - persaingan
		- kompetitor -pesaing
		- memaksimalkan - mengoptimalkan
		- dipakai – diimplementasikan
		- memerlukan -membutuhkan
		- customers – pelanggan
		Corrections to use the right spellings
		- bisa > biasa
		- diempuh- ditempuh
		- mengmbangkam> mengembangkan
		- menrut . Menurut
		- kebtuhan > kebutuhan
		- menuhi > memenuhi
		- meningkatkan >peningkatan
		- memeberikan >memberikan
		- mengungkpkan >mengungkppkan
		- didefinisakn
		Corrections and suggestions to add information
		- loyalitas - loyalitas pelanggan
		- Permalasahannya > Permalasahan yang tejadi
		- membatasi permasalahan > membatasi fokus permasalahan
		- Bagaimana program >Bagaimana penerapan program
		- telah disebutkan > telah disebutkan di atas
		Part 2
		Corrections to include the pages for references
		Sunarto (2006)
		Kotler dan Keller (2009)
		Lukas (2001),
		Kotler dan Armstrong (2004),
		William G. Zikmund, Raymond McLeod, Jr, dan Faye W. Gilbert (2003)
		Bernd H Schmitt (2003)
		Griffin (2008)
		Oliver (1996)

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

277

		Sheth, Parvatiyar dan Shainesh, 2002)
		Corrections to use Italics such as "Marketing is a organizational function and a set of processes for creating, communicating, and delivering value to customers and for managing customer relationship in ways that benefit the organizational and its stakeholders".
		acquisition,Intregated marketing : - Communication -Product and services - Internal marketing : - Marketing Departemen - Senior management - Other departement - Social Responsibility Marketing : - Sales revenue - Brand and costumer equity - Ethnics - Environment - Legal - Community - Relationship marketing : - Customers - Channel - Partners
		Corrections & suggestions to give further information : - Co-branding dan affinity partnering? - Loyality? - Pembentukan Loyalitas Pelanggan - Jenis Loyalitas
		Corrections to use spaces - kegiatandanfungsi-fungsi - dapatmembantu - pengembangan,perancangandanimplementasi - *partneringprogram*. - strategimengelolahdanmenjaga - yangunggulsaatdiminta - mengembangkanikatan - produkataujasa - danjasatertentu - pelanggandalam - dimana
		Corrections to use the right spelling

		- mrupakan
		- orgnisasional
		- mendfinisikan:
		- membrikan
		- kompehensif
		- mengmpulkan
		- ddasarkan
		- pernikiran
		- berinterksi
		- kentungan
		- perushaan
		- kemngkinan
		- *Purchses*
		- pelangan
		Corrections to use the proper words such as:
		- mencapai goal perusahaan > mencapai tujuan perusahaan
		- menunjukkan > mengindikasikan
		- pemahaman > pemikiran
		- dinyatakan > digambarkan
		- digabungkan > dikombinasikan
		- menyatakan > menggambarkan
		- diberikan > ditawarkan
		Part 3
		Corrections to write dates in the references
		Sugiyono, 2011.
		Sutrisno Hadi (2008),
		Rakhmat (2002)
		Corrections to use the right spellings such as:
		- mengmpulkan
		- penrapan
		- pengmbangan
		- berkopetensi
		- masa menatang,
		- pelangan
		- diindentifikasikan
		- pengargaan
		- kanggotaan
		- generlisasi
		- mengtahui
		- permsalahan
		- dijadkan
		- pengmpulan
		- perhtungannya

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

279

| | | Corrections to use Italics such as:
- Loyalty
- customer
- centricitY,
- Honesty
- openness
- Integrity.
- eFficient & effective
- channel procedures
- frequent-flyer
- corporate account,
- direct electronic mail
- eligible flight
- purposive sampling,
- Garuda Indonesia Training Center
- eFficient & effective- check-incounter

Corrections to use spaces such as:
dimulaisaatbangsa
barubagimasa
restrukturisasiutang
Halinididasari
Retensidanloyalitasyang
Salahsatu
check-incounter
untukpenerbangan
samplingadalah
mencaridanmengumpulkan

Corrections to use capital letters such as:
- Logo perusahaan
- Visi perusahaan
- Misi perusahaan
- Nilai perusahaan
- Teknik pengumpulan data
- Penelitian kepustakaan (Library research)
- Penelitian lapangan *(*Field research)
- Alat pengumpulan data
- Rancangan penelitian
- *Customer relationship management* (CRM)

Part 4
Corrections to use Italics/Non-Italics such as:
- Garuda Frequent Flyer
- costumer relationship management (CRM)
- Office |

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

280

| | | - *Sumber: Data Hasil Olahan Peneliti, 2013*
- *Sumber: Modifikasi Dari Hasil Penelitian, 2013*
- GFF Reguler
- GFF Junior
- Executive Card Plus (EC Plus)
- Garuda Indonesia Citibank Card (GIC Card),
- GFF Membership Service
- Garuda Inflight Magazine.
- Short Message Service)
- Citiphone Banking.

Corrections to use spaces such as:
- selalumengutamakan
- sesuaidenganpangsa
- diatas
- inisesuaidengan
- carapendaftaran
- menggunakankartu
- penilaianpadabesarnya
- yangdiberikan
- dicernaoleh
- Halini
- manasaja
- adalahmaskapaipelopor

Corrections to use the right spellings such as:
- pengolhan
- pengluaran
- dikrenakan
- medapatkan
- kemudaahan
- tangapan
- peyampaian
- responen
- kuntungan
- penglahan

Corrections to use the appropriate words or phrases such as:
- Pelanggan - responden
- pendaftaran- registrasi
- memperoleh – mendapatkan
- angket - kuesioner
- kebanyakan pelanggan - mayoritas responden
- merujukkan - mereferensikan
- kompetitor - pesaing |

Sutanto, 2015
***THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING***
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

281

		- ditingkatkan - diperbaiki
		Part 5
		Corrections to use spaces such as:
		- baikdanharus
		- bergabungdalam
		- diluarpenelitian
		- Halini
		- perusahaanlain
		- mengharapkanagar
		Corrections to use the right spellings such as:
		- keimpulan
		- frekensi
		- pemblian
		- sisnya
		- mejawab
		- membrikan
		- menkarkan
		- memprbanyak
		- mempetahankan
	Valence	Most feedback was positive and suggestive. It suggested the student to check and to revise as needed. The suggestions include: a) The introduction is not clear!, b)The theory should focus on the variables, c) The data collection methods should explain the methods used to collect the data only, d) The finding should be presented on the basis of the research questions.
	Clarity	Most feedback was clear, a little feedback was not clear. The problems were shown by symbol/signs exactly on the locations, on the margins, on the top of the page and at the bottom of the page. The symbols such as circles are to show problems in spellings, slashes to show preposition problems, ticks to agree with the information, crosses to phrases not needed, arrows to show connected ideas, interjections to show the wrong used of words, underlines to show problems with sentences/ideas, double arrows to show spacing problems, linking to show unconnected words and question marks to show unclear sentences or ideas. Some problems were not given solution.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

282

	Specificity	The feedback was specific. It showed the locations of the problems using various symbols such as: circles, slashes, ticks, crosses, arrows, interjections, underlines, double arrows, linking, and question marks.
	Tone	The feedback was inspiring. The student was inspired to make revision There were no praises and critiques.
Sources	Supervisors Tutor Peer	The feedback was only from the supervisor.

Table 17
Data of interview with student 3
About supervisors 3a and 3b

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks
Writing Supervision	Selecting supervisors	I chose my supervisors as planned and the study program agreed them. I knew their expertise as they taught me before. The supervisors matched with research interest. Supervisor 3a was expert in my topic area and	Supervisors were chosen as planned.

		comfortable and relaxed to talk with. Supervisor 3b was thorough and careful.	

	Responsibilities of supervisors	Both supervisors met me regularly, guided me to write my thesis and to ensure my completion. Supervisor 3a was responsible to guide me to conduct a research based on my interest. He gave systematic feedback in the concept.
		
		   Supervisor 3b had a big responsibility. She reminded me to keep in progress. Both supervisors suggested me the locus for the research. They are professional supervisors.
		
