LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 25, No. 1, April 2022, pp. 338-349

LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

PROMOTING LEARNER AGENCY AND REFLECTIVE THINKING BY ELIMINATING DIRECT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN WRITING

Sahnaz Natasya Fath[1] and Wening Sahayu[2]
[1,2]Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
correspondence: sahnaznatasya.2021@student.uny.ac.id[1]
https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v25i1.4416
received 25 February 2022; accepted 18 May 2022

Abstract

Many researchers have examined the implementation of the promotion method toward the agency principle of multicultural theory. However, little has examined the corrective feedback in promoting the tenet. Given the corrective feedback, the learner will be less used of their reflective thinking to promote themselves as an agent. Therefore, this study aimed to promote learners' agency by eliminating the corrective feedback in writing class and encouraging learners' reflective thinking. Three non-formal intermediate learners writing ability is analyzed in this study. The material given was following the syllabus of the course which is expressing of obligation and prohibition. There were three tasks given in this class. The first task is an individual project, the second is a group project, and the third is an individual project. After the learner finished the task the researcher analyzed the learner's writing improvement by analyzing the frequency and the variation of the lexical used and the grammar detail. Using Primary Trait Scoring, the findings pointed out that the writing ability of the learners improved both lexically and grammatically. Besides, the findings also supported that language produced by the learners is complex, dynamics, and more individual. It is expected that this research could be a consideration for educational stakeholders to select the appropriate method for the learners.

Keywords: agency, corrective feedback, multicultural, reflective thinking

Introduction

The multicultural theory has developed nowadays due to its appropriateness to the globalized world of nowadays state, which requires a more encompassing, ecological, and social framework account as a complement (Larsen-Freeman, 2018 p. 59). The core of the teaching and learning process based on this theory is social relationships and political realities occurring through the interactions and relationships between learners and teachers (Nieto, 2010). Agency or co-constructed learning is described as one of the basic concepts of multicultural theory. The agency concept explains that the process of learning is not to expend thoughts but to form and re-create them (Freire in Nieto, 2010).

Practically, learning is not merely a state of transmitting knowledge, but rather encouraging the learner to be a more critical thinker. According to this

tenet, the learning process should be in the form of mutual discovery by students and teachers. By working together both teacher and learner can reflect, theorize, and create knowledge. The center on reflective questions triggers learners to consider distinctive alternatives, address taken-for-granted truths, and to gotten to be more critical thinkers. It is important to acknowledge that learners can make their designs with implications, employments and to extend the meaning potential of a given word. It is not fair to internalize a ready-made framework (Larsen–Freeman, 2012b).

It is better to obligate oneself in an action; the more likely one is to advance. More vitally, the agency joins motivation to activity and characterizes a bunch of ways taken by learners (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001, p. 145). Lier (2008) in (Larsen–Freeman, 2012b) pointed out three main compositions of agency in language classrooms: self-regulate capacity action from the learner, the socially interceded nature of the sociocultural setting, and a mindfulness of one's duty for one's acts. Bown (2009) uncovered that the awareness of learners' agency and the conviction in them viably exercising that agency can engage learners to successfully oversee their learning.

Reflexive/reflective thinking enabled language learners' agency and identifies learners' stories as supporting this considering when instructors exchange with learners almost what the learners have composed (Gao, 2013) in Larsen–Freeman, 2012b). Reflective learning is depicted as the method of inside looking at and investigating an issue, activated by an encounter, which makes and clarifies meaning in terms of self. It leads to a change in conceptual perspective (Boyd & Fales 1983). Kohonen in Cooke (2013) stated that the concept of individual or peer self-evaluation in a cooperative learning environment is the key to expanding learners' certainty who can celebrate the act of fruitful communication with their peers.

The hypothesis utilizes fundamental and esteems on learners' subjective encounters, attitudes, and sentiments concerning their learning. It is recommended that by improving the learners' see of themselves and their creating capacities; they may get to be way better learners. Li (2020) formulated some principles to promote greater learner agency in language learning. It is described as the changes from instructing the target language to instructing education abilities, from educating the target culture to making lessons socially important to students, from centering on giving language input to advancing interaction within the language, from going to last products to students as makers of language, and from planning for exams to conducting locks in evaluations.

