

Incorporating Feedback and Process Approach to Promote Students' Writing Skills in EFL Context

Rita Handayani*,

Language Education Program, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
ritahandayani_lt16s3@mahasiswa.unj.ac.id

YumnaRasyid

Graduate School, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
Yumna.rasyid @unj.ac.id

NinukLustyantie

Graduate School, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
ninuk.lustyantie@unj.ac.id

Abstract: Many studies have proved the effectiveness of either the process approach or feedback on students' writing achievement. Most earlier studies used feedback primarily to improve students' grammatical and writing accuracy. However, studies focusing on feedback on students' writing are hard to figure hard. This study attempts to fill this gap. This study used a process approach and feedback focusing on the content and organization of students' writing. Purposive sampling was used to select 35 second-semester students from Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa University's English study program. This study method was action research, which was carried out in three cycles. Questionnaires, observations, and writing tests were used to collect data. A detailed assessment rubric criterion and an assessment of writing results given by two interrater were used to determine the validity and reliability of the data. According to the findings of this study, the combination of a process approach and feedback has a significant impact on improving students' skills in writing effective paragraphs. The average pre-cycle test score of 56.80 increased to 68.84 in cycle one, 77.37 in cycle two, and 85.65 in cycle three. The suggestion is that combining a process approach with feedback was beneficial in improving student skills in writing effective paragraphs.

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

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the English language skills that college students must learn. It is crucial in both personal and business lives. However, unlike spoken communication, communicating in written English is a difficult skill to master to produce a good piece of writing. In addition, to balance various elements in writing such as content, organization, purpose, audience, vocabulary, punctuation, and other mechanical devices and present them by the accepted pattern of organization. Therefore, acquiring this skill takes a lot of practice, and producing a piece of writing takes a long time.

Besides, the complexity of writing, the limited time, knowledge of the topic, inadequate practice, and insufficient guidance and feedback given by writing teachers make this skill difficult to master (Fareed, Ashraf & Bilal, 2016; Ibnian, 2017). As a result, many students who learn writing either in EFL or ESL contexts experienced similar difficulties. They tend to write paragraphs or essays that

lack cohesion and coherency (Rass, 2015; Ali Muhammed, 2015; Arianti&Fitriana, 2017). Additionally, many language writing teachers still use a product approach and focus mainly on the accuracy and correctness of grammar and mechanics. Students are rarely given feedback on their writing content and the opportunity to correct, modify, and improve their work. As a result, many EFL or ESL students struggle to improve the quality of their writing.

As a result of these circumstances, the researchers believe there is something incorrect with the instruction implemented thus far. Elements affecting the lesson's success, such as the teacher's teaching method and technique, should be examined, and a better teaching technique should be pursued. Therefore, an appropriate strategy is required to solve the problems and increase the students' writing competence. The ability to write well is not something that comes naturally. Writing is an activity that should be approached with caution and thought through to communicate with a reader effectively. These statements imply that writing is a tough skill that requires extensive practice.

The Problem: In Indonesian schools, the English language has been taught as a foreign language. Even though the skill is taught and practiced at the secondary and tertiary levels, the investigator has discovered that many students struggle to express their ideas, opinions, and feelings appropriately in written forms. Many lecturers in the English study program at Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa expressed dissatisfaction with their students' research proposals because they had difficulty identifying the main idea of each paragraph. The majority of sentences in each paragraph contained a variety of ideas. This issue is visible in the Paragraph Based Writing course, where the researcher discovered that most students' paragraph writing tests lacked coherence and cohesion. The method of instruction contributes to students' success or failure in writing, and teachers should experiment with various learning methods and techniques. The primary goal of this research is to investigate the impact of a process approach and feedback on improving students' paragraph writing skills. The study's specific goals were to assist students in writing an effective paragraph and improve their writing quality.

Process approach in teaching writing

Traditionally, writing was concerned with the written product. This traditional method encourages students to mimic a model text and see writing as a finished product. This causes dissatisfaction among English teachers and researchers because teaching writing is similar to grammar exercises in which students are forced to produce an error-free finished product. The dissatisfaction prompted researchers and English teachers to look for ways to help students write better by creating well-written texts. As a result, the process approach was born.