		   They needed to read my draft prior to the supervision meetings so that they understood what I wrote.
			The supervisors were responsible for guiding students conducting research based on her interest.
			
			.

	Responsibilities of students	My responsibility was to attend the meetings and to complete my thesis on time. I met her only 5 times. When I had difficulty to get the locus as the previous one was suddenly cancelled. Luckily, my supervisors helped me to find the locus.	The student was responsible to complete her research on time.
	Relationship	I was more open and close to supervisor 3a. I could come to him at any time. He motivated me a lot. Supervisor 3b gave more attention. She kept asking my progress but I was not close to her. I did not want to make her angry at my progress. I was reluctant to meet her and she was too busy and difficult to meet.	There was a good relationship between supervisors and student.
Feedback	Timing	I had met Supervisors 3a about 8 times and Supervisor 3b was 5 times (less that the frequency required). Supervisor 3a spent around 20	The time provided was about enough. The feedback was almost given

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

284

Strategies		to 30 minutes for each meeting while Supervisor 3b spent around 25 to 35 minutes for each meeting. Supervisor 3a directly gave feedback when I came. Supervisor 3b sometimes delayed on the next day due to her other office arrangement.	immediately.
	Amount	There was much feedback on the contents provided by Supervisor 3a. Supervisor 3b also gave much feedback both on the contents and writing mechanism. Every problem was corrected with symbols such as crosses, underlines, and question marks.	Both supervisors gave sufficient feedback.
	Modes	Supervisor 3a gave oral feedback only. Supervisor 3b gave written and oral feedback. The written feedback was in red pen. There was no electric feedback.	Both written and spoken feedback was provided. Supervisor 3a gave oral feedback only.
	Audience	Most feedback was given individually by both Supervisors 3a and 3b. There was no group feedback.	The feedback was given individually.
Feedback Contents	Focus	Supervisors 3a focussed the feedback on the work, self-regulation and process especially on the concept (contents and organisations). Supervisors 3b focussed the feedback on the work, self-regulation and process on the concept but more on writing mechanism. There was no feedback on the person and on the strengths but on the correction of the mistakes. There was constructive criticism both from Supervisors 3a and 3b.	Supervisors 3a focussed the feedback on the contents and organisations. Supervisors 3b focussed the feedback on the concept but more on writing mechanism.
	Comparison	Supervisor 3a compared my thesis with the criterion reference	The feedback was mostly compared

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

285

		(standard rubrics) and my students previous drafts of thesis. Supervisor 3b compared my thesis with the criterion reference (standard rubrics).	with the standard rubrics.
		Both supervisors 3a and 3b did not suggest me to compare with others but I did especially the questionnaire. There was no feedback compared with the norm-criterion reference.	
	Function	Supervisor 3a and 3b provided descriptive, evaluative, and formative but more corrective feedback.	The feedback was descriptive, evaluative but more corrective.
		There were praises such as "Ini sudah bagus, jangan diubah" (It is good, do not change it).	
	Valence	Most of the feedback was positive, suggestive and corrective. They showed the mistakes and gave the corrections.	The feedback was suggestive and corrective.
		Supervisor 3b showed every mistake and corrected them. There was a warning such asking the student why she was too long not to appear.	
	Clarity	The feedback was clear enough, the problems were shown and solutions were provided. Supervisor 3a only gave oral feedback. The student had to record it carefully.	The feedback was about clear enough.
		Supervisor 3b showed every mistake and corrected them by using symbols such as crosses, underlines and question marks.	
	Specificity	Supervisor 3a gave general feedback on the concept and got more specific on the problems.	The feedback was general and specific.
		Supervisor 3b gave systematic feedback from general to specific. It included specific details in	

		writing mechanism.	
	Tone	Supervisor 3a was more friendly and tolerable. Supervisor 3b was stricter; I wrote what she said otherwise she was angry. There were praises and constructive criticism. They both motivated and inspired me. "Ke mana saja kamu Feb?(Where are you Feb? You did not appear for a while.)	There was an open communication between supervisor and students.
Sources	Supervisors	The sources were the supervisors. My supervisors provided enough feedback to improve my thesis writing and encouraged me to engage with the feedback for revision.	
	Tutors	There was statistics tutor out of the supervisor. I learned a statistics a lot with him.	
	Peers	I talked with my friends about our projects. I felt happy to share problems with my friends.	

Table 18
Data of interview
(Student 3 from Supervisor3a)

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks
Feedback providers and receivers in writing supervision	Selecting supervisors	I don't know how she chose me. She came to me and said that I was her supervisor. I think the study program recommended me as her supervisor. Her research topic matched with my interest.	Supervisor was decided by the management to be matched with the title.
	Responsibilities of supervisors	The first time she came to me, we talked about her interest and her knowledge about it. I met her regularly and reminded her to complete on time. I guided her to focus on her interest and suggested her to find a research topic related to her interest.	The supervisor was responsible to guide students and monitor student's progress.
	Responsibilities of students	I think she has a very high responsibility and good motivation. She met me regularly. She was responsive, able to grasp and develop ideas well and to complete the thesis on time. It was shown by her attitude she came to me.	The student was responsive and responsible.
	Relationship	Referring to our type of education, I treated the student as our customer and sometimes as my daughter. We had an open, close, warm and honest communication. She felt motivated and inspired, I think.	The relationship was like a teacher and a student.
Feedback Strategies	Timing	The length of each meeting was about 30 to 45 minutes. I have met her around 8 times or more as required. When she came, I directly read and discussed the draft with her and gave back the draft back right	The time was not much but effective.

		after the discussion. Each time she came, I asked her to bring the whole draft that has been revised. This is to check her progress and to continue to the next part of the draft.	
	Amount	I think I gave enough feedback especially on the contents (organisation and concept). There was much discussion and, she took notes as much as needed. There were no notes, codes or signs to mark the problems or mistakes.	There was not much feedback, not every mistake was corrected.

	Modes	The mode of feedback was only oral. I discussed mainly on the concept and the student wrote important points of the discussion.
		    The discussion was progressive to follow the development of the draft but sometimes went back to the previous part of the draft.
		    There was no written feedback, no electronic, workshop and conference feedback.
			There oral and written comments were mostly on the quality.

	Audience	The feedback was given individually to provide individual need. There was no feedback given in-group.	The feedback was to cater individual need.
Feedback Contents	Focus	The feedback focused on self-regulation, process and work especially on the concept (contents and organisation). There was no corrective feedback on the writing mechanism. There was no feedback on the person. The student curiosity was high and able to comprehend the feedback fast. There was constructive criticism but there was no negative comment.	It was a good focus on the quality.

Sutanto, 2015
***THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING***
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

289

	Comparison	The draft was compared with the criterion reference (school guide book) and self-reference (I asked my students to bring the previous drafts) The feedback was not compared with norm-criterion reference . The student had high motivation; she knew what to do and did not need to be reminded to complete the thesis.	It was compared with the standard rubrics and supervisor's perception.
	Function	I provided descriptive, evaluative, formative and corrective feedback. In the discussion, it was clearly seen as descriptive feedback showing the strength and weaknesses of the draft. There was direct praise from the supervisor by saying "Bagus and kamu sudah kerja keras" (Great and hard-working).	The feedback was provided with correction.
	Valence	The feedback depended on the situation and condition. My feedback could be positive, negative and suggestive. There was no correction on the writing mechanism. There were no warnings or punishments.	The supervisor did not give much pressure.
	Clarity	The feedback was quite clear. It was clear as each time the student came, I asked her to bring the previous drafts to check the progress. I did not give written feedback to highlight the problems and solutions. The key problems on the concept were always discussed in detail with the student.	Symbols or signs were also given to make the feedback clearer.
	Specificity	The feedback was general and specific especially on the contents and organisation. At the beginning, we discussed	The specificity is good.

Sutanto, 2015
***THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING***
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

290

		general ideas about her interest and plan but later got more specific on the exact parts of the problems with the solution.	
	Tone	I did not know how the student felt when coming to me. From her attitude and progress, I noticed that she was motivated, inspired and responsive. There were direct praises such as 'Bagus, kamu kerja keras" (It is great' and 'You work hard). There were critiques such as 'It is not right', 'This part is not relevant'. The supervisor was relatively satisfied, I did my best to guide her doing her research and writing the thesis.	There was an open communication between supervisor and students.
Sources	Supervisors	The feedback was only from supervisors.	
	Tutors	There was no feedback from tutors.	
	Peers	There was no feedback from peers.	

