Merging Feedback in Process Approach to Develop Students' Ability in Writing an Effective Paragraph

Rita Handayani[a*]

[a] Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, Banten, Indonesia

Article Info	Abstract
	Many studies have been conducted to demonstrate the efficacy of either the process approach or feedback on students' writing achievement. Earlier studies primarily used feedback to improve students' grammatical and writing accuracy. However, studies that focus on providing feedback to improve the content of students' writing are hard to come by. This study aims to bridge that gap. The process approach was used in this study, with feedback focusing on the content and organization of students' writing. Purposive sampling was used to select 35 second-semester students from the English study program at Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa University. Data was gathered through the use of questionnaires, observations, and writing tests. To determine the validity and reliability of the data, a detailed assessment rubric criterion and an assessment of writing results given by two raters were used. The results of this study show that combining process approaches with feedback has a significant impact on improving students' skills in writing effective English paragraphs. The most significant improvements are on the aspect topic development, topic sentence writing, and ideas organization. This suggests that combining a process approach with feedback is beneficial in improving students' skill in writing effective paragraphs.

INTRODUCTION

One of the English language skills that college students must learn is writing. It is essential in both personal and professional lives. However, unlike spoken communication, communicating in written English is a difficult skill to master because, in order to produce a good piece of writing, one must be able to balance various elements in writing such as content, organization, purpose, audience, vocabulary, punctuation, and other mechanical devices and present them in accordance with the accepted pattern of organization. As a result, acquiring this skill requires a great deal of practice, and creating a piece of writing takes a long time.

Furthermore, the difficulty of mastering this skill is due to the complexity of writing, limited time, lack of knowledge of the issue, insufficient practice, and insufficient assistance and feedback provided by writing

professors (Fareed, Ashraf & Bilal, 2016; Ibnian, 2017). As a result, many students learning writing in an EFL or ESL setting have similar challenges. They have a tendency to compose paragraphs or essays that are disjointed and incoherent. (Rass, 2015; Ali Muhammed, 2015; Arianti & Fitriana, 2017). Furthermore, many language writing instructors still take a product-oriented approach to education, focusing primarily on the precision and correctness of grammar and mechanics. Students rarely receive comments on their writing content, allowing them to revise, amend, and improve their work. As a result, many EFL or ESL students find it difficult to enhance their writing quality.

As a result of these situations, the researchers believe the instruction that has been implemented thus far is erroneous. Aspects affecting the lesson's success, such as the teacher's teaching style and technique, should be investigated, and a more effective teaching technique pursued. As a consequence, an effective technique is required to address the issues and improve the pupils' writing abilities. Writing is a skill that does not come easy to everyone. Writing is an activity that should be undertaken with caution and consideration in order to properly communicate with a reader. These assertions imply that writing is a difficult skill that takes a lot of practice.

The English language is taught as a foreign language in Indonesian schools. Despite the fact that the skill is taught and practiced at the secondary and tertiary levels,

the investigator noticed that many students have difficulty expressing their thoughts, opinions, and feelings in writing form. Many teachers in Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa's English study program were dissatisfied with their students' research ideas since they couldn't identify the key concept of each paragraph. Each paragraph's bulk of sentences contained a variety of ideas. The researcher noticed that most students' paragraph writing exams lacked consistency and continuity. As we know, students' writing success or failure is influenced by the manner of education, so teachers should try out different learning approaches and techniques. The primary purpose of this study is to see how content feedback which is given in a process approach might help students improve their paragraph writing skills. The study's particular objectives were to help students write effective paragraphs and improve their writing quality.

Process Approach in Teaching Writing

Writing has traditionally been concerned with the written product. This strategy encourages pupils to copy a model text and view writing as a completed product. This irritates English teachers and researchers since teaching writing is comparable to grammar exercises in which students are pressured to produce a flawless final output. Researchers and English teachers were motivated by this unhappiness to look for ways to help students write better by supporting them in the actual process of

writing good written documents. The process method was born as a result.

