Self-Correction E-Assessment Rubric (SCeAR) to Measure EFL Students' Writing Ability

Ike Dian Puspita Sari
IKIP Budi Utomo
ikedianpuspitasari@budiutomomalang.ac.id

Indrawati Pusparini
IKIP Budi Utomo
indrawatipusparini@budiutomomalang.ac.id

Anita Kurnia Rachman
IKIP Budi Utomo
anitakurniarachman@budiutomomalang.ac.id

Abstract: *In writing process, students cannot measure their writing product. Otherwise, feedback is depended on teacher's objectives. The development of the Self-Correction E-Assessment Rubric (SCeAR) in the Intermediate Writing class aims to help students measuring the relationship between using SCeAR and their writing ability. This research used quasi-experimental research method. The research subjects consisted of 50 students. The researcher gave pre-test to the students to know their innate capacity. The pre-test score was also used to be analyzed with post-test score comparison. The treatment was using SCeAR. The students do writing process by involving SCeAR. There are four classifications for SCeAR, namely organization, content, text characteristics, and language use. Post-test were taken from their writing product's score. From the research results, the difference mean score between pre-test and post-test in table 4 is 10.24. In case of t_{value} is -19.772, it shows that the mean score of pre-test is lower than the mean score of post-test. If the mean score of post-test is higher than pre-test, it can be analyzed that the used of Self Correction E-Assessment Rubric (SCeAR) in writing process gives positive effect. In case of sig. (2-tailed) value 0.000 is less than probability value ($α=0.05$), the mind mapping is effective to be used in writing process.*

Keywords: EFL Students; Self-Correction E-Assessment Rubric; Writing Ability

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the productive skills that students consider difficult because they have to consider several things, such as the accuracy of grammar, writing, ideas, and others. So that students not only have difficulty writing their ideas, but also must be able to convey them to readers.

Gebhard (2000) found three difficulties experienced by students in writing, including writing skills, inability to write in English, and teacher responses. Writing is often associated with word choice, grammar use, word arrangement, writing mechanics (punctuation and spelling), and coherent and cohesive idea arrangement (Brown, 2017). For this reason, an appropriate strategy is needed that can help improve students' writing skills.

In teaching writing skills, there are two approaches that can be used, namely the product approach and the process approach. Widiati & Cahyono (2006) explain that teaching writing in Indonesia still uses a product approach, where students focus more on the final results of the learning process. Students tend to

imitate the writing model provided by the teacher as an example of an essay. In fact, not infrequently, the accuracy of using tenses is more concerned than the content or ideas conveyed.

According to Gabrielatos (2002), there are several factors that are elements of proper writing, namely the use of language, arrangement of ideas, linkages, and clarity. The use of language includes correct and consistent spelling, the use of correct grammar and word order, as well as broad and precise word selection. The composition of ideas includes the arrangement of relevant and organized content, the use of correct conjunctions, and proper punctuation so that the essay is easy to read. The level of explicit idea exposure must be neatly arranged. Likewise, a proper and consistent writing style also needs attention. In a text, especially a narrative text, there are things that need to be considered, for example the sequence of the plot and the characters in the story. Unlike argumentative texts, the author's ideas must be clearly explained along with arguments and examples.

Unlike the product approach, another approach, namely the process approach, focuses on the learning process. There are several stages in writing that students can do, starting from prewriting, drafting, responding, revising, editing, evaluating, and post-writing activities (Richards & Renandya, 2002; Abas & Aziz, 2018; Wibowo, 2013; Maolida, 2018; Bayat, 2014). At the prewriting stage, students collect the main ideas and supporters they want to write. After that, these ideas can be arranged into an outline for the drafting process. In the responding process, the teacher provides written input regarding the outline of the essay they have made. Providing input on content and drafting the overall idea can

be done at the revising stage. At the editing stage, students check their use of tenses, spelling, punctuation, and choice of words. Furthermore, the teacher provides a score at the evaluating stage, and students can upload, read out, or share their writing at the post-writing stage.