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

291

Table 19
Data of interview
(Student 3 from Supervisor3b)

Variables	Sub-variables	Descriptors	Remarks
Feedback providers and receivers	Selecting supervisors	The student proposed three supervisors to the study Program. Student Academic and Affairs agreed two of them including me. Her title was not really my interest but the interest of the other supervisor, Supervisor 3a.	Supervisor was decided by the management to be matched with the title.
	Responsibilities of supervisors	She came to me with her proposal. I gave some comment about her proposal. Then she came to me again and she had revised the proposals as needed. I met her regularly to ensure the completion of the thesis. I checked her progress until the proposal was ready. Unluckily, the proposed Airline company for research refused her. I tried to help her find the locus for her research.	The supervisor was responsible to guide students from the research proposal until the thesis completed.

	Responsibilities of students	The student was smart, capable and masters the materials of the research. She may feel that she did not need supervision.
		    She did not come regularly and was very intensive at the last days to catch up with the deadline.
		    She lacked of communication.
			The student was smart but still supervisors.

		She should have communicated more. She needed to be more respectful to the supervisors.	
	Relationship	My relationship with the student was like a teacher and a student. Actually, I was close to her but she was not. I think she was inspired by my comment or feedback. I always reminded and pushed her to come and work more intensively.	The relationship was like a teacher and a student.
Feedback Strategies	Timing	She met me three times for the proposal and two times for the thesis but I gave her 8 signatures as required. The length of each meeting was about 30 minutes but the last meeting was 60 minutes. Normally, when she came I directly read her draft and discussed the draft with her and gave back the draft back right after the discussion. Sometimes I asked her to put the draft on my table if I was not ready to meet her.	The time was not enough.
	Amount	I think I gave much feedback on the writing mechanism. Every mistake in writing mechanism was corrected. "It is important."	There was much feedback and every mistake was corrected.
	Modes	The modes of feedback used were written and oral. The written feedback was given in red ink to highlight the message. The oral feedback provided was discussions and comment on the contents and writing mechanism. There was not any feedback given by hand phone (electronics), workshop and conference.	There oral and written comments were on the contents and writing mechanism.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

293

	Audience	All the feedback was given individually to provide individual need. There was no feedback given in-group.	The feedback was to cater individual need.
Feedback Contents	Focus	The feedback focused on the self-regulation, process and work both on the concept (contents and organisation) and writing mechanism. 　There was feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the draft orally. There was no feedback on the person. 　There were critics and negative comment orally.	The focus was on the work and process, on the concept and writing communication.
	Comparison	The draft was compared with the criterion reference (school guide book) and students' previous drafts (self-reference.) I sometimes asked her to compare with previous similar thesis. 　The feedback was not compared with norm-criterion reference' The student was actually smart and she might have read the previous theses.	It was compared with the standard rubrics.
	Function	The feedback provided was stated as corrective feedback but there was also descriptive, formative, and evaluative feedback. 　There was feedback showing the strength and weaknesses of the draft. There were praises and critics such as: "Ini bagus", "Ini tidak benar." (It is good, It is not right).	The feedback was provided for correction.
	Valence	My feedback was positive, negative and suggestive. I gave correction to every problem in the writing mechanism.	The supervisor gave positive, negative and suggestive.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

294

		I also gave warnings to make her punctual or disciplined. You cannot ask me to give 8 signatures when you came to me less than that.	

	Clarity	The feedback was clear enough and every mistake was shown.
		
		    I used symbols such as tick (v), crosses (x), question marks (?) underlines (_) and circles (O) on the locations of problems.
		
		    I did not check her understanding to my feedback but she came again she showed her progress.
			The feedback was clear enough and every mistake was shown.

	Specificity	The feedback was specific both on the contents and writing mechanism. Every problem was shown. The locations of the problems were indicated on the exact parts of the problems and suggestions of the solution were also given.	The specificity was specific.

	Tone	I was a bit bossy with the student to make her work harder and more intensive.
		
		    The student was inspired by the feedback and it was shown on her writing progress.
		
		    There were praises and critics. I did not feel satisfied because she was not able to meet me as often as required.
		
		    She should have better attitude and respect the supervisor by regular communication.
			The student was inspired although the supervisor was bossy.

Sources	Supervisors	The feedback was only from supervisors.	
	Tutors	There was no feedback from tutors.	
	Peers	There was no feedback from	

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

295

		peers.	

Table 20
Observation Data on Student's Draft of Thesis
(Student 3 from Supervisor 3a)

Variables	Sub-variables	Indicators
Feedback providers and receivers	Selecting supervisors	There was no evidence of the supervisors selection manner.
	Responsibilities of supervisors	The supervisor guided the student by providing feedback through discussions or interaction, questions and answers. The supervisor met her regularly and made sure the time completion of the thesis.
	Responsibilities of students	The student attended the meeting regularly as required and was able to give a good response to supervisor's comments and suggestions. The student was active and initiative to complete the thesis on time.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

296

	Relationship	The relationship of the supervisors is open, warm and close. The student was treated like a customer, although sometimes the relationship was like a child and father.
Feedback Strategies	Timing	The feedback was given immediately. The time was about 30 to 45 minutes for each meeting. There was a frequent meeting. When she came, the supervisor read and discussed the draft with her and gave back the draft back right after the discussion.
	Amount	The amount was about enough, mostly on the quality or concept. There was no feedback on the writing mechanism.
	Modes	There was only oral feedback and the student was to take Notes There was no electronic, conference or workshop feedback.
	Audience	The feedback was provided individually.
Feedback Contents	Focus	The feedback focused on the work, self-regulation and process. The feedback on the work focused on the quality (contents and organisation) from the background, scope of the study, research questions, theories, methodology, findings and recommendations.
	Comparison	It was compared with the school rubrics (criterion-reference) and self-reference. No feedback was compared with norm-criterion reference.
	Function	The function of feedback was mostly descriptive, evaluative, and formative feedback. It described the strengths and weaknesses of the draft. The problems were discussed and the solutions were given in the discussion. There was no corrective feedback.
	Valence	Most of the feedback was positive and suggestive It focused more on the concept. There was no negative feedback.
	Clarity	The feedback was clear; it discussed the problems found in the drafts and solutions were given.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

297

	Specificity	There was general and specific feedback. General feedback was for general concept at the beginning of the research activities. The specific feedback was for specific parts of the draft.
		The specific feedback was to discuss and to give solutions to the problems.
	Tone	The tone of feedback was motivating and inspiring. There were praises and constructive critiques. The student was able to show a good progress.
Sources	Supervisors	Supervisor 3a gave the feedback. There was no feedback from tutor or peer.
	Tutor	
	Peer	

Table 21
Observation Data on Student's Draft of Thesis
(Student 3 from Supervisor 3b)

Variables	Sub-variables	Indicators
Feedback providers and receivers	Selecting supervisors	This is not applicable on the student's draft.
	Responsibilities of supervisors	The supervisor guided the students from the proposal, recommended the locus and read the whole parts of the draft and gave feedback.
		The supervisor met the student regularly and pushed the student to complete the thesis on time.
	Responsibilities	The student was responsible for attending the

	of students	supervision, revising the mistakes, and completing the thesis. There was a serious effort to complete the thesis on time.
	Relationship	It was just like student and teacher relationship.
Feedback Strategies	Timing	It was around 30 minutes. The feedback was directly given when student came. The supervisor read and gave comments or had discussion. The frequency of the meeting almost as required.
	Amount	There was much enough feedback, Much on the contents and writing organisation.
	Modes	The feedback was oral and written with red pen. There was no conference, workshop or electronic feedback.
	Audience	The feedback was given individually.
Feedback Contents	Focus	The feedback focused on the work, self-regulation and processes both the contents and the writing mechanism. There was feedback on the person. The student was asked to respect the supervisor by coming regularly and making good communication.
	Comparison	The feedback was compared with school rubrics (criterion-reference) and self-reference. There was no feedback compared with norm-criterion reference.