A process is a set of activities or processes that are carried out in order to achieve a specified goal. On the stages, more focus is placed on the process approach, which helps learners of all levels explore and discover their views. Idea invention, story completion, description, narration, paragraph writing, editing, and proofreading are just a few of the activities that students participate in. The emphasis is placed on the content and meaning first, followed by the form. This method needs procedures for planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing that allow students to write freely while yet producing high-quality works.

The process method emphasizes writing exercises that guide students through the entire writing process, from idea generation to data collecting to final publication (Tribble, C. 1996). his method is useful for teaching writing since it stresses students' development in planning, identifying problems, and assessing and executing potential solutions (Hyland, 2003). Instead of depending on a single draft, students learn writing through a number of procedures to enhance and revise their writing (Celce-Murcia, 2001). Instead, students are given enough time to investigate a topic by writing, rereading, pondering, and redrafting new ideas. (Raimes, 1983). It's a non-linear, exploratory, and generative process in which writers uncover and reformulate their ideas as they try to approximate meaning (Kroll, 1990).

Students are guided to compose well-organized, properly developed paragraphs and essays using this method.

The efficacy of the process approach has been established in numerous research. Aside from helping pupils write more descriptive paragraphs, (Nabhan, 2017), This method also helps pre-service teachers overcome their fears of writing (Arici & Kaldirim, 2015); having a favorable impact on EFL students' attitudes on writing ability (Mehr, 2017); and dramatically improves students' writing performance in an overcrowded EFL writing class. (Dokchandra, 2018). Furthermore, in a comparison study, the process method was found to be more effective in boosting students' writing abilities than the traditional approach and the genre-based approach in promoting students' writing abilities. (Hashemnezhad & Hashemnezhad, 2012).

Feedback in Writing

Feedback is defined as any information received about the learner's task performance with the goal of improving it (Ur, 1991). The most beneficial feedback is given at the process level because it directs students to search for and manage their strategy for giving their best effort in a task or situation, resulting in higher confidence and greater investment of effort. (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Teachers should supplement written feedback with discussions, questions, and answers in order to be more effective; teachers should also add commendation and

encouragement in their written comments because good feedback can motivate students to improve their writing skills. (Srichanyachon, 2012). Furthermore, the discussion session will allow the teacher-student audience to negotiate the meaning for a successful revision in the subsequent draft (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999).

Feedback is important in the learning process, according to both students and teachers, because it may be used as a guide for students to rewrite and enhance the quality of their work (Tom, Morni, Metom, & Joe, 2013). Students regarded their teacher as the primary source of feedback that influenced their writing performance positively. (Bijami, Pandian, & Singh, 2016). Most students expected their teachers to consider all aspects of written texts when providing written feedback (Omer, Mahfoodh, & Pandian, 2011) as it can help them to improve their writing (Listiani, 2017). As a result, feedback is clearly an important component of any formal language learning situation that has a major impact on students' learning outcomes.

Feedback effectiveness has also been extensively researched, with numerous discoveries. Direct correction, for example, is advantageous for students at the beginning level of proficiency when they lack sufficient linguistic knowledge to self-correct, according to Ferris (2002). Because of its clarity, direct corrective feedback can help students become more aware of their linguistic errors and improve their writing (Adisca & Mardijono, 2013). Furthermore, providing students with

direct corrective feedback has a greater impact on their writing grammatical correctness. (Farjadnasab & Khodashenas, 2017; Zareil & Rahnama, 2013). While some studies have shown that direct feedback improves students' writing accuracy, others have shown the opposite. According to Hosseiny's (2014) research, indirect corrective feedback on error helps learners improve their writing accuracy by encouraging them to participate in the repair process (Hosseiny, 2014); In the same way, indirect feedback strategies that focus on local errors (Jamalinesari, Rahimi, Gowhary, & Azizifar, 2015), simple past tense errors correction (Eslami, 2014), and vocabulary and spelling errors (Goksoy& Nazli, 2016) have a significant impact on students' writing accuracy.