At some of these stages, students can check their writing to practice their writing fluency. Seow (2002) believes that self-correction cannot be done by students alone, but requires assistance from the teacher. Chandler (2003) conducted a study to prove the effectiveness of error correction to improve the accuracy of students' writing skills. The results showed a large increase in students who were given error correction treatment compared to the other two groups who were not. To find out how significant the use of this self-correction strategy is, a deeper study is needed. This study aims to develop Self-Correction e-Assessment Rubric (SCeAR), especially in the Intermediate Writing class. This is to find out how the SCeAR is used by students.

In the language learning process, learners sometimes see some of their own mistakes, through monitoring strategies, and they can also correct some of their mistakes when other people, such as teachers or peers, give them cues or hints about them. Students who correct their own mistakes can activate their linguistic competence (that is, linguistic knowledge). Unfortunately there is little research in this area (Makino, 1993; Adi, et. al, 2017; Sakinah, 2018). The study that followed took on the idea that teachers could provide students with opportunities to try self-correction without further

assistance. This assumes that learners can apply the rules they have learned to correct their own mistakes (Kubota, 2001). Students' self-correction can have a long-term effect on their memory, because they are involved in the process directly and actively, and this can activate the operations needed for long-term retention (Ganji, 2009).

Bitchener (2008) conducted a study on error correction on 75 ESL international secondary students in Auckland, New Zealand. The purpose of this study was to investigate the error correction strategies used in ESL students who showed positive results. There is an increase in the accuracy of essay writing over two months. In addition, this study aims to examine the effect of writing accuracy that occurs on differences in error correction strategies. Students were divided into 4 groups, where three of them were given error correction treatment and one as the control group was not treated. The results showed that there was more accuracy in the students who received error correction.

Another study was conducted by Maftoon (2011) regarding the comparison of the effects of recast and self-correction on writing accuracy. They focus on the level of students' awareness to hone their writing skills. Self-correction lets students know more mistakes they made than recasts. Both strategies were applied to the two groups to see a significant difference between the students' writing skills, especially the accuracy of using the past tense. The results show that there is no significant difference between the two strategies, but the self-correction shows better results than the recast on the students' post-test results.

Both studies show the positive impact of error correction on students' writing skills. The used of media can help teaching and learning process to be more effective for students long term effect because the media can help them to study independently after class (Sari and Pusparini, 2020). So it is necessary to re-examine the use of self-correction strategies for students at IKIP Budi Utomo Malang. This is to find out whether the strategy is suitable or not with the characteristics of students at IKIP Budi Utomo Malang.

Writing Aprroach

The product approach focuses on the end result of the learning process. Students tend to imitate the writing model provided by the teacher as an example of an essay. In fact, not infrequently, the accuracy of using tenses is more concerned than the content or ideas conveyed. According to Gabrielatos (2002), there are several factors that become elements of proper writing, namely:

a. Use of language
   The use of language includes correct and consistent spelling, the use of correct grammar and word order, as well as broad and precise word selection.

b. Creating ideas
   The composition of ideas includes the arrangement of relevant and organized content, the use of correct conjunctions, and proper punctuation so that the essay is easy to read.

c. Linkages
   The level of explicit idea exposure must be neatly arranged. Likewise, a proper and consistent writing style also needs attention

d. Clarity
   In narrative text, there are things that need to be considered, for example the sequence of the plot and the characters in the story. Unlike argumentative texts, the author's

ideas must be clearly explained along with arguments and examples.

Unlike the product approach, another approach, namely the process approach, focuses on the learning process. There are several stages in writing that students can do, starting from prewriting, drafting, responding, revising, editing, evaluating, and post-writing activities (Richards and Renandya, 2002). At the prewriting stage, students collect the main ideas and supporters they want to write. After that, these ideas can be arranged into an outline for the drafting process. In the responding process, the teacher provides written input regarding the outline of the essay they have made. Providing input on content and drafting the overall idea can be done at the revising stage. At the editing stage, students check their use of tenses, spelling, punctuation, and choice of words. Furthermore, the teacher provides a score at the evaluating stage, and students can upload, read out, or share their writing at the post-writing stage.