	Function	The function of feedback was descriptive, formative, evaluative and corrective.
		   There was description on the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis draft. There was correction both the contents and writing organisation and writing mechanism.
		   The problems were shown and solutions were given.

	Valence	The feedback given was positive, negative and suggestive The background information was not strong enough, you Needed to read more.
	Clarity	The feedback provided was clear enough; it showed the locations of the problem by giving symbols such as crosses, underlines, ticks, circles, and question marks.

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

299

		The solutions of the problems were also given.
	Specificity	The feedback was specific and pointed to the exact parts of the problems. The feedback was shown on the locations of the problems and sometimes on the margin, There was no general feedback.
	Tone	The feedback was inspiring. There were praises and critiques.
Sources	Supervisors	Supervisor 3b gave the feedback. There was no feedback from tutor or peer.
	Tutor	
	Peer	

Appendix 4 : Data of thesis assessments of student 1

Table 22
The data of Thesis Document Assessment
from the Independent Evaluator on student 1's theis.

(Thesis Document Assessment)

Student identity/code   : Student 1
Supervisor identity/code   : Supervisors one (1) and two (2)
Class/major   : Accommodation and Catering
Title of thesis   : Pengaruh Kulaitas Pelayanan Terhadap Kepuasan Konsumen
                               Di Sapulidi Resto, Resort & Gallery Cihedueng, Lembang
Submission to the evaluators : 1 November 2013

No.	What do you think of the following thesis aspects?	Scores	Value	Sub-total
A.	**Topic** 1. The topic is attractive, researchable, significant, manageable, and ethical	10	1	10
B.	**Content (Ideas)** 2.The thesis has a clear main idea supported with several points or arguments.	7.5	3	22.5
	3. The arguments or examples are clear and logical.	7.5	4	30
	4. Opposing viewpoints have been considered and responded clearly and effectively.	7.0	4	28
	5. The question(s) in the thesis have been answered.	8.0	3	24
C.	**Organisation** 6. There is a clear introduction, review of literature, research methodology and conclusion.	7.0	3	21
	7.The introduction introduces the topic and establishes the significance of the problem clearly.	7.0	4	28
	8.The review of literature is relevant, discusses the previous studies including arguments for and against and is well organized.	7.5	4	30
	9. The research methodology provides comprehensive, consistent, and accurate information about the procedure of research to replicate the research and method used to analyze the data.	8,5	4	34
	10. The conclusion ties the ideas in the body of the thesis, summarizes the main points of the problem, and restates views on the most feasible solution(s)	8.0	4	32
D.	**Style and tone** 11.The thesis uses formal language.	9.0	1	9
	12.The thesis follows academic style guidelines.	9.0	1	9
E.	**Conventions** 13.Terms and words have been defined.	9.0	1	9
	14. Citations and references have been included.	9.0	1	9
	15. The essay's word length guidelines have been followed.	6.0	1	6
	16. The layout follows thesis guidelines.	9.0	1	9

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

301

	Total		4.0	3.11
F	17. Extra comments: The introduction is too wide and less focus on the title. The review of literature did not have strong arguments. The methodology provided clear procedure.			

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

302

Appendix 5 : Data of thesis assessments of student 2

<div align="center">

Table 23
Thesis Document Assessment
Period: May – October 2013
</div>

Student identity/code   : Student 2
Study Program   : Tourism Destination
Title of thesis   : Studi Profil Masyarakat Dalam Mendukung
                                   Pengembangan Pariwisata di Kelurahan Jelekong,
                                   Kecamatan Bale Endah, Kabupaten Bandung.
Submission to the evaluator: 1 November 2013

No.	What do you think of the following thesis aspects?	Scores	Value	Sub-total
A.	**Topic** 1. The topic is attractive, researchable, significant, manageable, and ethical	10	1	10.0
B.	**Content (Ideas)** 2.The thesis has a clear main idea supported with several points or arguments.	8.0	3	24.0
	3. The arguments or examples are clear and logical.	8.0	4	32.0
	4. Opposing viewpoints have been considered and responded clearly and effectively.	8.5	4	34.0
	5. The question(s) in the thesis have been answered.	8.0	3	24.0
C.	**Organisation** 6. There is a clear introduction, review of literature, research methodology and conclusion.	8.5	3	25.5
	7.The introduction introduces the topic and establishes the significance of the problem clearly.	8.0	4	32.0
	8.The review of literature is relevant, discusses the previous studies including arguments for and against and is well organized.	8.0	4	32.0
	9. The research methodology provides comprehensive, consistent, and accurate information about the procedure of research to replicate the research and method used to analyze the data.	8,0	4	32.0
	10. The conclusion ties the ideas in the body of the	8.5	4	34.0

	thesis, summarizes the main points of the problem, and restates views on the most feasible solution(s)			
D.	**Style and tone** 11.The thesis uses formal language.	8.0	1	8.0
	12.The thesis follows academic style guidelines.	8.5	1	8.5
E.	**Conventions** 13.Terms and words have been defined.	9.0	1	9.0
	14. Citations and references have been included.	9.0	1	9.0
	15. The essay's word length guidelines have been followed.	8.0	1	8.0
	16. The layout follows thesis guidelines.	7.5	1	7.5
	Total		4.0	3.30
F	17. Extra comments: The background is not focused. The objectives of the research are not appropriate. The review of literature is too wide and needs more focus. The research method has not focused on the research plan but only the concept. The conclusion is not straight to the point (not sharp). The recommendations are not well related with the conclusion.			

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

304

Appendix 6 : Data of thesis assessments of student 3

<div align="center">

Table 24
Thesis Document Assessment
Period: May – October 2013

</div>

Student identity/code   : Student 3
Study Program   : Travel Business
Title of thesis   : Pengaruh Customer Relationship Management Terhadap
                                         Loyalitas Pelanggan
Submission to the evaluator: 1 November 2013

No.	What do you think of the following thesis aspects?	Scores	Value	Sub-total
A.	**Topic** 1. The topic is attractive, researchable, significant, manageable, and ethical	10.0	1	10.0
B.	**Content (Ideas)** 2.The thesis has a clear main idea supported with several points or arguments.	8.0	3	24.0
	3. The arguments or examples are clear and logical.	8.0	4	32.0
	4. Opposing viewpoints have been considered and responded clearly and effectively.	8.0	4	32.0
	5. The question(s) in the thesis have been answered.	8.0	3	24.0
C.	**Organisation** 6. There is a clear introduction, review of literature, research methodology and conclusion.	8.0	3	24.0
	7.The introduction introduces the topic and establishes the significance of the problem clearly.	8.0	4	32.0
	8.The review of literature is relevant, discusses the previous studies including arguments for and against and is well organized.	8.5	4	34.0
	9. The research methodology provides	8,0	4	32.0

	comprehensive, consistent, and accurate information about the procedure of research to replicate the research and method used to analyze the data.			
	10. The conclusion ties the ideas in the body of the thesis, summarizes the main points of the problem, and restates views on the most feasible solution(s)	8.5	4	34.0
D.	**Style and tone** 11. The thesis uses formal language.	8.0	1	8.0
	12. The thesis follows academic style guidelines.	7.5	1	7.5
E.	**Conventions** 13. Terms and words have been defined.	8.0	1	8.0
	14. Citations and references have been included.	7.5	1	7.5
	15. The essay's word length guidelines have been followed.	7.5	1	7.5
	16. The layout follows thesis guidelines.	80.	1	8.0
	Total		4.0	3.25
F	17. Extra comments: The background does not support the title. The sources of the theory are not clear yet The population and sampling in the research methodology are not clear yet. The sources of data in finding and analysis are not clear. The conclusion has not answered the research questions clearly.			

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

306

Appendix 7 : Document analysis guideline/Checklist

Table 25

Description of textual evidence of feedback from the supervisors on students' thesis draft.

