

ISBN 978-602-98483-7-3

PROSIDING  
SEMINAR NASIONAL  
aramasastra



*Bahasa, Sastra, dan  
Pengajarannya  
dalam Paradigma  
Kekinian*

SABTU, 1 NOVEMBER 2014  
Kampus UNESA Lidah Wetan  
Gedung T2, Lantai 3  
Auditorium Prof. Dr. Leo Idra Ardiana, M.Pd.



UNESA  
FAKULTAS BAHASA DAN SENI  
UNIVERSITAS NEGERI SURABAYA

Editor :  
**Agus Ridwan  
Ahmad Munir**

<http://semint.fbs.unesa.ac.id>

Seminar Nasional "Paramasastra"  
"Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya dalam Paradigma Kekinian"

**PROSIDING**

Penanggung Jawab : Prof. Dr. Setya Yuwana, M.A.  
Dr. Subandi, M.Litt  
Ketua : Prof. Dr. Bambang Yulianto, M.Pd  
Wakil Ketua : Dr. Ali Mustofa, M.Pd  
Editor : Ahmad Munir Ph.D  
Dr. phil. Agus Ridwan

Setting dan Layout : Tim Penerbit

ISBN 978-602-98483-7-3

Diterbitkan Oleh:

**FBS UNIVERSITAS NEGERI SURABAYA**

No. Register : 0545/B.22.3/UK/PA.2019

PENGESAHAN

Telah diperiksa keabsahannya dan  
sesuai dengan aslinya

Malang, Tgl. 25/11/2019

Universitas Keanekaragaman Malang  
Rektor,



Dr. Pieter Sahertian, M. Si

REKTORNIK. 298601102

Dilarang memperbanyak atau memindahkan sebagian atau seluruh isi buku ini dalam bentuk apapun, baik secara elektronik maupun mekanis, termasuk memfotokopi, merekam atau dengan sistem penyimpanan lainnya, tanpa izin tertulis dari penerbit.

## DAFTAR ISI

PROSIDING SEMINAR NASIONAL PARAMASAstra 2014 "Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya dalam Paradigma Kekinian"

Hari, Tanggal: SABTU, 1 Nopember 2014

Tempat: Auditorium Prof. Dr. Leo Indradriana, M.Pd. Fakultas Bahasa Dan Seni Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Penyelenggara: Fakultas Bahasa Dan Seni Universitas Negeri Surabaya

DAFTAR ISI.....	i
KATA PENGANTAR.....	iv
KOMISI KEBAHASAAN .....	1
Transitive and Intransitive Verbs in Japanese.....	1
Klasifikasi Partikel dalam Bahasa Jepang dan Aplikasinya dalam Pengajaran Bahasa Jepang .....	12
Bahasa Indonesia dalam Pendidikan di Indonesia .....	22
Beberapa Hal tentang Nomina Wajib Hadir dalam Kalimat Bahasa Jepang.....	28
Konsistensi Definisi dalam Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia.....	42
Politeness Strategy in Directive Speech Act Used by Host of Hitam Putih Talk Show (Episode "Tukang Becak Berbahasa Inggris").....	55
The Neutrality of News Entitled 'Jokowi-JK Kalah Dukungan Suara Partai Dibanding Prabowo-Hatta': A Critical Discourse Analysis.....	64
Pola Frasa Endosentrik Apositif pada Rubrik Dialog Majalah Suara Muhammadiyah (Suatu Pendekatan Sintaksis).....	77
Alih Kode dan Campur Kode dalam Kajian Kitab Kuning di Pesantren .....	88
Genre Bahasa Pada Syair Lagu Blitar Kawentar dan Mantra pada Upacara Bersih Desa di Wlingi Blitar: Sebuah Tinjauan Etnolinguistik .....	98
Pengklasifikasian kata berdasarkan kesanggupan kata mengisi unsur pusat dalam frasa endosentris .....	110
Karakteristik Bahasa Indonesia Anak Disleksia dan Kompleksitas Struktur Sintaksisnya .....	123
Fungsi Pragmatis Kalimat Statif Bahasa Jawa pada Wacana Klinis.....	125
Grammatikalisierung der präpositionalen Präfixe.....	149
KOMISI SASTRA .....	161
Kembali ke Akar .....	161
The Evil in The Scarlet Letter by Hawthorne: A Study of Guillen's Comparative Literature.....	180