In the language classroom, the agency is needed to be encouraged in any skill including writing. Writing skill is still being regarded as a problematic issue for second language learners. It is regarded to have complicated aspects that should be fulfilled by the learners. Harmer (2001 & 2007) described the use of lexical things, accentuation, content arrangement, spellings, and sentence structure as conventional issues in writing. Besides, Broughton, Brumfit, Flavell, Hill, and Pincas (2003) indicated the four sorts of issues related to creating English writing aptitudes. These incorporate mechanical issues with the script of English, issues of the exactness of English language structure and lexis, issues relating the fashion of composing to the requests of a specific circumstance, issues of creating ease and consolation in communicating what must be said (p. 116).

Hyland (2003) highlighted the cultural and learners diversity aspect in writing instruction. It is stated that each writing process is associations and social. It communicates socially recognized reason, reflecting a certain kind of relationship, and recognizes an engagement in a given community. It implies that writing cannot be evacuated down to a set of cognitive or specialized capacities or a framework of rules as it were. Writing the second language isn't only a matter of activity to compose and reexamine but too an accentuation on that there are parallels within the composing forms of first and second language writers, recognized by their bilingual and bicultural foundations and especially their earlier encounters as writers and learners.

Besides, in the writing teaching and learning process, it must be considered that learners have characteristics and personal factors that can influence their procurement of L2 composing aptitudes. Person dissimilarities influence how learners learn, how they react to instruction, and how they advance to make strides in their composing. Their bilingual, bicultural, and biliterate encounters can disentangle or ruin writing in different ways. They may have distinctive conceptions of information, self, and writings which negate with teachers' directions practices and judgments of quality. In any case, culture joins as well personally to language, explanatory styles, learning inclinations, and understandings of information, writings, and character.

Therefore, it is suggested that learners' social components ought to be recognized as a potential source of clarification for writing differences and utilized to recognize various ways of making implications. An endorsement of changed composing can encourage cross-cultural understandings and offer assistance to see that composing difficulties are not issues characteristic in understudies themselves. Besides, these understandings can strengthen teaching practices that make such contrasts explicit to students.

To improve learners writing skill many researchers argued that corrective feedback must be given. As resumed in Budianto et al (2017), corrective feedback leads to a positive result since it can progress the language improvements for L2 of EFL learners and EFL.

However, Hyland (2003) stated that a few researchers have questioned the viability of instructor criticism as a way to improve students' writing. As cited in Hyland (2003), Sommers (1982) revealed that much-written input is of destitute quality and regularly misjudged by students, being as well dubious and conflicting first language writing. Besides, it is often dictator, formalist, and harsh (Connors & Lunsford, 1993 in Hyland, 2003). Comments oversee to be centered on form instead of substance and reactions can suitable, or take over, student writings by being as well mandated (Sommers, 1982). Zamel (1985: 86) in Hyland (2003) suggested a similar view in ESL contexts stating that the teachers misinterpret student's writings, conflict in their responses, make self-assertive adjustments, compose conflicting comments, give a dubious suggestion, force unique rules, and benchmarks, react to writings as fixed and final items, and once in a while make content-specific comments or offer specific techniques for changing the writings.

Besides, the teachers overwhelmingly see themselves as language teaching as a whole rather than focusing on writing. It is suggested that written feedback can be effective if it reinforces the patterns through modeling the sort so that it gets to be a portion of the method of learning to write a class instead of an

unconstrained reaction to error. Trusscot (2007) summarized that the leading assessment is that adjustment includes a little destructive impact on students' capacity to compose precisely, and he was certain that if it has any benefits, they are exceptionally little.