Supervisor Identity/Code   :

Student Identity/Code   :

Thesis title   :

Date   :

Feedback in Writing Supervision

Variables	Sub-variables	Indicators
Feedback providers and receivers	Selecting supervisors	Not applicable for textual evidence.
	Responsibilites of supervisors	a. How was the supervisor guide the student? Cooper et al., (1998: 274); Oliver, (2004:51). b. Was there any resposibility in providing feedback that needs improving? Dragga (1991) Patchan et al. (2009)
	Responsibilites of students	Not applicable for textual evidence.
	Relationship	Not applicable for textual evidence.
Feedback	Timing	Not applicable for textual evidence.
	Amount	a. How much was the feedbak perovided: too much, about right amount, or too little? b. Was there any comment on quality (strength &

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

307

Strategies		weakness)?
		c. Was much feedback provided on quality or writing mechanism?
		Hairston (1986), Salmoni, Schmidt & Walter (1984: 375), Thalheimer (2008), Wulf, Shea, & Matschiner (1998) etc.
	Modes	How was the feedback written (a pen, a redpen or pencil)?
		Witten: Coffin et al., (2003), Karim & Ivy (2011), Ivanic et al.,(2000).
	Audience	Not identified in the textual evidence.
		How was the feedback provided (individual or group)?
		Individual:
		Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Slavin et al. (1984).
		Vasquez et al. (1993), Smith (1972)
Feedback Contents	Focus	a. Did the feedback focus on: the work itself; the process; the student's self-regulation; and the student personally?
		b. Did the feedback focus on concept, content, organisation or writing mechanism?
		c. Did the feedback focus on the strengths & weaknesses?
		d. Was there any critics?
		On the work itself:
		Ferris (2003). Goldstein (2006), Hyland & Hyland (2006), Ferris (1999), Leki (2006).
		On the process:
		Hattie and Timperley (2007), Balzer et al., 1989).
		(Purdie, Hattie, & Douglas, 1996).
		on the student's self-regulation:
		Zimmerman, 2000:14). Hattie and Timperley (2007),
		On the student personally:
		Kluger and DeNisi (1996), Burnett (2002) and Elwel & Tiberio (1994)
	Comparison	a. What criteria was used (criterion referenced, norm-referenced or self-referenced)
		b. was the criteria compared with one another?
		c. Did the feedback encourage recluctant students?
		Brookhart (2008), Youyan (2013), Knight (2001), Connoley (2004), Dunn et al., (2002), Ilies and Judge (2005),
	Function	a. Was the feedback provided evaluative, descriptive, formative or corrective?

		b. Was every mistake shown?
		c. Were there any praises and critics on quality ?
		Hattie & Timperley (2007), Askew (2000), Coffin et al (2003), Sofoulis, 1997). Hyland (2009),
		Description : Jinguji (2008), Black and Wiliam (1998), Davies (2003), Lipnevich & Smith (2008), Barry & Hickman (2008)
		Evaluation: Davies (2003) Black and Wiliam (1998), Oluwatayo and Fatoba (2010), Lipnevich & Smith (2008).
		Formative: Shute, 2007, Race, 2001; Yorke, 2003.
		Corrective: Lighbown & Spada 1999; Truscott, 1996; Ferris, 1999.
	Valence	a. How was the feedback provided (positive, negative, or suggestive)?
		b. Did the feedback show every weakness? Did you feel encouraged or discouraged? (Brookhart, 2008) Coffin et al., 2003).
		c. Were there any rewards or punishments?
		Positive: Hyland & Hyland (2001), Askew (2000), Barrow (2008), Karim and Ivy, 2011).
		Negative: Hyland & Hyland (, 2001, 2006). Karim & Ivy (2011), Brockner et al., (1987), North (2013),
		Suggestive: Van den Boom et al. (2007) , Hyland & Hyland (2006), Ferris (1995).
	Clarity	a. Was the feedback clear or unclear?
		b. Were the problems shown?
		c. Could students understand the codes or symbols used?
		d. Was student understanding checked?
		Biber et al., (2011), Hodges (1997), Zamel (1985), Ruegg (2010), Coffin et al. (2003), Lighbown & Spada (1999)
	Specificity	a. Was the feedback specific or general?
		b. Was there any feedback on concept and strategy?
		b. Was every error/mistake edited?
		Nelson & Schunn (2009), Goodman, Wood, & Hendrickx (2004), Shute (2007), Irons (2007), Bangert-Drowns , et al. (1991; Pridemore & Klein (1995), Phye and Sanders (1994)
	Tone	a. How did you feel when you get feedback?
		b.Were you inspired and curious with the feedback?
		c. Were there any praises or critics?
		(Brookhart, 2008)Hyland and Hyland (2001) Tunstall and Gipps (1996)
		Gottschalk and Hjortshoj (2004); Harvard Writing Project Bulletin (2000).

Sources	Supervisors	a. Who provided the feedback?
		b. Were there any other persons?
		Cho et al. (2006), Prystowsky & DaRosa, (2003), Nathan & Koedinger (2000).
	Tutors	Bloom (1984), Moore et al., 2004).
	Peers	Peterson (2010), Leki (1990), Rollinson (1998)

Appendix 8 : Interview guideline for student

Table 26

Interview questions for the students

Student Identity/Code   :

Supervisor Identity/Code   :

Thesis title   :

 Date   :

The Nature of Feedback in Writing Supervision

Variables	Sub-variables	Indicators
	Selecting supervisors	a. How did you choose your supervisor(s)?
		b. Was it done in a planned manner?(Ray, 2007)
		c. Was he the right person for your project?(Baldwin, 1999)
Feedback providers and		b. How did you like the style of your supervisor(s)?

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

310

receivers		(Ray, 2007)
	Responsibilites of supervisors	a. How did your supervisor guide and monitor you? Cooper et al., (1998: 274); Oliver, (2004:51). b. How did he ensure you to finish on time? Anderson et al.,1982: 15), c. Was there any resposibility that needs improving (meeting time, completion of thesis, etc) ? Dragga (1991) Patchan et al. (2009)
	Responsibilites of students	a. How was your resposilibity? b. Did you come regularly to your supervisor(s)? c. Did you have initiative to discuss and to make good progress? b. Was there any responsibility that needs improving? (MA Programme Director, 2008, Guide on Thesis Supervision, *2010-2011:38-39).*
	Relationship	a. How close were you with your supervisor? (Abidin, 2007, Amstrong 2004) b. Did you have clear and open communication? (Moses, 1985)
Feedback Strategies	Timing	a. How soon was the feedback provided? b. How often and how long was it given? c. Was the feedback provided one week or two weeks later after submision? Cowan (2003), Thalheimer (2008), Azevedo and Bernard (1995) and Mory (2004), etc.
	Amount	a. How much was the feedbak perovided: too much, about right amount, or too little? b. Was there any comment on quality (strength & weakness)? c. Was much feedback provided on quality or writing mechanism? Hairston (1986), Salmoni, Schmidt & Walter (1984: 375), Thalheimer (2008), Wulf, Shea, & Matschiner (1998) etc.
	Modes	a. How was the feedback provided (oral, written, electronic, conference or workshop)? b. How was the feedback written (a pen, a redpen or pencil)? Oral: Guffey et al. (2006), Jordan (2004), Murray (1985), Lee (2008), Nah (2008), Witten: Coffin et al., (2003), Karim & Ivy (2011), Ivanic et al.,(2000). Electronic: Ware & Warschauer (2006), Milton (2006), etc.
	Audience	a. How was the feedback provided (individual or group)? b. Were there any mini lessons for the group?