Membaca Novel Bidadari-Bidadari Surga Karya Tere Liye: Independensi Seorang Laisa di Bidadari-Bidadari Surga .....	191
Membaca Gadis Pantal Karya Pramoedya Ananta Toer: Dilema Gadis Dalam Sangkar Emas .....	200
Teks Permainan Anak Oray-Orayan Analisis Struktur, Makna dan Fungsi.....	208
Moral Values in American Folktales 'Jack and the Beanstalk' .....	221
Citra Perempuan Jawa Novel Rara Mendut Karya Y.B. Mangunwijaya (Kajian Strukturalisme Genetik dan Nilai Pendidikan).....	231
Karakterisasi Melalui Gaya Bahasa dalam Kumpulan Cerpen Senyum Karya Ahmad Tohari .....	245
Perspektif Kontradiktif dalam Cerpen Perempuan Buta Tanpa Ibu Jari Karya Intan Paramaditha .....	245
Celurit Emas Modifikasi Sudut Pandang Umum .....	263
Membedah Psikologi Sastra Tokoh Utama Dalam Novel Tenggelamnya Kapal Van Der Wijck Karya Haji Abdul Malik Karim Amrullah (Hamka) .....	269
Lanskap Ekofeminisme dalam Sastra Indonesia .....	275
Memosisikan Sastra Siber Sebagai Lahan Baru dalam Penelitian Sastra Mutakhir di Indonesia ..	281
Traversing Literature in Ontological Question .....	292
<b>KOMISI PENDIDIKAN</b> .....	304
Process Analysis of the Presentation Activity in JFL Classes.....	304
Persoalan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di Lapangan .....	315
Pengembangan Pembelajaran Sastra Lokal untuk Membangun Karakter Positif Anak Sekolah Dasar .....	333
The Implementation of Scientific Approach in Teaching Writing Based on the 2013 Curriculum in Junior High School.....	344
Fabel Sebagai Bahan Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia di Sekolah Dasar .....	356
Revitalisasi Pembelajaran Teks Prosedur untuk Menumbuhkan Literasi Siswa.....	367
The Effect Of Written Feedback To Writing And Linguistics Intelligence On Students' Writing Achievement .....	374
Teaching Literature In English Classrooms Based On The 2013 Curriculum.....	382
Pengaruh Keterampilan Berbicara Terhadap Sikap Moral Yang Dimiliki Siswa SMP Kota Sukabumi ..	394
Pengembangan Buku Ajar Pengayaan Bahasa Arab Berdasarkan Kurikulum 2013.....	403
Bahasa Inggris dengan Pemahaman Lintas Budaya .....	416
Pembentukan Karakter Melalui Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab .....	428
Bias Gender Dalam Bahan Ajar Bahasa Di Sekolah Dasar Jawa Timur.....	439

## KATA PENGANTAR

Puji syukur kehadiran ilahi kami sampaikan atas terselesaikannya Prosiding Seminar Nasional Paramasastra 2014 dengan tema "Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya dalam Paradigma Kekinian" yang diselenggarakan pada hari Sabtu, 1 Nopember 2014 bertempat di Auditorium Prof. Dr. Leo Indradriana, M.Pd. Fakultas Bahasa Dan Seni Universitas Negeri Surabaya. Seminar ini diselenggarakan oleh Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni, Universitas Negeri Surabaya dalam rangka memperingati Bulan Bahasa Nasional dan Dies Natalis Unesa ke 50.

Seminar ini merupakan pengejawantahan misi FBS Unesa, yakni sebagai fakultas yang bertanggung jawab dalam menangani dan menyelenggarakan kegiatan pendidikan, penelitian, serta pengabdian kepada masyarakat dalam bidang bahasa, sastra, dan pengajarannya, baik untuk bahasa Indonesia maupun bahasa asing. Ilmu kebahasaan, ilmu kesastraan, serta pengajaran bahasa dan sastra, baik untuk bahasa Indonesia maupun bahasa asing telah berkembang pesat mengikuti paradigma keilmuan saat ini. Oleh karena itu, muncul berbagai aliran ilmu bahasa, ilmu sastra, maupun pengajaran bahasa dan sastra.