Many studies have shown that either the process approach or feedback improves students' writing achievement. However, many previous studies used these approaches and techniques separately and primarily used feedback to improve students' grammatical and writing accuracy. Furthermore, little research has been conducted to determine how the process approach and feedback can be combined to assist students who struggle with writing. As a result, this research combined a process approach and feedback in writing instruction, with an emphasis on the content and organization of students' writing. It is proposed that students' writing problems can be alleviated by using a process approach and providing them with teacher feedback on their written work. (Gashout, 2014). As a result, the

goal of this study was to see how a process approach and feedback affected students' paragraph writing skills. The particular goals of the study were to assist students in creating an effective paragraph and to improve their writing quality.

METHOD

The study was carried out at Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa University in Serang Banten. English is studied in this case in an EFL context. This study included 35 students (30 females and 5 males) from the second semester enrolled in the 'Paragraph Based Writing' subject. They were chosen using a technique known as purposive sampling. An action research method was used in the study. (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).

The researcher designed a pre-test to assess students' level at the beginning of the course, and a post-test to indicate any substantial progress after the treatment, at the end of each cycle, to examine the efficacy of the process approach and feedback in supporting the teaching of writing. Analytics writing rubric assessment, developed from Jacobs' et.al. (1981) as cited in (Weigle, 1997) was used to grade the students' paragraph writing assessments. This rubric was created by combining effective paragraph writing criteria (Brown, 2003) with the following domains of evaluation: topic sentence writing, topic development/supports, ideas organization, language use, and mechanics. In terms of data validity, two interraters evaluated the results of the students' writing tests. Following each treatment cycle, students were instructed to write a complete paragraph on a specific topic. The post-nature test's was then compared to that of the pre-test.

Participants for this study were chosen using purposive sampling. The students' data was gathered through observation, interviews, and tests. To collect baseline data, students were given a preliminary study that included observation, small group interviews, and a paragraph writing test. Following baseline data collection, a series of treatments (4 meetings per cycle) were implemented using a process approach and feedback. Finally, a post-test was given to determine whether the intervention helped the learners outperform their peers.

RESULT

To investigate the effectiveness of using a process approach and feedback in teaching paragraph writing in English as a foreign language in higher education, the researchers calculated the differences in students' achievement scores in pre-test and post-test. The data gathered during the preliminary phase of the action research indicates that the problem necessitates immediate attention. According to the observation and interview data, the traditional method used, as well as feedback that was limited to incorrect grammar usage and the accuracy of the students' work, caused the students to be unaware of the poor quality of their writing.

Table 1. The students' paragraph average score of the pre-test

No	Aspects	Interval score	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Average Score
1.	Topic sentence	7 – 20	14.5	7.5	10.34
2.	Topic Dev./Support	13 – 30	21.5	13.5	17.47
3.	Ideas Organization	7 – 20	16	8.5	11.50
4.	Language use	5 – 25	19.5	7.5	13.87
5.	Mechanics	2 -5	4	3	3.61
	Total Average		75.5	40	56.79

According to the above tables, the average performance of the students is 56.79. It implies that the students' ability to write an effective paragraph was deficient. As a result, a course of action must be devised to improve the situation.

Proposed Action

The following actions have been proposed to improve students' paragraph writing skills by focusing specifically on the content and quality of their paragraphs.

1. Improve students' understanding of the concept of a paragraph and its components.

2. Encourage students to complete each step of the process writing.

3. Encourage group work and discussion while the writing process is underway.

4. Encourage students to be critical readers when reading the paragraphs of their classmates.

5. Encourage students to give their all when reviewing and revising their work.

6. Provide feedback to students to help them understand their own writing.

Action Implementation

Students' preliminary test performance was thoroughly scored by two raters. As a result of identifying the students' difficulty in writing an effective paragraph, the following actions were taken to improve the content and quality of their paragraph writing. Accordingly, the teacher instructed students for three months to carry out the proposed actions. During the teaching learning activities, the students were divided into individual, small group, and pair groups. Furthermore, the goals of each step in the writing process were communicated to the students clearly. Students were taught the concept and elements that make up a good paragraph before beginning the writing process, and they were also exposed to and asked to analyze some paragraphs with good and poor construction. They were then encouraged to work in small groups to select one of several given topics and brainstorm a variety of ideas related to the topic selected before moving on to select a focus and make an outline or plan their own paragraph individually. Students were told explicitly which areas they needed to concentrate on, particularly those related to topic support or idea development. Students' work was examined by their peers in small groups or pairs after they completed the planning and drafting processes (1st draft) utilizing the parameters supplied by the teacher. Following the review results, the students revised their work (2nd draft) and submitted it to the teacher. The draft was revised again for the