A process is a series of activities or steps taken to accomplish a specific goal. More emphasis is placed on the process approach on the stages that assist learners of all levels in exploring and discovering their thoughts. Learners are actively involved in various activities such as idea generation, story completion, description, narration, paragraph writing, editing, and proofreading. The focus is first on the content and meaning, then on the form. This approach necessitates planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing strategies that allow students to write freely and produce high-quality texts.

The process approach emphasizes writing activities that take students from generating ideas and data collection to publishing a finished text (Tribble, C. 1996). This approach is appropriate for teaching writing because it emphasizes students' progress in planning, identifying issues, and analyzing and implementing possible solutions (Hyland, 2003). Using this approach, students learn writing through a series of steps to refine and correct their writing rather than relying on a single draft (Celce-Murcia, 2001). Instead, students are given sufficient time to explore a topic through writing, rereading,

thinking about, and redrafting new ideas (Raimes, 1983). It is a non-linear, exploratory, and generative process in which writers discover and reformulate their ideas while attempting to approximate meaning (Kroll, 1990). Using this approach, students are guided to write well-organized, adequately developed paragraphs and essays.

Many studies have demonstrated the efficacy of the process approach. Aside from improving students' descriptive paragraphs (Nabhan, 2017), this approach is also effective at reducing pre-service teachers' writing anxieties (Arici & Kaldirim, 2015); demonstrating a positive effect on EFL learners' attitude toward writing skills (Mehr, 2017); and significantly improving students' writing performance in an overcrowded EFL writing class (Dokchandra, 2018). Furthermore, in a comparative study, the process approach promoted students' writing abilities more effectively than the traditional approach and the genre-based approach (Hashemnezhad & Hashemnezhad, 2012).

Feedback in writing

Feedback is defined as any information received about the learner's task performance to improve it (Ur, 1991). Feedback at the process level is the most beneficial 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). To be more effective, teachers should supplement written feedback with discussion, questions, and answering sessions; teachers should also include commendation and encouragement in their written feedback because positive feedback can increase students' motivation to improve their writing skills (Srichanyachon, 2012). In addition, the discussion session will provide time for the teacher-students audience to negotiate the meaning for resulting a successful revision in the subsequent draft (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999).

According to both students and teachers, providing feedback is critical in the learning process because it can be used as a guide for students to revise and improve the quality of their writing (Tom, Morni, Metom, & Joe, 2013). Students regarded their teacher as a primary source of feedback that positively impacted their writing performance. (Bijami, Pandian, & Singh, 2016). When providing written feedback, most students expected their teachers to consider all aspects of written texts (Omer, Mahfoodh, & Pandian, 2011) as it can help them to improve their writing (Listiani, 2017). So, it is clear that feedback is an essential component of any formal language learning context that significantly impacts students' learning achievement.

The effectiveness of feedback has also been extensively researched, and numerous discoveries have been made. For example, according to Ferris (2002), direct correction is advantageous for students at the beginning level of proficiency when they lack sufficient linguistic knowledge to self-correct. Because of its clarity, direct corrective feedback can guide students to be more aware of their mistakes in language use and improve their writing (Adisca & Mardijono, 2013). In addition, giving students direct corrective feedback has a greater impact on their grammatical accuracy in writing. (Farjadnasab & Khodashenas, 2017; Zareil & Rahnama, 2013).

Although some studies demonstrated the effectiveness of direct feedback on students' writing accuracy, others revealed the opposite result. For example, according to Hosseiny's research (2014), indirect corrective feedback on error helps learners improve their writing accuracy because it encourages the learner to participate in the repair process (Hosseiny, 2014); similarly, 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 influence on students' writing accuracy.