Munculnya Kurikulum 2013 memberikan warna tersendiri bagi pengajaran bahasa di sekolah sekaligus memunculkan berbagai masalah dalam penerapannya di lapangan. Kenyataan inilah yang harus dicarikan solusi untuk mendapatkan hasil pembelajaran yang efektif.

Berdasarkan hal itu, ajang kegiatan seminar ini menjadi sangat bermanfaat karena akan terjadi tukar-mempukar pengalaman dan pemikiran yang dapat dimanfaatkan bagi guru di sekolah serta ilmuwan yang sedang mengembangkan ilmu.

Prosiding ini dibagi menjadi tiga komisi yaitu Komisi Kebahasaan, Komisi Sastra, dan Komisi Pengajaran. Komisi Kebahasaan menyajikan empat belas makalah dengan rincian tiga pemakalah utama dan 11 pemakalah pendamping. Keempatbelas makalah ini mengacu pada dua sub tema "Kajian linguistik bahasa Indonesia, bahasa daerah, atau bahasa asing" dan "Hasil penelitian bidang sociolinguistik, psikolinguistik, etnolinguistik, atau linguistik forensik".

Komisi Sastra menyajikan empat belas makalah dengan rincian satu pemakalah utama dan tiga belas makalah pendamping. Keempatbelas makalah ini mengacu pada dua sub tema "Aliran sastra modern serta teori sastra dan perkembangannya, baik di Indonesia maupun di mancanegara" dan "Hasil penelitian bidang sastra, baik di Indonesia maupun di mancanegara".

# THE EFFECT OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK TO WRITING AND LINGUISTICS INTELLIGENCE ON STUDENTS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT

MUJIONO

Kanjuruhan University of Malang, Jl. S. Supriyadi No. 48 Malang  
moejie\_nova73@yahoo.com

## Abstract:

The main purpose of this study was to know the effect of written feedback and linguistics intelligence on students' writing achievement. This research was carried out in 'SMP An Nur' of Malang. A quasi experimental design was used in this study. To this end, 60 students of 2013 academic year were randomly selected. The instruments of this study were tasks which needed the students to write in English and test of linguistics intelligence. The findings showed that (1) there was a significant difference between the students who were treated written feedback and those who were audience feedback on students' writing achievement with  $P=.001<.01$  (2) There was correlation between linguistics intelligence and students' writing achievement ( $r=.419$ ;  $P=.001<.05$ ). (3) There was interaction between written feedback to writing and linguistics intelligence on students' writing achievement ( $F=5.863$ ;  $P=.019$ ). It can be concluded that giving written feedback to the students whose high linguistics intelligence was effective to improve the students' writing achievement.

**Key Words:** written feedback to writing, linguistics intelligence, and writing achievement

## 1. Introduction

English as foreign language (EFL) writing is one aspect of four language skills such as reading, writing, listening and speaking. According to Chastain (1988) writing is skill of a basic communication and a unique asset of learning a second language process. Furthermore Chastain (1988) explains that writing is an act of conceptualization which involves thinking, writing, and thinking during the process. Writing is one of the most challenging skills for L2 learners to master, and the important roles that one's multiple intelligence (MI) can play begin to evolve when we look at how the brain sets out to experience the actual act of reading and writing (Armstrong, 2003). One of one's MI playing important role to EFL learner's writing is linguistics intelligence (LI). Practically, linguistic intelligence is the extent to which an individual can use written language.

LI is a part of Howard Gardner's MI theory dealing with an EFL learner's performance to understand written language. LI can include the ability to express oneself effectively through the written word and the increased ability to learn foreign languages. In addition, information is learned effectively through the written word. Armstrong (2009), explains that LI comprised the ability of manipulating the syntax or structure

of language, the phonology or sounds of language, the semantics or meaning of language, and the pragmatic dimensions or practical uses of language. Based on Gardner (1983), children LI excel at reading, writing, telling stories, and doing crossword or other word puzzles. To support Gardner's theory, Armstrong (2009) states that a person who has LI with the high ability, they think through the words. They love reading, writing, telling stories, playing word games. In addition, they also need method of instruction such teacher's feedback to support their learning activities particularly writing English as foreign language activities.

In EFL writing instruction, teacher feedback means a variety of responses, mainly focusing on lexical, grammatical and content errors, provided by the teacher who intends to help students to improve their writing. Giving feedback by the teacher in EFL writing process is important part because writing is probably the most difficult learning task that English learners face as they have to know not only grammatical rules but also writing conventions in a specific culture such kind of organization of a paper, word choice, constructing well-formed sentence, and exploring ideas.