Teaching Media

In instructional learning, sources of information are lecturers, teachers, instructors, students, reading materials and so on. Learning media is a technology (information) that can be used for learning purposes. Learning media is also a physical means to convey learning content or material. Learning media is anything that can be used to transmit messages from sender to recipient, so as to stimulate students' thoughts, feelings, attention and interests so that the learning process occurs. From these definitions it can be said that the media is something that is convincing messages and can stimulate the thoughts, feelings, and willingness of the audience (students) so that it can encourage the learning process in themselves.

In the teaching and learning process, a teacher can use the media to convey material to students. Media is a tool for conveying messages that can stimulate thoughts, feelings and learning interests of students in the learning process (Rais et. all, 2020; Marasut, 2012; Fauzan and Aeifin, 2019). From this understanding, the media does not only function as a tool to convey material. However, media can also be used as tools to increase student motivation and interest in the learning process.

According to Hanafiah & Suhana (2010) learning media are all forms of stimulants and tools provided by the teacher to encourage students to learn quickly, precisely, easily, correctly and without verbalism. In addition to this opinion, Prihatin (2008) explains that learning media is a medium that can be used to help students understand and obtain information that can be heard or seen by the five senses so that learning can be effective and efficient.

Based on these definitions, it can be concluded that learning media are all physical tools used by teachers to convey material to students in order to stimulate students to learn quickly, precisely, easily, correctly and not to verbalism so that learning objectives can be achieved.

There are many learning media, ranging from very simple to complex and complex, ranging from those that only use the eye senses to a combination of more than one sense. From cheap and doesn't require electricity to expensive and highly dependent on hardware. In its development the media follows technological developments. The oldest technology that is used in the learning process is printing which works on the basis of mechanical principles. Then was born audio-visual technology that combines mechanical and electronic inventions for learning purposes. The technology that emerged last was microprocessor technology which gave birth to the use of computers and interactive activities (Arsyad 2006: 29). Based on these technological developments,

learning media can be grouped into four types, namely: media printed technology, media resulting from audio-visual technology, media based on computer technology, and media combined with print technology and computers.

Criteria of Good Teaching Media

Media can help the learning and learning system run. The following are the criteria for good media to be used in the teaching and learning process according to Sudjana and Rvai (2005):

a. The media used is in accordance with the learning objectives.

b. Media supports teaching materials.

c. The media used is easy to get.

d. Media can be used by teachers or students

f. The media used is relevant to the cognitive level of students.

Factors to consider in choosing media or criteria for choosing these media:

a. Purpose

This means that when the teacher chooses the media to be used based on the previously designed goals. If the goal is to make children understand the concept of numbers, then the teacher can use a number planel board, provide several forms of numbers and use objects when learning the concept of numbers.

b. Student Characteristics

The provision of media is also related to the number of children, where are the learning locations and how the children's learning styles are in the classroom. That way, teachers can provide media according to the number of children so that all children have the same opportunity to use media optimally.

c. Media Characteristics

The teacher must know the characteristics of the media which are related to the strengths and weaknesses of the media. For example the teacher does not use photo media to teach movement, it would be better if the teacher uses video media.

d. Time Allocation

The teacher must plan how long the child uses the media and also the teacher must pay attention to how to tidy up the media. This is related to the efficiency of the media.

e. Availability

Before the teacher uses the television in the classroom, the teacher must pay attention to the availability of television supporting devices such as the availability of electrical outlets, electricity and so on.

f. Effectiveness

It is related whether the use of the media is effective in achieving predetermined learning objectives.

g. Compatibility

The media to be used must be practical, flexible and durable so that it can be used the next time. Then in use it does not bother teachers and children so it is easy to use.

h. Cost

This is related to the treatment of the media used. Is maintenance easy or use very expensive costs. Based on several explanations about the criteria for selecting media in general, it can be seen that the criteria for using media are generally considered when selecting media.