It is proven that improvements produced by students are very constrained, indeed when useful unessential components are not directed. And these undesirable comes about likely overestimated the achievement of corrected groups, particularly in language structure errors. Mustafa (2012) proved that the students mostly responded negatively regarding the efficacy of feedback. The students pointed out that the feedback they recognized did not create their writing abilities, nor did it deliver unused information. The students accepted that the nature of the feedback delays the viability of criticism. It moreover found the students' disappointment with the feedback in terms of adequacy and practices. The given criticism did not accomplish the anticipated long-term points of students. In short, corrective feedback has an insignificant effect on learner writing instead it give some disadvantages to the learning process. Ellis (2008) identified that direct corrective feedback involves minimal internal processing from the learner, thus, it may not lead to long-term learning. Latifah et. al (2019) revealed that direct feedback is less effective than indirect feedback to escalate learner's' writing ability in terms of content aspect and language use aspect.

Moreover, Cook (2012) in the multicompetence theory explained that error is not a mistake when a learner fails to conform to the language of monolingual native speakers. Learner error is not viewed as deficient from the L2 users' level of language proficiency rather it is viewed as different. In short, an error is a unique feature that the learners have. It has been generated from their background both cognitively and sociocultural. Even Lasagabaster & Sierra (2005) demonstrated that a noteworthy rate of the teacher's error-correction moves went unnoticed by the learner. It may lead to one of the foremost disappointing errands for foreign-language a teacher which is adjusting the same errors time and again. One possible clarification may well be the distinctive recognitions that instructors and students have of the foremost satisfactory adjustment of errors. In any case, in numerous conditions instructors do not create nor advance enough the methodologies those students already have. It makes the opportunity to advantage from their past linguistic information is lost.

Moreover, the given direct feedback may lead the dependency on the teacher to improve their skill rather than find herself or himself to explore. It somehow contradicts the tenet of agency which requires reflective thinking. Many have explored the issue of corrective feedback for the learner. Some also have claimed that there are some advantages and disadvantages of direct corrective feedback. However, the only limit has correlated the use of corrective feedback with the concept of agency. Considering the fact above, the researcher examined the elimination of direct corrective feedback in promoting learners' agency aspect.

Method

The context of the research is in a non-formal language classroom in Indonesia consisting of three intermediate students with the researcher as a teacher as well. The intermediate learners were selected due to their ability in performing

reflective thinking. The detailed analysis such as how each learner improved and how the learners performed the language will be analyzed.

Before the research was conducted, the teacher used to conduct a monolingual class in which the learners are forced to produce English as L2 both spoken and written. The teacher always gave direct corrective feedback to the learner. However, the teacher observed that there was no significant improvement in the learner's writing ability both grammatically and lexically. It may be due to unnoticed significant feedback from the teacher or the different learner perception toward the feedback. The material given is following the syllabus of the course which is expressing of obligation and prohibition. There were three tasks given in this class. The first task is an individual project, the second is a group project, and the third is an individual project. After the learner finished the task the researcher analyzed the learner's writing improvement by analyzing the frequency and the variation of the lexical used and the grammar detail.

Primary Trait Scoring developed by Lloyd-Jones (1977) was employed to analyze the learners writing improvement. It gives advantages in providing a clear, comprehensive description of a student's writing ability for a certain rhetorical task. Normah (2006, p.212) explains this scoring method is suitable for classroom use because the teachers were given the chance to construct the rubrics depending on what trait they wanted to test on the students".

This scoring according to Salmani (2014) only focuses on a single aspect of writing and goes into detail in that particular aspect. The vocabulary used and grammar issues are the focus of this research. And the teacher only makes the rubric regarding the issues.

Findings and Discussion

In this part, the description is divided into task analysis and learners' analysis.

Task 1

The teacher first gave a simple task for the students to measure the previous writing mastery under the topic of obligation and prohibition. In the first task, the learners were instructed to write do's and don'ts related to the prevention of the Corona Virus spread. It was applied to promote aspects of the community to make learning more meaningful and to provide authentic material for the learners since it is related to their life. Lansford (2014) stated some advantages of authentic materials which are assisting learners for the 'real' world of communication, directing the learners within the requirements for a specific setting, persuading learners to communicate since they offer assistance make communication 'real'.