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

311

		c. Was there individual feedback that takes too much time?
		Individual:
		Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Slavin et al. (1984).
		Vasquez et al. (1993), Smith (1972)
		Group:
		Crooks et al., (1998), Brookhart (2008:17), Magney (1997), MLA Citation, 2013).
		Vasquez et al. (1993)
Feedback Contents	Focus	a. Did the feedback focus on: the work itself; the process; the student's self-regulation; and the student personally?
		b. Did the feedback focus on concept, content, organisation or writing mechanism?
		c. Did the feedback focus on the strengths & weaknesses?
		d. Was there any critics?
		On the work itself:
		Ferris (2003). Goldstein (2006), Hyland & Hyland (2006), Ferris (1999), Leki (2006).
		On the process:
		Hattie and Timperley (2007), Balzer et al., 1989).
		(Purdie, Hattie, & Douglas, 1996).
		on the student's self-regulation:
		Zimmerman, 2000:14). Hattie and Timperley (2007),
		On the student personally:
		Kluger and DeNisi (1996), Burnett (2002) and Elwel & Tiberio (1994)
	Comparison	a. What criteria was used (criterion referenced, norm-referenced or self-referenced)
		b. was the criteria compared with one another?
		c. Did the feedback encourage recluctant students?
		Brookhart (2008), Youyan (2013), Knight (2001), Connoley (2004), Dunn et al., (2002), Ilies and Judge (2005),
	Function	a. Was the feedback provided evaluative, descriptive, formative or corrective?
		b. Was every mistake shown?
		c. Were there any praises and critics on quality ?
		Hattie & Timperley (2007), Askew (2000), Coffin et al (2003), Sofoulis, 1997). Hyland (2009),
		Description : Jinguji (2008), Black and Wiliam (1998), Davies (2003), Lipnevich & Smith (2008), Barry & Hickman (2008)
		Evaluation: Davies (2003) Black and Wiliam (1998), Oluwatayo and Fatoba (2010), Lipnevich & Smith

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

312

		(2008).
		Formative: Shute, 2007, Race, 2001; Yorke, 2003.
		Corrective: Lighbown & Spada 1999; Truscott, 1996; Ferris, 1999.
	Valence	a. How was the feedback provided (positive, negative, or suggestive)? b. Did the feedback show every weakness? Did you feel encouraged or discouraged? (Brookhart, 2008) Coffin et al., 2003). c. Were there any rewards or punishments? Positive: Hyland & Hyland (2001), Askew (2000), Barrow (2008), Karim and Ivy, 2011). Negative: Hyland & Hyland (, 2001, 2006). Karim & Ivy (2011), Brockner et al., (1987), North (2013), Suggestive: Van den Boom et al. (2007) , Hyland & Hyland (2006), Ferris (1995).
	Clarity	a. Was the feedback clear or unclear? b. Were the problems shown? c. Could students understand the codes or symbols used? d. Was student understanding checked? Biber et al., (2011), Hodges (1997), Zamel (1985), Ruegg (2010), Coffin et al. (2003), Lighbown & Spada (1999)
	Specificity	a. Was the feedback specific or general? b. Was there any feedback on concept and strategy? b. Was every error/mistake edited? Nelson & Schunn (2009), Goodman, Wood, & Hendrickx (2004), Shute (2007), Irons (2007), Bangert-Drowns , et al. (1991; Pridemore & Klein (1995), Phye and Sanders (1994)
	Tone	a. How did you feel when you get feedback? b.Were you inspired and curious with the feedback? c. Were there any praises or critics? (Brookhart, 2008)Hyland and Hyland (2001) Tunstall and Gipps (1996) Gottschalk and Hjortshoj (2004); Harvard Writing Project Bulletin (2000).
Sources	Supervisors	a. Who provided your feedback? b. Were there any other persons? Cho et al. (2006), Prystowsky & DaRosa, (2003), Nathan & Koedinger (2000).
	Tutors	Bloom (1984), Moore et al., 2004).
	Peers	Peterson (2010), Leki (1990), Rollinson (1998)

Appendix 9 : Interview guideline for supervisor

Table 27

Interview questions for thesis supervisors

Student Identity/Code   :
Supervisor Identity/Code   :
Thesis title   :
 Date   :

The nature of feedback in Writing Supervision

Variables	Sub-variables	Indicators
Feedback providers and receivers	Selecting supervisors	a. How did your student choose you? b. Was it done in a planned manner?(Ray, 2007) c. Were you the right person for her project?(Baldwin, 1999) b. How did you like the style of your student? (Ray, 2007)
	Responsibilites of supervisors	a. How did you guide and monitor your student? Cooper et al., (1998: 274); Oliver, (2004:51). b. How did you ensure your student to finish on time? Anderson et al.,1982: 15), c. Was there any resposibility that needs improving (meeting time, completion of thesis, etc) ? Dragga (1991) Patchan et al. (2009)
	Responsibilites of students	a. How was your students' resposilibity? b. Did your student come to you regularly? c. Did your student have initiative to discuss and to make good progress? b. Was there any studen's responsibility that needs improving? (MA Programme Director, 2008, Guide on Thesis Supervision, *2010-2011:38-39).*
	Relationship	a. How close were you with your student? (Abidin, 2007, Amstrong 2004) b. Did you have clear and open communication? (Moses, 1985)
Feedback Strategies	Timing	a. How soon was the feedback provided? b. How often and how long was it given? c. Was the feedback provided one week or two weeks later after submision? Cowan (2003), Thalheimer (2008), Azevedo and Bernard (1995) and Mory (2004), etc.
	Amount	a. How much was the feedbak perovided: too much, about right amount, or too little? b. Was there any comment on quality (strength & weakness)? c. Was much feedback provided on quality or writing mechanism? Hairston (1986), Salmoni, Schmidt & Walter (1984: 375), Thalheimer (2008), Wulf, Shea, & Matschiner (1998) etc.
	Modes	a. How was the feedback provided (oral, written, electronic, conference or workshop)? b. How was the feedback written (a pen, a redpen or pencil)?

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

315

		Oral: Guffey et al. (2006), Jordan (2004), Murray (1985), Lee (2008), Nah (2008), Witten: Coffin et al., (2003), Karim & Ivy (2011), Ivanic et al.,(2000). Electronic: Ware & Warschauer (2006), Milton (2006), etc.
	Audience	a. How was the feedback provided (individual or group)? b. Were there any mini lessons for the group? c. Was there individual feedback that takes much time? Individual: Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Slavin et al. (1984). Vasquez et al. (1993), Smith (1972) Group: Crooks et al., (1998), Brookhart (2008:17), Magney (1997), MLA Citation, 2013)., Vasquez et al. (1993)
Feedback Contents	Focus	a. Did the feedback focus on: the work itself; the process; the student's self-regulation; and the student personally? b. Did the feedback focus on concept, content, organisation or writing mechanism? c. Did the feedback focus on the strengths & weaknesses? d. Was there any critics? On the work itself: Ferris (2003). Goldstein (2006), Hyland & Hyland (2006), Ferris (1999), Leki (2006). On the process: Hattie and Timperley (2007), Balzer et al., 1989). (Purdie, Hattie, & Douglas, 1996). on the student's self-regulation: Zimmerman, 2000:14). Hattie and Timperley (2007), On the student personally: Kluger and DeNisi (1996), Burnett (2002) and Elwel & Tiberio (1994)
	Comparison	a. What criteria was used (criterion referenced, norm-referenced or self-referenced) b. Was the criteria compared with one another? c. Did the feedback encourage recluctant students? Brookhart (2008), Youyan (2013), Knight (2001), Connoley (2004), Dunn et al., (2002), Ilies and Judge (2005),
	Function	a. Was the feedback provided evaluative, descriptive, formative or corrective? b. Was every mistake shown? c. Were there any praises and critics on quality ? Hattie & Timperley (2007), Askew (2000), Coffin et al (2003), Sofoulis, 1997). Hyland (2009),

		Description : Jinguji (2008), Black and Wiliam (1998), Davies (2003), Lipnevich & Smith (2008), Barry & Hickman (2008) Evaluation: Davies (2003) Black and Wiliam (1998), Oluwatayo and Fatoba (2010), Lipnevich & Smith (2008). Formative: Shute, 2007, Race, 2001; Yorke, 2003. Corrective: Lighbown & Spada 1999; Truscott, 1996; Ferris, 1999.
	Valence	a. How was the feedback provided (positive, negative, or suggestive)? b. Did the feedback show every weakness? Did the student feel encouraged or discouraged ? (Brookhart, 2008) Coffin et al., 2003). c. Were there any rewards or punishments? Positive: Hyland & Hyland (2001), Askew (2000), Barrow (2008), Karim and Ivy, 2011). Negative: Hyland & Hyland (, 2001, 2006). Karim & Ivy (2011), Brockner et al., (1987), North (2013), Suggestive: Van den Boom et al. (2007) , Hyland & Hyland (2006), Ferris (1995).
	Clarity	a. Was the feedback clear or unclear? b. Were the problems shown? c. Could students understand the codes or symbols used? d. Was student understanding checked? Biber et al., (2011), Hodges (1997), Zamel (1985), Ruegg (2010), Coffin et al. (2003), Lighbown & Spada (1999)
	Specificity	a. Was the feedback specific or general? b. Was there any feedback on concept and strategy? b. Was every error/mistake edited? Nelson & Schunn (2009), Goodman, Wood, & Hendrickx (2004), Shute (2007), Irons (2007), Bangert-Drowns , et al. (1991; Pridemore & Klein (1995), Phye and Sanders (1994)
	Tone	a. How did you feel when you get feedback? b.Were you inspired and curious with the feedback? c. Were there any praises or critics? (Brookhart, 2008)Hyland and Hyland (2001) Tunstall and Gipps (1996) Gottschalk and Hjortshoj (2004); Harvard Writing Project Bulletin (2000).
Sources	Supervisors	a. Who provided your feedback? b. Were there any other persons? Cho et al. (2006), Prystowsky & DaRosa, (2003), Nathan & Koedinger (2000).