Self Correction

According to Bitchener et. al (2005), self-correction is an indirect response, where the teacher allows students to correct the results of their work. This self-correction strategy occurs on the condition that the teacher provides corrective instructions that can be a reference for students (Ibarrola, 2018; Balderas & Cuamatzi, 2018; Ramdas & Zimmerman, 2008; Lyster, 1998). Judging from this definition, the teacher's role is still needed as a guide for the use of self-correction strategies. One of the interesting things about this self-correction strategy is

that the number of errors found in students' essays is reduced when using self-correction compared to using self-help resources (searching for data by oneself) (Kubota, 2001).

In the language learning process, learners sometimes see some of their own mistakes, through monitoring strategies, and they can also correct some of their mistakes when other people, such as teachers or peers, give them cues or hints about them. Students who correct their own mistakes can activate their linguistic competence (that is, linguistic knowledge). Unfortunately there is little research in this area. The study that followed took on the idea that teachers could provide students with opportunities to try self-correction without further assistance. This assumes that learners can apply the rules they have learned to correct their own mistakes (Makino, 1993). Students' self-correction can have a long-term effect on their memory, because they are involved in the process directly and actively, and this can activate the operations needed for long-term retention (Ganji, 2009).

Both studies show the positive impact of error correction on students' writing skills. So it is necessary to re-examine the use of self-correction strategies for students at IKIP Budi Utomo Malang. This is to find out whether the strategy is suitable or not with the characteristics of students at IKIP Budi Utomo Malang.

METHOD

This research used quasi-quantitative research design. The researcher used 1 class only. The sample were 50 students of first semester of English Department of IKIP Budi Utomo. As the procedure of quasi-experimental research design the researcher did not assign the sample into a certain group. However, the pre-test was done to know the innate capacity of the students. Moreover, the pre-test score was used to be analyzed with post-test score comparison.

The researcher modified the process writing into several stage as the treatment. Each stage was done in one meeting (100 minutes). The first stage was pre-writing activity to discover and explore the ideas of students to write descriptive writing. The second stage was drafting, in which the students begun to develop their ideas into a descriptive paragraph. The next stage was revising the paragraph whether there was strange idea in their writing. In revising stage, the researcher used Self Correction E-Assessment Rubric (SCeAR). The last stage was editing, in order to check their grammar in their descriptive paragraph. For sure, the researcher gives feedback to each stage of writing.

While the researcher only used one group with two difference mean score, the researcher used paired-sample t-test measurement by using SPSS 20 to check the effectiveness of SCeAR in argumentative writing. The researcher should ensure whether the data found were distributed normally or not. Hence, the decision making was based on the significance value of paired-sample t-test measurement. When the sig.2-tailed value was less than probability value ($\alpha=0.05$), the H_o was rejected and H_a was accepted. If H_a is accepted, it can be concluded if there is influence of Self Correction E-Assessment Rubric (SCeAR) toward students' writing ability.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

There are 50 samples used in this research. They were given pre-test and post-test to measure the effectiveness of mind mapping in writing activities. The researcher

counted the normality test from the score of pre-test and post-test of 50 samples. Here the result of the normality test:

Table 1. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Pretest	Posttest
N		50	50
Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	75.02	85.26
	Std. Deviation	2.676	2.671
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.197	.181
	Positive	.183	.171
	Negative	-.197	-.181
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.393	1.281
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.041	.075

a. Test distribution is Normal.