The result of this task is that all the learners used must and mustn't to express obligation and prohibition in their 10 sentences. In doing the task, the learners are asked to write down the unknown vocabulary and they independently found the English in a dictionary for the unknown words. The learners demonstrated their character of agency to behave autonomously. They demonstrated a capacity like a construct of behavior and capabilities which allows learners to take responsibility for their learning (Vanijdee, 2003, p.76). Besides, they performed the act of reflective learning which provides learners with an arranged opportunity to examine their learning (Verpoorten, Westera, & Specht,

2011 in Chen, et al, 2019). And they have applied specific strategies in new tasks and. (Hwang, Wu, & Ke, 2011 in Chen, et al ,2019)

Jiao (2005, p.28) pointed out some advantages of an autonomous learner. They are improving the learner's motivation and making learning more effective, providing learners with a chance to expose English communication in a non-native setting, giving the personal needs of learners at all levels, and generating an enduring impact.

After the first task finished, the teacher started to give exposure of the obligation and prohibition expression to the students using video showing do's and don't during corona as well as the reading passage. The video exposure is chosen because it can encourage simulation. It does not only provide feedback when students can watch themselves and evaluate their performance but also assists students to feel more realistic (Harmer, 2001) Besides, it can generate ideas for learners in writing (Harmer, 2007: 144). It is expected that by using video students can process the input audio-visually so they can write based on what they have seen and heard.

After showing the video and discussing the content of the text, the teacher with the students made a list of some expressions of prohibition and obligation obtained from both video and reading text. The learners were asked to note down and memorize the expressions discussed. This step may acknowledge as a step to accommodate the concept of agency. By working together both teacher and learner can reflect, theorize, and create knowledge.

Task 2

In the following days, the students in the group were asked to make a poster of do's and don't during the pandemic. From that project, the student can construct meaning together. The group-worked project has been chosen due to its effectiveness in improving the learners' writing ability (Pamularsih, 2014). Its effectiveness may result from some advantages deliberated from a group-worked project such as providing a variety of learners' backgrounds and experiences, stimulating creativity, reminding material better, giving greater satisfaction, and more easily understanding (Burke, 2011). Besides, this group project also aimed to apply the agency principle from centering on giving language input to advancing interaction within the language as pointed out by Li (2020).

Table 1. Lexical Frequency in Task 2

Expression	Frequency (%)
must	8
mustn’t	3
have to	2
are forbidden	2
to be allowed	2
don’t	1

In this task, the student still made some grammar errors such as:

1. The faulty in modal use
In this task they wrote down:
You must wearing mask

This mistake related to the use of modal occurred once from the 8 sentences they used. They write present participle instead of a based verb for following the modal.

2. Articles
In two of their 18 sentences they produced:
You must wearing mask
You wasn't allowed to go to mall.
It is indicated that the article before mask and mall was also missed.

3. Subject and verb Agreement
They also wrote:
Drinking alcohol are forbidden.
Drinking other people's bottle or glass are forbidden.
You wasn't allowed to go to mall.
You wasn't allowed to go to school.

Those examples above showed learners' mistakes in the subject and verb agreement in a sentence. The teacher reflected that the use of the word wasn't allowed for subject You is caused by the learner's overgeneralization of the use to be+ allowed. Brown (2000: 95) pointed out that to generalize implies to induce or determine a law, rule, or conclusion, ordinarily from the perception of a specific example. It showed that the learner makes an overgeneralization in the use of being. The teacher then reflected that the exposure of subject and verb agreement is needed.

To be noted in this research, the teacher did not give any corrective feedback to the learners of their mistakes. It followed the concept of agency in which it is believed that learners have linguistic competence and the teacher acknowledged it. It focuses on the whole person, specifically the cognitive and affective needs of the learner to evaluate their work. It was the realization of how the teacher encouraged the learner's reflective thinking. In this group activity, the learners constructed the language together affecting vocabulary improvement performed by the learners. It showed from the learners had already used the word crowd without checking the dictionary. Besides, the learner was proved to associate to produce the language in this group activity as well.

Task 3

The next task is an individual task in which the learners were asked to make a rule of what thing they like to encourage the student identity in the classroom. Besides, it is expected to give an impact on the learner. The effect is accomplished when materials have a self-evident impact on learners, that's when the learners' interest, intrigued, and consideration is included. If this has triumphed, there's more chance that a few of the languages within the materials will be taken in for preparation (Tomlinson, Brian, 2011).