Reigeluth (1999) explains that feedback is a method of instruction that can foster cognitive learning. Feedback is included in one of the purposes of systematic instructional design (Goodson 1980). While Driscoll (2007) states that feedback serves two functions during learning process. First, feedback provides learners with information about the correctness of their response or performance. Second, feedback provides corrective information that can be used by the learners to modify their performance. The more feedback students receive of their works the better they understand what they need to do to correct their mistakes (Cardelle and Corno 1981). Feedback is as a crucial part in learning and instruction, including language learning and language instruction. In language learning and language instruction, including writing in English as a Foreign Language, giving feedback in students' learning is needed. Students can revise their sufficient writings on their drafts to produce a final piece of writing. In these processes, students frequently rely on feedback either from a teacher, peer, or by themselves. It is received by them from a source, or a combination of sources which provides them with information of what it is good and what needs to be improved so that they can incorporate and use the feedback in their works revisions and in the final product of their writing. A lot of studies have examined the effectiveness of feedback on EFL learner's writing performance. A few studies found that feedback are helpful and effective in improving EFL learner's writing. As Garcia (1999) points out, teacher feedback can help students become aware of errors and other writing problems which they failed to notice when they wrote their drafts. Hyland (2003) reported that feedback could serve as guidance for eventual writing development as far as students were concerned. Dealing with Hyland's finding, Carless (2006) revealed that students who receive feedback during the writing process had a clearer sense of how well they were working and what they needed to improve it. Furthermore, he confirmed that feedback might also modify either students' thinking or behavior toward their work and focus students' attention on the aim of writing. In addition, the feedback can also

provide assessment on how well the students perform their work or their accomplishment of their task.

## 2. Method

This study was an experimental research design. Pre-test, post-test, control, two-group-quasi-experimental design was applied in this study. This was allowed the application of treatment on the experimental group and comparison by control group. The investigator applied t-test to compare pre-tests and post-tests of the two groups for all the hypotheses. It was employed to test whether there were significant differences between the means. Six (6) classes used as the population and 2 classes used as the sample of the study. One of the classes was assigned as the written feedback group and the other one is the audience feedback. To this end, 60 students of 2013 academic year were randomly selected. The instruments which applied of this study were tasks which required the students to write in English and LI test. LI level measurements was done at one meeting by spreading the LI test to students, consisting of 17 statements being developed from the 4 indicators of Gardner's LI theory. Four of these indicators were the rhetoric (use of language to influence others to take action), mnemonic/rote (use of language to recall information), explanation (use of language to provide information), and metalanguage (use of language to discuss language itself). While instruments which was used to know students' writing performance, tasks were applied. The data were collected through writing test which was conducted after four (4) meetings of giving the treatments. The students were asked to write according to teacher feedback. In order to answer the interaction between written feedback and students' LI on the writing ability of the participants, a two-way test of ANOVA was run.

## 3. Findings and Discussion

Based on the result of *t test* analysis, it was revealed that mean of the students' score who were taught by providing teacher written feedback had better score of writing achievement than those who were taught by providing audience feedback. The result of *t test* showed that the significant value was  $.015 < .05$ . *t test* result analysis can be seen as the following table.

Table 1. The t-test analysis of the pre-test and post - test scores of the Experimental Group

Test Type	Mean	SD	Sig. (2-tailed)	$\alpha$	N
Pre-test	74.1000	7.73416	.015	.05	30
Post-test	79.1000	7.77862			30

Table 1 showed that  $P=.015 < .05$ . This implies that there was significant difference between the pre-test and post scores of the students in the experimental group. The

implication of this was that, the performance of the Experimental group after treatment changed for better and the change was significant.

Table 2. The t-test analysis of the Post-test scores on the overall performance of the Control and Experimental Groups.

Groups	Mean	SD	Sig. (2-tailed)	$\alpha$	N
Experiment Group	79.1000	7.77862	.001	.01	30
Control Group	72.4000	6.34959			30

Table 2 showed that  $P=.001 < .05$ . It means that the null hypothesis stated that there was significant difference between the experiment and control groups was rejected. The mean score of experiment group was (79.1000). It was greater than the mean score (72.4000) of the control group. It can be concluded that treatment had significant difference on overall writing performance. The experimental group performance of writing was better than the control one.