From the table above, the Asymp sig. (2-tailed) value is 0.075. While p_{value} is more than α=0.05, it means that the data is normal distributed. Thus, the next measurement is paired sample t-test. This paired sample t-test measurement was chosen because researcher only used 1 group with two different mean scores. Here the result of paired sample t-test:

Table 2. Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	75.02	50	2.676	.378
	Posttest	85.26	50	2.671	.378

In table 2, the mean score of pre-test is 75.02 and the mean score of post test is 85.26. While the mean score of pre-test > mean score of post test, it can be concluded that there is difference mean score of both test=10.24. Here the result of paired sample t-test measurement that can be analyzed by these table below:

Table 3. Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pretest & Posttest	50	.062	.669

The correlation value is 0.62 with the significant value=0.669. In case of sig. 0.669 is more than probability value (α=0.05), it can be concluded that there is not any correlation variable between pre-test and post test. The detail measurement can be seen in the table below:

Table 4. Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Pretest - Posttest	-10.240	3.662	.518	-11.281	-9.199	-19.772	49	.000

Similar to the previous analysis, the difference mean score between pre-test and post test in table 4 is 10.24. In case of t_{value} is -19.772, it shows that the mean score of pre-test is lower than the mean score of post-test. If the mean score of post-test is higher than pre-test, it can be analyzed that the used of Self Correction E-Assessment Rubric (SCeAR) in writing process gives positive effect. However, to ensure the effectiveness of SCeAR in writing process, it can be seen from the sig. (2-tailed) in table 4, in which it is 0.000 with df 49 (n-1). In case of sig. (2-tailed) value 0.000 is less than probability value (α=0.05), it can be concluded if H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Thus, the mind mapping is effective to be applied in writing process.

Bitchener (2008) conducted a study on error correction on 75 ESL international secondary students in Auckland, New Zealand. The purpose of this study was to investigate the error correction strategies used in ESL students who showed positive results. There is an increase in the accuracy of essay writing over two months. In addition, this study aims to examine the effect of writing accuracy that occurs on differences in error correction strategies. Students were divided into 4 groups, where three of them were given error correction treatment and one as the control group was not treated. The results showed that there was more accuracy in the students who received error correction.

Another study conducted by Mafrroon et. al. (2011) on a comparison of the effects of recast and self-correction on writing accuracy. They focus on the level of students' awareness to hone their writing skills. Self-correction lets students know more mistakes they made than recasts. Both strategies were applied to the two groups to see a significant difference between the students' writing skills, especially the accuracy of using the past tense. The results show that there is no significant difference between the two strategies, but the self-correction shows better results than the recast on the students' post-test results.

CONCLUSION

Students used Self Correction E-Assessment Rubric (SCeAR) in their writing process. The researchers applied process approach with four stage, namely

pre-writing activity, drafting, revising, and editing. SCeAR was used in revising stage. Students measure their writing performance by using SCeAR. They can revise their writing product in the next stage and may used SCeAR again to measure their writing performance. Based on the result, it can be concluded that the used of Self Correction E-Assessment Rubric (SCeAR) is effective to be used in writing process. It showed from students' mean score. In post test, the mean score is higher than pre-test mean score.

The weaknesses of SCeAR used in this research is the criteria divided. The criteria used in SCeAR was only for argumentative writing. There should be more development SCeAR for another types of writing. Thus, it can be measure whether SCeAR is effective or not to be used in another types of writing.

REFERENCES

Abas, I., Aziz, N.H. (2018). Model of the Writing Process and Strategies of EFL Proficient Student Writer: A Case Study of Indonesian Learners. *Pertanika Journal of Science and Humanities.* Vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 1815-1842.

Adi, Y. P., Sutarsyah, C., Nurweni, A. (2017). The Use of Self-Correction in Teaching Recount Text Writing. *U-JET: Unila Journal of English Teaching.* Vol 6, no. 1, pp. 1-8.

Balderas, I. R., Cuamatzi, P. M. G. (2018). Self and Peer Correction to Improve College Students' Writing Skills. *Profile: Issue Tech.* Vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 179-194. https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v20n2.67095.

Bayat, N. (2014). The Effect of the Procecss Writing Approach on Writing Success and Anxiety. *Education Sciences: Theory and Practice.* Vol. 14, no. 3. Pp. 1133-1141. Doi: 10.12738/estp.2014.3.1720

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

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*, 102–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004

Brown, H. D. (2017). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching: 5th Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*, 267–296. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9.