The teacher offered the learners topic to choose to make rules for something that they were keen on. The teacher first has already identified the students' characteristics and interests. Learner's needs were considered as well. To increase achieving impact, the teacher ought to comprehend as much as conceivable almost

the target learners and to pull in their consideration (Tomlinson, Brian, 2011). Based on the learner need observation the teacher assumed that Student A was interested in business; Student B was interested in history including world war; student C was keen on laying online games. Therefore, in this task, the teacher provided choices for the student to make a rule in a world war, new company, or new online game.

Student A wrote five obligations and five prohibitions in his new company. He made his name as the company name. The lexical frequency of student A production can be seen in table 2.

Table 2. Student A Lexical Frequency in Task 2

Expression	Frequency (%)
Have to	2
Must	1
To be allowed*	2
Not + present simple	1
Don't have to	1
Can't	1

Student B wrote rules for *Nuclear War* as he was interested in historical topics and war. He produced eleven sentences with more varied modal use modal use. The lexical frequency of the student B production can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Student B Lexical Frequency in Task 2

Expression	Frequency (%)
(to be) allowed*	4
must	2
Aren't permitted	3
Must not	2

Student C wrote five obligations and five prohibitions in his new company as well instead of making rules for a game. He said it was easier to do than think about a rule in a new game. From this, it can be seen that the learner made the communication that most comprehensible for them if they were given choices. It may give a positive effect that the learner has a chance to decide and regulate what they do during the learning process. The lexical frequency of the student B production can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Student C Lexical Frequency in Task 2

Expression	Frequency (%)
Can	3
Cannot	2
Must not	1
To be allowed*	3

From the three meetings conducted by the teacher, the teacher found a more varied expression that the learners use in producing the language. From the first meeting, the learners only made use of 2 types of lexical which are must and must

not. In the following days, the learners proved to use the more varied expression. The learner lexical improvement can be seen in Table 5.

Table 4. Student Lexical Frequency Improvement

Expression	Frequency (%)		
	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3
must	8	8	3
Mustn't (must not)	6	3	3
Can			3
Cannot			3
Have to		2	1
Not have to			1
Do not		1	9
(to be) allowed		2	
(to be) forbidden		2	
(to be) permitted			3
Total sentences	**15**	**19**	**26**

This task can be used as an engaging assessment conducted by the teacher based on the principle of agency pointed out by Li (2020). It is said that to promote the tenet of agency there should be a change from preparing for exams to conducting engaging assessments. Therefore, rather than using a template of the exam the teacher tended to use this task as the assessment in learner writing ability.

Analysis of Learners' Writing Improvement

Student A

In the second meeting, he came up with the idea to write

You must wearing mask.

From the sentence, it can be seen that he still used the present participle after a modal. In the third meeting, he can produce

must maintain order

must use identity card

It shows that he began to realize the use of modal must that should be followed by a based verb. In addition to that in the third meeting, he produced longer sentences than in the first meeting. He put more prepositional phrases to expand his idea in writing.

Student B

Initially, Student C performed monotonous lexical in producing the language, he merely used the expression of must and mustn't. In the second meeting, he had the idea to use the expression of to be forbidden. Then, in the third task, he performed to be not permitted in which the teacher has never given the exposure related to the word. However based on his experience he can use the expression as well. It shows that language development is complex (Larsen-Freeman, 2006). Besides, he performed reflective thinking by relating new knowledge to previous understandings (Hwang, Wu, & Ke, 2011 n Chen, et al (2019). It can be identified that he has the previous word and implemented it in the task given. During a reflective activity, learners can develop reflective

thinking skills by (1), His writing has also developed in terms of complex sentences. In the first task, he only produced simple sentences. But in the third task, he could convey a complex sentence. He also produced more prepositional phrases to deliver his idea.

Student C

In the beginning, he has already performed well related to grammatical accuracy. However, in the third meeting, he sometimes missed the grammar detail such as

You not allowed borrowing money to company.

You not allowed make a drinking 11.00 pm until 01.00.