Many studies have demonstrated the efficacy of either the process approach or feedback on students' writing achievement. However, many previous studies used these approaches and techniques separately and used feedback primarily to improve students' grammatical and accuracy in writing. Furthermore, there has been little research into how the process approach and feedback can be combined to help students who have difficulty writing. As a result, this study combined a process approach and feedback in teaching writing, focusing on the content and organization of students' writing. It is proposed that students' writing problems be alleviated through a process approach and teacher feedback on their written work (Gashout, 2014). So, this study aimed to investigate the impact of a process approach and feedback on improving students' paragraph writing skills. The study's specific goals were to help students write an effective paragraph and improve their writing quality.

Research Design

The research was conducted at Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa University in Serang Banten. In this case, English is studied 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 during the 2018/2019 academic year. They were chosen through a purposive sampling technique. The study used an action research method (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).

Data collection tools:

To assess the efficacy of the process approach and feedback in supporting the teaching of writing, the researcher created a pre-test to assess students' level at the beginning of the course, and to indicate any significant improvement after the treatment, a post-test was given at the end of each cycle. The students' paragraph writing tests were scored by analytics writing rubric assessment adapted from Jacobs et al. (1981), as cited in (Weigle 1997). This rubric was developed using criteria of effective paragraph writing (Brown, 2003) containing the following domains of evaluation: topic sentence writing, topic development/supports, ideas organization, language use, and mechanics. In terms of the validity of the data, two integrators assessed the students' writing tests results. After each treatment cycle, the students were instructed to write a complete paragraph on one given topic. The nature of the post-test was then compared to that of the pre-test.

Procedures of the Study

Purposive sampling was used to select participants for this study. Observation, interviews, and tests were used to collect data from the students. The preliminary study conducted through observation, small group interview, and paragraph writing test was given to the students to collect baseline data. Next, a series of treatments (4 meetings per cycle) was implemented following baseline data collection using a process approach and feedback. Finally, a post-test was administered to determine whether the intervention assisted the learners in outperforming their counterparts.

Results of the Study

The researchers calculated the differences in students' achievement scores in pre-test and post-test 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 data collected during the preliminary phase of the action research indicates that the problem requires critical intervention. The observation and interview data revealed that the traditional method used and 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.

The result of the students' pre-test:

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

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

According to the above tables, the students' average performance is 56.79. Therefore, it suggests that the students' ability to write an effective paragraph was lacking. As a result, an action must be planned to improve the situation.

Proposed Action

Based on the findings of a preliminary study that included observation, interviews, and a paragraph writing test, the following actions have been proposed to improve students' paragraph writing skills by focusing specifically on the content and quality of their paragraphs.

1. Promote students' understanding of the concept of a paragraph and the components of a good paragraph.
2. Motivate students to follow each step of process writing.
3. Encourage group work and discussion while the process of writing is being completed.
4. Encourage students to be critical readers when reading their classmates' paragraphs.
5. Encourage students to put forth their best effort when reviewing and revising their work.
6. Enhance students' understanding of their writing by providing feedback.

Implementation of Action

The two raters thoroughly scored the preliminary test performance of students. As a result, the students' difficulty in writing an effective paragraph was identified, and the following actions were implemented to improve the content and quality of their paragraph writing. Therefore, the teacher taught three months to implement the proposed actions. The students were divided into individual, small group, and pair groups during the teaching-learning activities. Furthermore, the goals of each step in the writing process were communicated to the students. Before beginning the writing process, students were taught the concept and the elements that make up a good paragraph, and they were also exposed to and asked to analyze some paragraphs with good and poor construction. Then, they were encouraged to work in small groups to choose one of several given topics and brainstorm a variety of ideas related to the topic chosen before moving on to choose a focus and make an outline or plan their paragraph individually. The students were explicitly told which areas they needed to focus on, particularly topic support or idea development. After completing the planning and drafting steps (1st draft), students' work was reviewed by their peers in small groups or pairs using the guidelines provided by the teacher. The students then revised their work based on the review results (2nd draft) and submitted it to the teacher. 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, each with a different set of topics. After completing the treatment, the students were given a post-test to determine whether or not there was an improvement.