final result after the teacher provided written feedback and conducted a personally written conference with the students (3rd draft). Each cycle was covered in four 100-minute meetings, with each meeting focusing on a different set of topics. Following the completion of the treatment, the students were given a post-test to see if they had improved. The tables below demonstrate the results obtained on intervention test:

Table 2. The students' paragraph average score of the post-test 1

No	Aspects	Interval score	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Average Score
1.	Topic sentence	7 – 20	17	9	14.09
2.	Topic Dev./Support	13 – 30	25.5	14.5	20.09
3.	Ideas Organization	7 – 20	19	8.5	13.90
4.	Language use	5 – 25	22	9	16.96
5.	Mechanics	2 -5	4	3	3.8
	Total Average		87.5	44	68.84

Table 3. The students' paragraph average score of the post-test 2

No	Aspects	Interval score	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Average Score
1.	Topic sentence	7 – 20	18	13	14.87
2.	Topic Dev./Support	13 – 30	27	18.5	22.87
3.	Ideas Organization	7 – 20	19	13	15.93
4.	Language use	5 – 25	22.5	14	19.57
5.	Mechanics	2 -5	5	3.5	4.13
	Total Average		91.5	62	77.37

Table 4. The students' paragraph average score of the post-test 3

No	Aspects	Interval score	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Average Score
1.	Topic sentence	7 – 20	18.5	15.5	17.30
2.	Topic Dev./Support	13 – 30	28.5	21	25.6
3.	Ideas Organization	7 – 20	19.5	14.4	17.54
4.	Language use	5 – 25	22.5	16.5	20.71
5.	Mechanics	2 -5	5	4	4.47
	Total Average		94	71.4	85,65

Evaluation of Action/Outcome

When compared to the mean score on the pre-test, the average performance of the students test improved slightly after the intervention. The average pre-cycle test score was 56.80 in cycle one, 68.84 in cycle two, and 85.65 in cycle three. Each aspect of the paragraph under consideration was weak prior to treatment and gradually improved following treatment. After receiving the treatment, most students who struggled to write their topic sentence and develop or support the main idea with appropriate details/supports, resulting in paragraphs lacking unity, cohesion, and coherence, gradually improved their writing quality. Their comprehension of the concept and the structure of an effective paragraph grows.

Each step of the writing process had overcome the students' difficulties. During the planning phase, students' difficulties in coming up with ideas for the chosen topic were addressed through brainstorming and mapping activities conducted in small groups. Students were taught to be critical readers during the reviewing process by analyzing and identifying flaws in their classmates' work and discussing and sharing their ideas on how to improve it. These activities not only increased confidence, perspective, and critical thinking, but they also fostered a sense of classroom community (Ferris, 2003). However, students' knowledge limitations sometimes prevent them from providing appropriate feedback, so teacher feedback is required to clarify this oversight. This procedure is crucial because it

allows pupils to learn about the strengths and flaws of their paragraphs and how to improve them (Silver & Lee, 2007). Studies in ESL writing also confirmed that teacher feedback is regarded as valuable device that can support students' revision and nurture the learning to write process (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, Hyland, 2003, Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

Some students struggled to understand the intended meaning of the feedback written on their paper when they received feedback from the teacher. Similarly, the teacher occasionally struggled to grasp the significance of the students' writing. This may cause confusion for both of them. The teacher uses a personal conference to mediate between the students to clarify this. So, before writing the revision, the teacher discussed the most common feedback written on the students' drafts with the entire class, followed by discussing specific feedback with each student individually. These activities allow students to negotiate the teacher's feedback while also advocating for their ideas, allowing them to better understand how to apply the feedback when writing the revision. (L. M. Goldstein, 2004). Finally, after understanding all of the written feedback, students wrote the revision and submitted the draft as their final product.