From the sentences above he missed the use of to be before the word allowed. However, in the same task, he wrote

You are allowed to wear other clothes.

It means that he sometimes has already made one right grammatical sentence but he just did not pay attention to grammar detail to perform the meaning-making. Besides, in the third task, he produced the word can which had never been exposed before in these three meetings. It showed that learner has their own choice in making meaning. It can also be identified that individual characteristics influenced the production of the language. As resumed in Abas, S. (2018). Moreover, it is also congruent to Carrio-Pastor (2020) which proved that the use of modal in writing academic diverse based on the writer's mother tongue. The writer tended to use some processes from their mother tongue.

Conclusion

The elimination of the corrective feedback can make the learner become more reflective thinking and be an agent of their learning process. In this research, it is proved that even though the corrective feedback was not given the leaner can still enhance their writing performance. This research has also proved that language is a complex system based on individual characteristics and background. Besides, to promote the learner agency the teacher has to consider some aspects such as method and material that can encourage the agency and reflective thinking to achieve the improvement in L2.

Even though this study has resulted positively, more exploration of that issue is still highly needed. The significance of the writing improvement made by the learners treated with and without feedback should be compared to identify the issue in depth.

References

Abas, S. (2018). Individual characteritics in second language acquisition. *Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa, 1*(1), 33–49.

Boyd, E. M., & Fales, A. W. (1983). Reflective learning. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 23*(2), 99–117. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167883232011

Broughton, G., Brumfit, C., Flavell, R., Hill, P., & Pincas, A. (2003). *Teaching English as a foreign language* (2nd Ed.). London: Routledge.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Budianto, S., Mukminatien, N., & Latief, M. (2017). The debate of written corrective feedback: What to do and where to go. *KnE Social Sciences. 1*(3), 372-378. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v1i3.758.

Burke, A. (2011). Group work: How to use groups effectively. *The Journal of Effective Teaching*, *11*(2), 87-95.

Carrio-Pastor, M. (2020). Cross-cultural analysis of English modal constructions in engineering papers. *ODISEA*, *0*(20), 75-90. https://doi.org/10.25115/odisea.v0i20.3189

Chen, M. A., Hwang, G., & Chang, Y. (2019). A reflective thinking-promoting approach to enhancing graduate students' flipped learning engagement, participation behaviors, reflective thinking and project learning outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 50*(5), 2288-2307. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12823

Cooke, S. D. (2013). Examining transcription, autonomy and reflective practice in language development. *RELC Journal, 44*(1), 75–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212473271

Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63*(2), 97–107. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach writing* (6th Ed.). Edinburg Gate: Longman.

Harmer, J. (2001). *How to teach English (An Introduction to the Practice of English Language Teaching)*. Edinburg Gate: Longman.

Jiao, L. (2005). Promoting EFL learner autonomy. *Sino-US English Teaching, 17*, 27- 30.

Lansford, L. (2014). *Authentic materials in the classroom: The advantages*. Cambridge university press.

Larsen–Freeman, D. (2012b). The emancipation of the language learner. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 2*(3), 297–309

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in the oral and written production of five Chinese learners of English. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(4), 590-619. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml029

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2005). Error correction: Students' versus teachers' perceptions. *Language Awareness, 14*(2-3), 112–127. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410508668828

Latifah, Y., Suwarno, B., & Diani, I. (2019). The effect of teachers' direct and indirect feedback on student' s writing ability. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics & Literature), 3*(2), 47-58. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v3i2.6846

Li, G. (2020). Principles for developing learner agency in language learning in a new Eduscape with Covid-19. *English Language Learning, 5*, 30-40.

Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Normah, O. (2006). *Assessment of directed writing by a group of TESL student at UPSI.* Paper presented at Prosiding Seminar Penyelidikan, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idrispator

Pamularsih, W. T. (2017). The effectiveness of group work discussion to improve the students' competence in writing descriptive text: The case of seventh grade students of SMP N 1 Tegowanu. *ETERNAL English Teaching Journal*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v5i1.1965

Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Material development in language teaching* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vanijdee, A. (2003). Thai distance English learners and learner autonomy. *Open Learning*, *18*(1), 75-84.