The tables below demonstrate the results obtained on the post-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.	<i>Topic sentence</i>	7 – 20	17	9	14.09
2.	<i>Topic Dev./Support</i>	13 – 30	25.5	14.5	20.09
3.	<i>Ideas Organization</i>	7 – 20	19	8.5	13.90
4.	<i>Language use</i>	5 – 25	22	9	16.96
5.	<i>Mechanics</i>	2 -5	4	3	3.8
<i>Total Average</i>			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.	<i>Topic sentence</i>	7 – 20	18	13	14.87
2.	<i>Topic Dev./Support</i>	13 – 30	27	18.5	22.87
3.	<i>Ideas Organization</i>	7 – 20	19	13	15.93
4.	<i>Language use</i>	5 – 25	22.5	14	19.57
5.	<i>Mechanics</i>	2 -5	5	3.5	4.13
<i>Total Average</i>			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.	<i>Topic sentence</i>	7 – 20	18.5	15.5	17.30
2.	<i>Topic Dev./Support</i>	13 – 30	28.5	21	25.6
3.	<i>Ideas Organization</i>	7 – 20	19.5	14.4	17.54

4.	<i>Language use</i>	5 – 25	22.5	16.5	20.71
5.	<i>Mechanics</i>	2 -5	5	4	4.47
<i>Total Average</i>			94	71.4	85,65

Evaluation of Action/Outcome

After the intervention, the average performance of the students' test showed a slight improvement compared to the mean score on the pre-test. The average pre-cycle test score of 56.80 increased to 68.84 in cycle one, 77.37 in cycle two, and 85.65 in cycle three. Each aspect of the paragraph being evaluated was weak before treatment and gradually improved after 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 after receiving the treatment. Their understanding of the concept and the structure of an effective paragraph improves.

Each step of the writing process had overcome the difficulties encountered by the students. Students' difficulties in generating ideas for the chosen topic were resolved during the planning phase through brainstorming and mapping activities conducted in small groups. During the reviewing process, students were taught to be critical readers by analyzing and identifying the flaws in their classmates' work and discussing and sharing their ideas on how to improve it. Besides gaining confidence, perspective, and critical thinking, these activities also built a sense of classroom community (Ferris, 2003). However, the limitations of the students' knowledge sometimes prevent them from providing appropriate feedback, so teacher feedback is required to clarify this oversight. This process is critical because students can learn about the strengths and weaknesses of their paragraphs that need to be improved. (Silver & Lee, 2007). Studies in ESL writing also confirmed that teacher feedback is a valuable device that can support students' revision and nurture the learning to write process (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, Hyland, 2003, Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

When receiving feedback from the teacher, some students struggled to understand the intended meaning of the feedback written on their paper. Likewise, the teacher occasionally struggled to understand the point of the students' writing. This can lead to misunderstandings for both of them. To clarify this, the teacher uses a personal conference to mediate between the students. So, before writing the revision, the teacher discussed the most common feedback written on the students' draft for the whole class and continued by discussing specific feedback personally with each student. These activities allow the student to negotiate the teacher's feedback and standing up for their ideas, so they can better understand how to use the feedback in writing the revision (L. M. Goldstein, 2004). Finally, after all the written feedback was comprehended, students wrote the revision and submitted the draft as their final result.

The combination of a process approach and feedback as a technique in teaching writing effectively facilitates students' difficulties in learning to write. The observation results showed that students' understanding of how to write and organize their ideas is improving. The various learning activities are done during the prewriting stage/planning process reduce the students' difficulty in formulating the topic sentence and developing the focus of their paragraph. In addition, the small group activity used at this stage can ease the student's difficulties in discovering more ideas related to the given topic and locating relevant supports and details for developing the focus chosen for their paragraph.

During the reviewing stage, the students were assisted with a peer review activity. They could assist one another by correcting and sharing opinions on making the paragraph more coherent and improved. As Keh (2015) mentioned, peer review can help students learn more about writing by critically reading other people's papers (Keh, 2015). Aside from improving the student's sense of audience at their level of development, the ability gained through this practice is also transferred when writing and revising their paper (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009). Thus, this practice gradually improves students' writing abilities (Rollinson, 2005, Min, 2005).