Table 3. Correlation analysis of relationship between LI and students' writing achievement

N	Coefficient Correlation	Determinant Coefficient	Probability	$\alpha$	Correlation Level
60	.419	17.5%	.001	.01	Sufficient

Table 3 showed that  $r=.419$  with  $P=.001 < .01$ . It means that there was a positive correlation between students' writing achievement and LI. Coefficient determinant showed that LI provided 17.5% to contribute student's writing achievement.

Table 4. F test analysis of the interaction between teacher written feedback and LI on students' writing achievement.

N	Sources	Mean square	Probability	$\alpha$	F
60	Teacher written feedback * LI	250.027	.019	.05	5.5.863

Table 4 showed that  $F=5.863$  with  $P=.019 < .05$ . It means that the null hypothesis was rejected. It can be concluded that there was an interaction between students' writing achievement and LI on students' writing achievement. Coefficient determinant showed that LI provided 17.5% to contribute student's writing achievement. It meant that the students who were provided written feedback had better their writing achievement than those who were provided audience feedback. It can be concluded that giving written feedback to the students whose high linguistics intelligence was effective to improve the students' writing achievement.

Data above showed that the average mean scores of writing of the students who were given teacher written feedback was higher than those who were given audience feedback. It was clear that teacher written feedback was consistently better than the

audience feedback. The mean scores of teacher written feedback group was consistently higher than the audience feedback. Williams (2005) reported that feedback in writing can stimulate explicit knowledge of students' achievement in writing. Furthermore, he explains that explicit knowledge as the knowledge of language rules. In terms of it, the students can articulate and provide their reasons. Dealing with his above statements, he emphasizes that students who receive feedback will resort to their prior knowledge about language and writing rules that they have learned. In terms of writing, the students can apply explicit knowledge because of stimulation of feedback on their writing. Feedback can develop students' attention on the subject they are writing. They receives feedback will pay more attention to what they have written. On the other hand, the teacher should offer opportunity for students to do self-correction and provide indirect feedback on student's grammatical errors. Chandler (2003) reported that teacher feedback in the form of underling errors could help college students to improve their writing accuracy. The results showed that the formal accuracy of student writing improved significantly if the participants were required to correct their errors than if they were not. While Brookhart (2010), described that feedback includes two factors: cognitive and motivational factors. Dealing with the writing, the teachers should not simply respond to grammar and content but should include comments of praise and encouragement in their written feedback. Weaver, (2006) observed that mitigation has been found to improve the confidence of students and lead them to be responsible for their writing Supporting effective written feedback, teachers should keep in mind that positive feedback is considered ' positive feedback ' whereas negative reinforcement is considered ' punishment ' (Brookhart, 2010: 11). Nicol and MacFarlane-Dick, (2006) explained that the use of its full potential, students must be able to self-regulate learning and lecturers have a role in encouraging and motivating this ability within students writing classes, students need teachers to check about the mistakes they made. Such as Ferris' (2003) finding that when teachers give feedback, they should show students examples of how they can apply to improve their writing and give them the opportunity to talk in class to express their ideas and to discuss any challenging analytical issues. In addition, written feedback must be done politely.

At least three reasons that teacher gives feedback on students' writing. Dealing with this, Ferris (1999) mentions three reasons why teachers shall continue giving feedback. Firstly, his surveys showed that students' opinion about teacher feedback asserts that receiving grammar correction from teachers has been of great importance. Secondly, studies on the subject of university instructors' perception of ESL students' errors in comparison with the native students' errors. Finally, students become more "self-sufficient in editing their own writing.

Dealing with written feedback in this study, the researcher was divided into two types. They were direct and indirect feedbacks. The distinction between direct and indirect feedback has been one focus of studies in the areas of writing. The term direct