Fauzan, and Arifin, F. (2019). The Effectiveness of Google Classroom Media on The students's Learning Outcomes of Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Teacher Education Department. *Al Ibtida: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru MI.* Vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 271-285. https://doi.org/10.24235/al.ibtida.snj.v6i2.5149

Gabrielatos, C. (2002). Available from. In *EFL Writing: Product and Process.* Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED476839.pdf

Ganji, M. (2009). Teacher-correction , Peer-correction and Self- correction : Their Impacts on Iranian Students ' IELTS Essay Writing Performance. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *6*(1), 117–139.

Gebhard, J.G. (2000). *Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language: A Teacher Self-development and Methodology Guide.* Ann Arbor, USA: The University of Michigan Press.

Hanafiah dan Suhana. (2010). Konsep Strategi Pembelajaran. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama

Ibarrola, A.L. (2013). Reformation and Self-Correction: Insights into Correction Strategies for EFL Writing in a School Context. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics.* Vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 29-49.

Kubota, M. (2001). *Error correction strategies used by learners of Japanese when revising a writing task*. *29*, 467–480. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00026-4

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. Language Learning, 48, 183-218.

Maftoon, P. (2011). The Effect of Recast vs . Self Correction on Writing Accuracy : The Role of Awareness. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, *2*(1), 17–28. Retrieved from http://www.edusoft.ro/brain/index.php/brain/article/view/134

Makino, T. Y. (1993). Learner Self-Correction in EFL Written Composition. *ELT Journal,* Vol 47. Issue 4. pp. 337-341. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/47.4.337

Maolida, E. H. (2018). Students' Writing Process for Project Ibunka: A Case Study of EFL Writes. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics.* Vol 3, no. 3. DOI: 10.21462/jeltl.v3i3.147

Marasut, A. (2012). Penggunaan Media Teknologi Watch dalam Pembelajaran Matematika di SMA Kristen Irene Manado. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan MIPA*. Vol 2, no. 1. http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/formatif.v2i1.80.

Prihatin, E. (2008). Guru sebagai Fasilitator. Bandung: PT Karsa Mandiri Persada

Rais, S., Verawardina, U., et. al. (2020). The Effectiveness of Instructional Video Media in Coffee Knowledge Courses (Baristas). *Journal Pendidikan Indonesia.* Vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 258-265. 10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v9i2.24378

Ramdass, D., Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). Effect of Self- Correction Strategy

Training on Middle School Stidents' Self-Eficiacy, Self-Evaluation, and Mathematics Division Learning. *Journal of Advancec Academics.* Vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 18-41.

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. . (2002). *methodology_in_language_teaching_2 002_scanned.pdf.* Retrieved from www.cambridge.org/9780521808293

Sari, I. D. P., & Pusparini, I. (2020). Pengembangan Interactive Multimedia Power Point Presentation (IMPPT) untuk Pengajaran Phonetics *Jurnal Inspirasi Pendidikan. 10*(1), 78–84. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21067/ jip.v10i1.4200

Sakinah, P. (2018). Peer and Self Error Correction Process of Speaking Performance in English Speaking Community at University. *RETAIN.* Vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 1-8.

Seow, A. (2002). *CHAPTER 30 The Writing Process and Process Writing.* https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/ CBO9780511667190.044

Sudjana, N., Rivai, A. (2005). Media Pengajaran. Bandung: Sinar Baru Algesindo

Wibowo, A. B, (2013). *Improving Writing Skill by Using Process Writing Approach for Grade X Students of SMAN 1 Kasihan Bantul Yogyakarta in Academic Year of 2012/2013.* Unpublished Thesis: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.

Widiati, U., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2006). The Teaching of EFL Writing in the Indonesian Context : The State of the Art. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, *13*(3), 139–150. Retrieved from http://journal.um.ac.id/index.php/jip/article/ view/40/357