Furthermore, the written conference, which was conducted personally after the students received written feedback from the teacher, provides the students with an opportunity to clarify and advocate for their ideas (Gilliland, 2014). This session also mediates both student and teacher to negotiate the intended meaning of their writing, giving clearer clues for the student in revising. During this activity, the successful negotiation leads the students to produce successful revision in their subsequent draft (L. Goldstein, 2017). Besides, the interactional activities during the feedback session foster a positive relationship between the teacher and the students while not deviating from their instructional objectives (Shvidko, 2018). This activity also assists students in enhancing their knowledge and understanding of how to improve their writing performance.

The analysis of the final draft of students' paragraphs revealed that students' paragraphs were well developed. All students can formulate their paragraph's topic sentence, develop the paragraph's focus with adequate supports and details, organize the ideas systematically, write different types of sentences, and use appropriate connectors and punctuation. As a result, it is possible to conclude that using a process approach and providing feedback has effectively facilitated students' learning and improved students' understanding and performance in writing an effective paragraph.

Conclusion and recommendation

This study demonstrated that combining a process approach with feedback is an excellent strategy for improving EFL writing skills. Students can improve their understanding and writing skills with proper guidance and an effective approach. Writing is a difficult skill to teach and master, so it is recommended that EFL teachers obtain input from their students before implementing a specific teaching method. To ensure that the teaching and learning of writing run smoothly, writing teachers are advised to create guidelines for the aspects of writing that students must fulfill, so they check their writing and produce a good piece of writing to help students understand and apply written feedback in revising their work properly, it is also recommended that the teacher hold a personal conference to clarify any remaining ambiguities. Finally, it is suggested that additional research be conducted to look more deeply into the aspects of given feedback that prompt students to make appropriate revisions.

References

1. Adisca, F. A., & Mardijono. (2013). *Written Corrective Feedback and Its Effects on English Department Students' Writing Drafts*.
2. 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>
3. Bijami, M., Pandian, A., & Singh, M. (2016). The Relationship between Teacher's Written Feedback and Students' Writing Performance: Sociocultural Perspective. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.4n.1p.59>
4. Brown, H. D. (2003). Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices. In -. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>

5. Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Retrieved from https://openlibrary.org/publishers/Heinle_&_Heinle_Publishers
6. 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>
7. 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](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80126-X)
8. 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>
9. 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>
10. 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>
11. Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to Student Writing: Implication for SecondLanguage Students*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
12. 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
13. Gilliland, B. (2014). *Academic Language Socialization in High School Writing Conferences*. 303–330. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.1753>
14. Goksoy & Nazli. (2016). *The Effect Of Direct And Indirect Written Corrective Feedback On Students' Writing*.
15. Goldstein, L. (2017). *Feedback and Revision in Second Language Writing: Contextual, teacher, and student variables*.
16. 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>
17. 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>
18. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). *The Power of Feedback*. 33. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
19. 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>
20. Hyland, K. (2003). Second Language Writing. In *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
21. Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
22. 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>

23. 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>
24. Kröll, B. (1990). *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom* (p. 246). p. 246. Cambridge University Press.
25. 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.
26. 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>
27. 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>
28. Min, H. (2005). *Training students to become successful peer reviewers*. 33, 293–308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.11.003>
29. 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.
30. 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>
31. Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. Oxford University Press.
32. Rollinson, P. (2005). *Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class*. 59(January), 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci003>
33. Shvidko, E. (2018). Writing conference feedback as moment-to-moment affective relationship building. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 127, 20–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.01.004>
34. Silver, R., & Lee, S. (2007). *What does it take to make a change? Teacher feedback and student revisions* RITA SILVER. 6(1), 25–49.
35. 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
36. 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>
37. Ur, P. (1991). *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
38. Weigle, S. C. (1997). *Assessing writing* (Vol. 4). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1075-2935\(97\)80014-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1075-2935(97)80014-1)
39. 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