feedback is used to denote instances where the writing instructor makes an explicit correction to the student's text. It is a technique of correcting students' error by giving an explicit written correction. In the term of indirect feedback Ferris, (2002) explains that when the teacher indicates that an error has been made by means of an underline, circle, code. Both feedbacks can improve your student's writing achievement, but a number of researchers think that indirect feedback is generally more appropriate and effective than direct feedback (Lalande, 1982; Frantzen, 1995). Lalande, (1982) emphasizes that indirect feedback can guide learning and help the students solve the problem by themselves. By giving feedback, students are able to express their ideas more clearly in writing and to get clarification on any comments that teachers have made (Frodesen, 2001). So, students feel that indirect feedback is useful in encouraging them to reflect on aspects of their writing and to develop improvements (Miceli, 2006). Indirect feedback can be done by a code representing a specific kind of error. Ferris (2002) describes that direct feedback in previous situations gives students the needed input and helps prevent fossilisation. It also gives them the opportunity to practice editing and correcting their own writing. Dealing with this, Chandler (2003) found that direct correction was superior to indirect feedback such as describing the type of error either with or without underlining for reducing long-term error. So it can be called that Indirect teacher feedback is very useful when it incorporated with student self-correction. Furthermore Ferris (2006) found that students utilized direct feedback more consistently and effectively than indirect types, mostly as it involves simply copying the teacher's suggestion into the next draft of their papers. However, when the teachers give direct feedback, they should give them clear explanations about grammatical errors. To increase students' writing achievement, combination between both direct and indirect feedbacks can be employed.

Another variable can contribute to increase students' writing achievement as reported in this study was linguistics intelligence (LI). This study revealed that there was positive correlation between LI and students' writing achievement. The findings showed that  $p=.001 < .01$ . To support this findings, Saricaoglu and Arican's (2009) reported that there was a significant correlation between the types of intelligences and the students' success in writing, listening, and grammar. And Hosseini (2012) found that the linguistic intelligence served as the best predictor of the writing performance of participants.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Based on the findings and discussion in previous section, it can be concluded that:

1. There was a significant difference between the score of pre-test and post test of the students in experimental group.
2. There was a significant difference between the students who were given teacher's written feedback and those who were given audience feedback on students' writing achievement.

3. There was a positive correlation between teacher written feedback and students' linguistics intelligence.
4. There was an interaction between teacher written feedback and students' linguistics intelligence on students' writing achievement.

## REFERENCES

- Armstrong, T. 2003. *The multiple intelligences of reading and writing: Making the words come alive*. Alexandria, VA, USA: ASCD.
- Brookhart, S. M. 2010 How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students. *Instructional Supervision & Evaluation: The Teaching Process*, page 10-18.
- Chandler, J. 2003 The Efficacy of Various Error Feedback for Improvement in the Accuracy and Fluency of L2 Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. Vol. 12 No. 2 page 267-296.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills*. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt Jovanovich, Inc
- Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 31No.2, page 219-233.
- Cardelle, M, & Corno, L. 1981. Effects of second language learning of variations in written feedback on homework assignments. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 15 No 3, 251-261
- Driscoll, M. P. 2007. Psychological foundations of instructional design. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and Technology* (2nd ed.), (36-44). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Ferris, D. R. and Roberts, B. (2001) Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Vol. 10 page 161-184.
- Frantzen, D. 1995 The Effects of Grammar Supplementation on Written Accuracy in an Intermediate Spanish Content Course. *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 79 page 244-329.
- Frodesen, J. 2001 Grammar in Writing. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (3rd ed.),
- Hosseini, F. 2012. A Study of the Relationship Between Iranian EFL Learners' Multiple Intelligences and their Performance on Writing. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 3 No. 1 page 111-126.
- Hyland, K. 1990. Providing productive feedback. *ELT Journal: English Language Teachers Journal*, Vol. 44 No. 4 page 279-285.
- Hyland, F. and Hyland, K. 2006 Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing. *Language Teaching*, Vol. 39 page 83-101.
- Lalande, J. F. (1982) Reducing Composition Errors: An Experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 66 No. 1 page 140-149.

- Miceli, T. (2006) Foreign Language Students' Perceptions of a Reflective Approach to Text Correction. *Flinders University Languages Group Online Review*, Vol. 3 No. 1 page 25-36.
- Nicol, D. and Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006) Formative Assessment and Self-regulated Learning: A Model and Seven Principles of Good Feedback Practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 31No. 2 page 199-218.
- Reigeluth, C. M. 1999. *Instructional design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory* Vol. 2.
- Weaver, M. R. 2006 Do Students Value Feedback? Student Perceptions of Tutors' Written Responses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 31 page 379-394.
- Williams, J. 2005. *Teaching writing in a second and foreign language classrooms*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill