

## REFERENCES

- Ariyanto, M. S. A., Mukminatien, N., & Tresnadewi, S. (2021). College students' perceptions of an automated writing evaluation as a supplementary feedback tool in a writing class. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 27(1), 41. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um048v27i1p41-51>
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Barrot, J. S. (2020). Integrating technology into ESL/EFL writing through Grammarly. *RELC Journal*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220966632>
- Bridgeman, B., Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2016). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Buku Panduan Akademik Fakultas Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara Tahun Akademik 2021/2022.
- Trapani, C., & Attali, Y. (2012). Comparison of human and machine scoring of essays: Differences by gender, ethnicity, and country. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 25(1), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08957347.2012.635502>
- Creswell, J.W (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J., & Plano Clark, V. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*, (3rd ed.,). Thousand Oaks: Sage
- 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(3), 267–296.
- Cohen, A. D., & Cavalcanti, M. C. (1990). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing:*

- Research insights for the classroom (pp. 155-177). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- C. P. D. (1979). [Review of *L. S. Vygotsky: Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes; Recent trends in Soviet psycholinguistics*, by L. S. Vygotsky, M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, E. Souberman, & J. V. Wertsch]. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 92(1), 166–167. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1421493>
- Dewi, U. (2019). Peer feedback in reviewing essay. *SALTeL Journal (Southeast Asia Language Teaching and Learning)*, 2(2), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.35307/saltel.v2i2.26>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Fahmi, M. A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2021). EFL students' perception on the use of Grammarly and teacher feedback. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 6(1), 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v6i1.849>
- Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588049>
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*. SAGE Publications Limited.
- Fithriani, R. (2018). Cultural influences on students' perceptions of written feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.3124>
- Fithriani, R. (2019). ZPD and the benefits of written feedback in L2 writing: Focusing on students' perceptions. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 19(1), 63–73.
- Gao, J., & Ma, S. (2020). Instructor feedback on free writing and automated corrective feedback in drills: Intensity and efficacy. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820915337>
- Ghufron, M. (2019). Exploring an automated feedback program 'Grammarly' and teacher corrective feedback in EFL writing assessment: Modern vs.

- traditional assessment. *Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> English Language and Literature International Conference, ELLiC, 27<sup>th</sup> April 2019, Semarang, Indonesia*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.27-4-2019.2285308>
- Guo, Q., Feng, R., & Hua, Y. (2021). How effectively can EFL students use automated written corrective feedback (AWCF) in research writing? *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 0(0), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1879161>
- Hassanzadeh, M., & Fotoohnejad, S. (2021). Implementing an automated feedback program for a foreign language writing course: A learner-centric study. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 37(5), 1494–1507. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12587>
- Hentasmaka, D., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2021). Peer feedback uptakes and outcomes across EFL students' proficiency levels: A study at tertiary education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(3), 271–286. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14316a>
- Huisman, B., Saab, N., van den Broek, P., & van Driel, J. (2019). The impact of formative peer feedback on higher education students' academic writing: A Meta-Analysis. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(6), 863–880. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1545896>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Iswandari, Y., & Jiang, Y. (2020). Peer feedback in college EFL writing: A review of empirical research. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 23(2), 399–413. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v23i2.2799>
- Jiang, L., & Yu, S. (2020). Appropriating automated feedback in L2 writing: Experiences of Chinese EFL student writers. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1799824>
- Jiang, L., Yu, S., & Wang, C. (2020). Second language writing instructors'

- feedback practice in response to automated writing evaluation: A sociocultural perspective. *System*, 93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102302>
- Karlina Ambarwati, E. (2021). Indonesian university students' appropriating *Grammarly* for formative feedback. *ELT in Focus*, 3(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.35706/eltinf.v4i1.5216>
- Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294–304. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/44.4.294>
- Lai, Y. H. (2010). Which do students prefer to evaluate their essays: Peers or computer program. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(3), 432–454. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.00959.x>
- Levi Altstaedter, L. (2018). Investigating the impact of peer feedback in foreign language writing. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(2), 137–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2015.1115052>
- Levine, G. S., Glenn S., Phipps, A. M., & American Association of University Supervisors, C. (2012). *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy*. 241.
- Li, Z. (2021). Teachers in automated writing evaluation (AWE) system-supported ESL writing classes: Perception, implementation, and influence. *System*, 99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102505>
- Liao, H. C. (2016a). Using automated writing evaluation to reduce grammar errors in writing. *ELT Journal*, 70(3), 308–319. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv058>
- Liao, H. C. (2016b). Enhancing the grammatical accuracy of EFL writing by using an AWE-assisted process approach. *System*, 62, 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.02.007>
- Link, S., Mehrzad, M., & Rahimi, M. (2020). Impact of automated writing evaluation on teacher feedback, student revision, and writing improvement. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 0(0), 1–30.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1743323>

- Liu, C. H., & Matthews, R. (2005). Vygotsky's philosophy: Constructivism and its criticisms examined. *International Education Journal*, 6(3), 386–399.
- Mackey, A. and Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research: methodology and design*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Matsumura, S. & Hann, G. (2004). Anxiety and students' preferred feedback methods in EFL writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(3), 403–415.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.
- Miranty, D., Widiati, U., Cahyono, B. Y., & Sharif, T. I. S. T. (2022). The effectiveness of using *Grammarly* in teaching writing among Indonesian undergraduate EFL students. *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Language, Education, and Culture (ISoLEC 2021)*, 612(ISoLEC), 41–45.  
<https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211212.008>
- O'Neill, R., & Russell, A. M. T. (2019). Stop! grammar time: University students' perceptions of the automated feedback program *Grammarly*. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 35(1), 42–56.  
<https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.3795>
- Ranalli, J. (2021). L2 student engagement with automated feedback on writing: Potential for learning and issues of trust. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100816>
- Ryan et al., (2016). Interviewing in qualitative research. *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*. 16 (6),  
<https://doi.org/10.12968/ijtr.2009.16.6.42433>
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Shang, H. F. (2022). Exploring online peer feedback and automated corrective feedback on EFL writing performance. *Interactive Learning*

- Environments*, 30(1), 4–16.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1629601>
- Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, 52(1), 119–158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00179>
- Su, W., & Huang, A. (2021). More enjoyable to give or to receive? Exploring students' emotional status in their peer feedback of academic writing. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 0(0), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.2004389>
- van Beuningen, C., de Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. *ITL - International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 156(December), 279–296. <https://doi.org/10.2143/itl.156.0.2034439>
- Vardi, I. (2009). The relationship between feedback and change in tertiary student writing in the disciplines. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(3), 350–361. <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>
- Waer, H. (2021). The effect of integrating automated writing evaluation on EFL writing apprehension and grammatical knowledge. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1914062>
- Wang, J., & Brown, M. S. (2008). Automated essay scoring versus human scoring: A correlational study. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 8(4), 310–325.
- Yin, R. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods* (1st ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing



## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1

#### TEACHING SYLLABUS

#### JURNAL PERKULIAHAN

Dosen Pengampu  
Matakuliah  
Semester/Kelas  
Program Studi

★  
: Scientific Writing  
★  
: TADRIS BAHASA INGGRIS

Pert.	Sesi	Ruangan	Materi Kuliah	Kegiatan	Catatan
1	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Introduction	Presentation and discussion on course syllabus and contract	
2	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Critical reading and writing	Presentation and discussion on how to read and write critically	
3	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Critical reading and writing	Selecting the reading article to report	
4	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Writing Evaluation from Grammarly	Students learn how to operate Grammarly to receive feedback on their writing.	
5	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Writing Evaluation from Peers	Students learn how to provide and receive feedback from their peers.	
6	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Practices	Students practice operating Grammarly and providing feedback with their peers	
7	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Writing a critical reading response: Outlining and drafting essay	Students draft their critical reading response essay	
8	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Mid-Semester Test	Students submit their mid-term paper	
9	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Writing a critical reading response	Students write a critical reading response individually	
10	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Writing a critical reading response: Peer feedback provision	Students provide and receive feedback on their draft	
11	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Writing a critical reading response: Peer feedback provision	Students provide and receive feedback on their draft	
12	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Writing a critical reading response	Students write a critical reading response individually	
13	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Writing a critical reading response: Writing revision and editing	Students revise the content and proofread the mechanics on their writing	
14	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Writing a critical reading response: Peer feedback provision	Students provide and receive feedback on their draft	
15	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Writing a critical reading response: Finishing	Students finish their critical reading response	
16	Sesi-8	Ft. Cr.3.13	Final Semester Test	Students submit their final test paper	

1/2

\*Due to confidentiality concerns, certain information has been withheld

### APPENDIX 2