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

317

	Tutors	Bloom (1984), Moore et al., 2004).
	Peers	Peterson (2010), Leki (1990), Rollinson (1998)

Appendix 10: Observation guideline/checklist

Table 28

Guidelines for observation

Student Identity/Code   :

Supervisor Identity/Code   :

Thesis title   :

 Date   :

The nature of Feedback in Writing Supervision

Variables	Sub-variables	Indicators
Feedback providers and receivers	Selecting supervisors	Not applicable for observation.
	Responsibilites of supervisors	a. How did the supervisor guide and monitor the student? Cooper et al., (1998: 274); Oliver, (2004:51). b. How did he ensure your student to finish on time? Anderson et al.,1982: 15), c. Was there any resposibility that needs improving (meeting time, completion of thesis, etc) ? Dragga (1991) Patchan et al. (2009)
	Responsibilites of students	a. How was the students' resposilibity? b. Did the student come for supervision regularly? c. Did the student have initiative to discuss and to make good progress? b. Was there any studen's responsibility that needs improving? (MA Programme Director, 2008, Guide on Thesis Supervision, *2010-2011:38-39).*
	Relationship	a. How close was the relationship between the supervisor with the student? (Abidin, 2007, Amstrong 2004) b. Was the communication clear and open? (Moses, 1985)

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia **|** repository.upi.edu **|** perpustakaan.upi.edu

318

Feedback Strategies	Timing	a. How soon was the feedback provided? b. How often and how long was it given? c. Was the feedback provided one week or two weeks later after submision? Cowan (2003), Thalheimer (2008), Azevedo and Bernard (1995) and Mory (2004), etc.
	Amount	a. How much was the feedbak perovided: too much, about right amount, or too little? b. Was there any comment on quality (strength & weakness)? c. Was much feedback provided on quality or writing mechanism? Hairston (1986), Salmoni, Schmidt & Walter (1984: 375), Thalheimer (2008), Wulf, Shea, & Matschiner (1998) etc.
	Modes	a. How was the feedback provided (oral, written, electronic, conference or workshop)? b. How was the feedback written (a pen, a redpen or pencil)? Oral: Guffey et al. (2006), Jordan (2004), Murray (1985), Lee (2008), Nah (2008), Witten: Coffin et al., (2003), Karim & Ivy (2011), Ivanic et al.,(2000). Electronic: Ware & Warschauer (2006), Milton (2006), etc.
	Audience	a. How was the feedback provided (individual or group)? b. Were there any mini lessons for the group? c. Was there individual feedback that takes too much time? Individual: Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Slavin et al. (1984). Vasquez et al. (1993), Smith (1972) Group: Crooks et al., (1998), Brookhart (2008:17), Magney (1997), MLA Citation, 2013). Vasquez et al. (1993)
Feedback Contents	Focus	a. Did the feedback focus on: the work itself; the process; the student's self-regulation; and the student personally? b. Did the feedback focus on concept, content, organisation or writing mechanism? c. Did the feedback focus on the strengths & weaknesses? d. Was there any critics? On the work itself: Ferris (2003). Goldstein (2006), Hyland & Hyland (2006), Ferris (1999), Leki (2006).

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

319

		On the process: Hattie and Timperley (2007), Balzer et al., 1989). (Purdie, Hattie, & Douglas, 1996). on the student's self-regulation: Zimmerman, 2000:14). Hattie and Timperley (2007), On the student personally: Kluger and DeNisi (1996), Burnett (2002) and Elwel & Tiberio (1994)
	Comparison	a. What criteria was used (criterion referenced, norm-referenced or self-referenced) b. was the criteria compared with one another? c. Did the feedback encourage recluctant students? Brookhart (2008), Youyan (2013), Knight (2001), Connoley (2004), Dunn et al., (2002), Ilies and Judge (2005),
	Function	a. Was the feedback provided evaluative, descriptive, formative or corrective? b. Was every mistake shown? c. Were there any praises and critics on quality ? Hattie & Timperley (2007), Askew (2000), Coffin et al (2003), Sofoulis, 1997). Hyland (2009), Description : Jinguji (2008), Black and William (1998), Davies (2003), Lipnevich & Smith (2008), Barry & Hickman (2008) Evaluation: Davies (2003) Black and Wiliam (1998), Oluwatayo and Fatoba (2010), Lipnevich & Smith (2008). Formative: Shute, 2007, Race, 2001; Yorke, 2003. Corrective: Lighbown & Spada 1999; Truscott, 1996; Ferris, 1999.
	Valence	a. How was the feedback provided (positive, negative, or suggestive)? b. Did the feedback show every weakness? Did the student feel encouraged or discouraged ? (Brookhart, 2008) Coffin et al., 2003). c. Were there any rewards or punishments? Positive: Hyland & Hyland (2001), Askew (2000), Barrow (2008), Karim and Ivy, 2011). Negative: Hyland & Hyland (, 2001, 2006). Karim & Ivy (2011), Brockner et al., (1987), North (2013), Suggestive: Van den Boom et al. (2007) , Hyland & Hyland (2006), Ferris (1995).
	Clarity	a. Was the feedback clear or unclear? b. Were the problems shown? c. Could students understand the codes or symbols used? d. Was student understanding checked?

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

320

		Biber et al., (2011), Hodges (1997), Zamel (1985), Ruegg (2010), Coffin et al. (2003), Lighbown & Spada (1999)
	Specificity	a. Was the feedback specific or general? b. Was there any feedback on concept and strategy? b. Was every error/mistake edited? Nelson & Schunn (2009), Goodman, Wood, & Hendrickx (2004), Shute (2007), Irons (2007), Bangert-Drowns , et al. (1991; Pridemore & Klein (1995), Phye and Sanders (1994)
	Tone	a. How did you feel when you get feedback? b.Were you inspired and curious with the feedback? c. Were there any praises or critics? (Brookhart, 2008)Hyland and Hyland (2001) Tunstall and Gipps (1996) Gottschalk and Hjortshoj (2004); Harvard Writing Project Bulletin (2000).
Sources	Supervisors	a. Who provided your feedback? b. Were there any other persons? Cho et al. (2006), Prystowsky & DaRosa, (2003), Nathan & Koedinger (2000).
	Tutors	Bloom (1984), Moore et al., 2004).
	Peers	Peterson (2010), Leki (1990), Rollinson (1998)

Appendix 11: Thesis assessment checklist

Table 30
Thesis Assessment Checklist

Student identity/code   :
Class/major   :
Title of thesis   :
Submission & approval date :
Supervisor identity/code   :

Please, give ticks to all aspects of the thesis quality ranging from zero (0) to ten (10)
according to your opinion.

No.	What do you think of the following thesis aspects?	Scores	Value	Sub-total
A.	**Topic** 1. The topic is attractive, researchable, significant, manageable, and ethical		1	
B.	**Content (Ideas)** 2.The thesis has a clear main idea supported with several points or arguments.		3	
	3. The arguments or examples are clear and logical.		4	
	4. Opposing viewpoints have been considered and		4	

	responded clearly and effectively.			
	5. The question(s) in the thesis have been answered.		3	
C.	**Organisation** 6. There is a clear introduction, review of literature, research methodology and conclusion.		3	
	7.The introduction introduces the topic and establishes the significance of the problem clearly.		4	
	8.The review of literature is relevant, discusses the previous studies including arguments for and against and is well organized.		4	
	9. The research methodology provides comprehensive, consistent, and accurate information about the procedure of research to replicate the research and method used to analyze the data.		4	
	10. The conclusion ties the ideas in the body of the thesis, summarizes the main points of the problem, and restates views on the most feasible solution(s)		4	
D.	**Style and tone** 11.The thesis uses formal language.		1	
	12.The thesis follows academic style guidelines.		1	
E.	**Conventions** 13. Terms and words have been defined.		1	
	14. Citations and references have been included.			
	15. The essay's word length guidelines have been followed.		1	
	16. The layout follows thesis guidelines.		1	
	Total		40	
F	17. Extra comments:			

Adapted from: Gay, Mills & Airasian (2006); Emilia (2008), Sorenson (2010), Holtom & Fisher (1999). Paltridge and Starfield (2007), Swales & Feak (1994): Kamler & Thomson, (2006); Mauch & Park (2003), Thomas (2000), and Glathorn & Joyner (2005). Hefferman & Lincoln (1996); Reid (1998) and Potter (1994), Thornbury (2006), Ferris (2003), and Calabrese (2006).

Date of evaluation

Name of Evaluator/Signature

Appendix 12: Consent letters from students

Appendix 13: Consent letters from supervisors

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

325

Appendix 14: Consent letter from independent evaluator

Sutanto, 2015
THESIS WRITING SUPERVISION: A CONTRIBUTION OF FEEDBACK TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS'
THESIS WRITING
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

326

Appendix 15: Research Approval

Appendix 16

Curriculum Vitae

Sutanto Leo graduated from IKIP Bandung majoring in English Language in 1985. He did his Diploma in Teaching English as a second Language (Dipl. TESL) at Victoria University, New Zealand in 1988. While his master degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (M.Ed. in TESOL) was gained in 1995 at Leeds University, UK. He is a lecturer, writer, English for hotel trainer, book writing trainer and book publishing consultant.

Experience

A. Presenting Seminar & Workshop on Book Writing and Publishing

1) USU Medan, 2) UNTAN Pontianak, 3) UNG Gorontalo, 4) RELC Singapore, 5) STP Bali, 6) Univ. Widya Mandala Surabaya, 7) Univ. Pelita Harapan Jakarta, 8) Univ. Paramadina Jakarta, 9) Univ. Satya Wacana Salatiga, 10) Univ. Nommensen Medan, 11) AKPAR Medan, 12) STAIN Surakarta, 13) AKPAR Satyawidya Surabaya, 14) UNY Yogyakarta, 15) Univ. Bengkulu, 16) MGMP Kodya Bandung, 17) IAIN Lampung, 18) STT Telkom Bandung, 19) STBA Bandung, 20) STP Bandung, 21) Univ. Maranatha Bandung, 22) Univ. Widyatama Bandung, 23) LLB Bandung, 24) Akademi Kebidanan Purwokerto, 25) Univ. Sriwijaya Palembang, 26) Univ. Sahid Surakarta, 27) UNISRI Surakarta, 28) STT SAPPI Cianjur, 29) MGMP Banyumas, 30) Univ. Soedirman Purwokerto, 31) Aptikes Semarang, 32) SMA 10 Pontianak, 33) Univ. Riau Pekanbaru, 34) UNILA Lampung, 35) Politeknik Manado, 36) STBI Semarang, 37) Univ. Andalas Padang, 38) UPN Surabaya, 39) Universitas Negeri Jember, 40) Sirikit Writing School, Surabaya, 41) MIPA Unpad, 42) STTB Medan, 43) Keperawatan Unpad, 44) IAIN Bengkulu, 45) Univ. PGRI Palembang, 46. IHS Surakarta, 47. STIE IBBI Medan, 48) Akper Muhammadiyah, Makassar, 49) Unkhair Ternate, 50) UNM Makassar, 51. Global Prestas school, Bekasi, 52) Telkom University, Bandung, 53) SMA Yos Sudarso Batam, 54) Perputakaan Kab. Bondowoso, etc.

B. Presenting Seminar on Writing *Skripsi,* Thesis & Dissertation

1) STP Bandung, 2) STTB Medan, 3) IAIN Bengkulu, 4) Univ. PGRI Palembang, 5) Univ. HKBP Nommensen Medan, 6) AKPAR Medan, 7) Univ. PGRI Semarang, 8) Akper Muhammadiyah, Makassar, 9) Unkhair Ternate, etc.

C. Giving Seminar & Workshop on Writing Popular Articles

1) SMA Santa Maria Bandung, 2) Univ. Paramadina Jakarta, 3) STP Bandung, 4) GBBZ Bandung, etc.

D. English Training

1) Grand Aquila Hotel, 2) Novotel Hotel, 3) SwissBell Hotel, 4) Preanger Hotel, 5) Papandayan Hotel, 6) Merdeka Hotel (Pekanbaru), 7) Majesty Hotel, 8) Grand Setiabudhi Hotel, 9) Permata Hotel, 10) Galery Ciumbeulit Hotel & Apartment, 11) Grand Pasundan Hotel, 12) Teachers of SMP 5 Bandung, 13) Lecturers of STP Bandung, dsb.

E. Sunday School Teaching

1) GBBZ Bandung, 2) GBI Tanggerang, 3) GKJ Cianjur, 4) GB Kalam Purwokerto, 5)

Radio Maestro Bandung, 6) Toko Buku Gramedia Bandung, 7) GKI Bandung, 8) BPD Jawa Barat, 9) Mission Care Bandung, 10) GBI Baitlahim, 11) Bimas Kristen DEPAG Jabar, etc.

F. International Seminar Presentation
1. Making your course notes worth publishing, RELC Singapore (2007)
2. ELT Materials for Hotel and Food & Beverages Services , 55th TEFLIN International Conference, UIN Jakarta (4-6 Desember 2007)
3. Preventing plagiarism around your campus, 57th TEFLIN International Conference, UPI Bandung (1-3 November 2010)
4. Thesis Writing Supervision for Tourism and Hospitality School of Higher Education, Asian Tourism Forum International, STP Bandung (8-10 Mei 2012)
5. Thesis Writing Supervision: A contribution of feedback to the development of students' thesis writing, Global Tourism & Hospitality Conference: Hongkong (18-20 May 2014)

G. Books and Articles Published
1. English for Professional Waiters, 2013, 5th Print, Jakarta, Gramedia
2. English for Professional Accommodation Services, 2013, 3rd Print, Jakarta, Gramedia
3. English for Professional Hotel Communication 213, 3rd Print, Jakarta, Gramedia
4. English for Leisure Time Speaking, 2007, 2nd Print, Jakarta, Gramedia
5. Menyikapi Penutupan Tempat Ibadah, Majalah Suara Baptis, No.5/Tahun 48, 2005
6. Menggali Potensi Penulis yang Terkubur, 2005, Jurnal Pariwisata, Vol. 4 No. 4 Desember 2005
7. Sertifikasi Kompetensi Dosen: Sebuah Penghargaan atau Ancaman, 2005, Jurnal Pariwisata Vol. 4 No. 4 Desember 2005
8. Mendongkrak Gairah KPW, Majalah Suara Baptis, No.3/Tahun 49, 2006
9. Publishing Your Teaching Materials' 2006, Jurnal Pariwisata Vol. 5 No. 5 Des 2006
10. English for Academic Purposes: Essay Writing (2007) Team Writers, Andi: Jogyakarta
11. Drama Musik GB Baitlahim Layak *Go International,* Majalah Suara Baptis, No.3/Tahun 2007
12. Kiat Sukses Mengelola dan Mengajar Sekolah Minggu (2008), Yogya, Andipmbr
13. Kiat Jitu Menulis dan Menerbitkan Buku (2010), Jakarta, Erlangga
14. Mengusik Penerbitan Umat Baptis, Suara Baptis (2013)
15. English for Hotel Supervisory and Managerial Communication (2013), Bandung, DC
16. A Challenging Book to Practice Teaching in English (2013). Yogya ,AndiOffset
17. Kiat Jitu Menulis Skripsi, Tesis dan Disertasi (2013), Jakarta: Erlangga
18. The Implementation of Competence-based Curriculum (A case study at Bandung Tourism School), Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Travel, Vol. 1. No.1, Dec 2013
19. Preventing Plagiarism around Our Campus in Indonesia, Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Travel, Vol. 1. No.1, Dec 2013