DISCUSSION

The use of a process approach combined with feedback as a technique for teaching writing effectively helps students overcome their obstacles in learning to write. Students' comprehension of how to write and

organize their ideas is improving, according to the observations. Students' difficulties in constructing the topic sentence and building the focus of their paragraph is reduced by the many learning activities done throughout the prewriting stage/planning process. Furthermore, the small group exercise employed at this stage can help students uncover more ideas linked to the given topic as well as locate appropriate supports and facts for building the focus chosen for their paragraph.

During the reviewing stage, students were guided through a peer review activity in which they could help one another by correcting and sharing opinions on how to make the paragraph more coherent and improved. Peer review, as mentioned by Keh (2015), can help students learn more about writing by critically reading other people's papers (Keh, 2015). Apart from improving the student's sense of audience at their current level of development, the skill gained through this practice is also transferred when writing and revising their own paper (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009). As a result, students' writing skills develop over time as a result of this exercise (Rollinson, 2005, Min, 2005).

Furthermore, the written conference, which was held personally after the students received written feedback from the teacher, allows them to clarify and advocate for their ideas (Gilliland, 2014). This session also mediates both the student and the teacher in negotiating the intended meaning of their writing, giving the student a clearer clue in

revising. During this activity, successful negation leads to successful revision in the students' subsequent draft (L. Goldstein, 2017). Furthermore, the interactional activities during the feedback session foster a positive relationship between the teacher and the students while staying on track with their instructional objectives (Shvidko, 2018). This activity also helps students increase their knowledge and comprehension of how to improve their writing skills.

The study of students' final draft paragraphs demonstrated that their paragraphs were effectively developed. All students can build their paragraph's emphasis with suitable supports and details, structure their thoughts rationally, compose different types of sentences, and use proper connectors and punctuation. As a consequence, it is feasible to infer that adopting a process approach and providing feedback successfully promoted students' learning and increased students' comprehension and performance in producing an effective paragraph.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study show that integrating a process approach with feedback is an effective technique for enhancing EFL writing abilities. With adequate coaching and an effective strategy, students may increase their knowledge and writing abilities. Writing is a tough talent to teach and master, thus EFL teachers should solicit feedback from their students before using a certain teaching strategy. Writing teachers are encouraged to

create rules for the components of writing that students must fulfill so that they check their writing and produce a good piece of writing to assist students comprehend and implement written comments in rewriting their work effectively, It is also suggested that the instructor arrange a personal discussion to clear up any residual misunderstandings. Finally, more study should be undertaken to go deeper into the components of offered comments that inspire students to make suitable modifications.

REFERENCES

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

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

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

Brown, H. D. (2003). Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices. In -. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Teaching English as a second or foreign language. Retrieved from

https://openlibrary.org/publishers/Heinle
_&_Heinle_Publishers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Raimes, A. (1983). Techniques in Teaching Writing. Oxford University Press.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. 59(January), 23–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci003

Shvidko, E. (2018). Writing conference feedback as moment-to-moment af fi liative relationship building. Journal of Pragmatics, 127, 20–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.01.004

Silver, R., & Lee, S. (2007). What does it take to make a change? Teacher feedback and student revisions RITA SILVER. 6(1), 25–49.

Srichanyachon, N. (2012). Teacher written feedback for L2 learners' writing development. Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts, 12(1), 7–17. Retrieved from www.journal.su.ac.th

Tom, A. A., Morni, A., Metom, L., & Joe, S. (2013). Students' Perception and Preferences of Written Feedback in Academic Writing. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n11p72

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

Weigle, S. C. (1997). Assessing writing (Vol. 4). https://doi.org/10.1016/S1075-2935(97)80014-1

Zareil, A. A., & Rahnama, M. (2013). The Effect of Written Corrective Feedback Modes on EFL Learners' Grammatical and Lexical Writing Accuracy: from Perceptions to Facts. International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL), 1(3), 1–14. Retrieved from www.arcjournals.org