

## **UPGRADING THE STUDENTS' ABILITY IN WRITING SKILL THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF DIRECTIVE FEEDBACK METHOD**

**Lisa Moulidia<sup>1</sup>, Silvi Listia Dewi<sup>2</sup>, Misnawati<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1-3</sup> Almuslim University, Bireuen

<sup>1</sup>Email: [lisamoulidia2@gmail.com](mailto:lisamoulidia2@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Email: [silvilistiadewi@umuslim.ac.id](mailto:silvilistiadewi@umuslim.ac.id)

<sup>3</sup>Email: [misnawati@umuslim.ac.id](mailto:misnawati@umuslim.ac.id)

### **ABSTRACT**

The title of this thesis is **Upgrading the Students' Ability in Writing Skill through Implementation of Directive Feedback Method to the second years students of SMAN 1 Peudada (A collaborative Classroom Action Research)**. The researcher put two problems of this research question as follows: first, how can the Directive Feedback Method upgrade the second-year students of SMAN 1 Peudada in writing skill? Second, how do the students respond toward the implementation Directive Feedback Method in learning writing skill? The purpose of this research were: first, to know the Directive Feedback Method upgrade the second year students of SMAN 1 Peudada in writing skill. Second, to indicate the student's response toward the implementation Directive Feedback Method in learning writing skill. This research was a collaborative classroom action research. The research subject was the second years students' students of SMAN 1 Peudada. The sample of this research was 25 students. The data was collected through the field note, writing test, student's observation checklist, teacher's observation checklist and questionnaire. The data was analyzed through the descriptive qualitative research. After the researcher was done all the steps of action research (cycle I and cycle II) the students' mean score increased from 61 in cycle I and became 76 in cycle II. Besides, from the observation checklist to the students' activity, it was found that the percentage of the students' participation during teaching learning process in writing class increased gradually. It was proved by the result of the observation checklist were taken at the beginning of cycle I, the percentage of the students' participation was only 50 and became 62 in cycle II. And also, the list of questionnaires given to the students indicates that the student had positive respond toward the implementation of Directive Feedback Method in writing class. It was provided by overall mean score 31,52 that was categorized to the level of Agree.

***Key of Terms: Writing Skill, Directive Feedback Method.***

## INTRODUCTION

One way for students to better retain what they've learned in class is to rewrite it in their own words, and this is exactly what writing is for in the English language learning process. Using materials provided by Teacher SMAN 1 Peudada. Students should be able to convey ideas in brief, everyday contexts using functional writing such as recounts, narratives, and procedures. SMAN 1 Peudada's curriculum stipulates that students must acquire the ability to communicate effectively in writing using the English language in a variety of settings, including formal and casual writing. Students were expected to produce writings of many genres (narrative, descriptive, how-to, etc.) in this setting. In order to pass the English course at SMAN 1 Peudada, students need an average of 75 points. This is based on the Standard of Minimum Competence (KKM) for that level. Most students, in fact, did not even reach the minimum passing grade. It's safe to say that the students' English skills, notably their writing abilities, were still inadequate. The study discovered that most students at the school had trouble learning English, particularly in writing, because they did not have a strong enough grasp of the language's lexicon. An issue was that the teacher relied solely on reading aloud from books to instruct the class, therefore the students lacked inspiration for their own writing. Because of this, it was hard to grasp the instructor's explanations as the learning process progressed. The researcher's proposed answer here is to have teachers adopt the Directive Feedback Method in order to help their students improve their writing.

Writing is one of the components that support other skills such as listening, reading, and speaking, according to Ling, who was quoted by [1]. They will need to be able to write because it is an essential ability for communicating effectively. Writing descriptive material would be quite challenging for the other students in the class.

According to Flynn and Stainthorp, who are cited in [2] "Writing is a multidimensional process that enables writers to explore concepts and ideas and make them visible and concrete." Because it encourages conversation and provides opportunity for reflection, writing is an effective tool for fostering both thinking and learning.

According to Richard and Renandia as quoted by [3] said that the writing process as a private activity may be broadly seen as comprising four stages planning, drafting, revising and editing. According to [4] stated that writing is nothing more than thought on paper-considered, organized thought.

According to [5] Paragraph is a number of sentences grouped and relating to one topic of related sentences that develop a single point. The part we can call a paragraph with single point in

paragraph itself. Paragraph is a group of related sentences that discuss only one main idea. According to Owl as quoted Andi (2009:36) clarified a paragraph as a group of closely-related sentences which deal with and develop one idea. Paragraph has been written to help the readers obtain the piece of information of writing. Paragraph helps the readers comprehend the information within the main idea and relate it to other paragraph.

[6] stated that paragraph is basic unit of organization in writing group-related sentences: a topic sentences and supporting sentences of a paragraph is not fixed but they should be sufficient to develop main idea clearly. A paragraph usually consist of more than one sentences, however it is possible to built only one sentences as one paragraph. The number of sentences in paragraph is not really important however the paragraph should be in a proper length to develop the main idea clearly.

[7] there are many kinds of text. The researcher really wanted to list them here briefly. Some kinds of text as follows: The first Descriptive Text a kind of text which functions to describe a particular person, place and thing in detail. Second, Recount Text is a kind of text, to retell events for the purpose of informing or entertaining. It means that to retell something that happened in the past and to tell a series of past event. Third, Narrative Text is to amuse, entertain, and to deal with actual of vicarious experience in different way. Narrative deals with problematic events, which lead to a crisis or turning, point of some kind which in turn find a resolution.

Next, Procedure Text is a text procedure give information about how something that accomplished through a sequence of actions or steps. This might include instruction for how to come out a task or play a game, directions for getting to a place and rules of behavior. And than Report Text is a text to describe the way things are, with reference a range of natural, man sculptured and social phenomena in our environment. News Item is a text that used to inform readers or listeners about events of the day which are considered news worthy or important. Discussion Text is a text which has the purpose to present arguments and information from differing viewpoints. The term "explanation text" refers to a type of text whose purpose is to shed light on the inner workings of some natural or socially-cultural phenomenon. A review is a piece of writing that provides constructive criticism of a work of art or an event for a general audience. Review are used to summarize, analyze and respond to art works. They may include: Movie, TV, Books, Plays, Concerts, etc. Analytical Exposition: used to persuade the readers or the listeners that something in the case, to analyzed or explain. And the last Hortatory Exposition: used to persuade the readers or the listeners that something should or should not be the case.

Based on explanation above, the researcher interest to choose a text is Descriptive Text. Here, the students will write a paragraph based on their experiences, Directive Feedback Method will help students to get a new idea to write a paragraph.

[8] Descriptive text is a paragraph that describes a particular, person, place and thing or tells how something looks and feels, and descriptive paragraph only focused on specific participants or describe parts, qualities, and characteristics. Descriptive paragraph is also as a text which says what a person or things is like or to provide enough vivid detail to help the reader create a mental picture of what is being written about.

[9] feedback is also reinforcement (reinforcement). He said that "Reinforcement means any event that increase the probability that a particular response will reoccur under similar consequences". Reinforcement means the provision of upper reinforcement events or activities that have been carried out so that these activities still able to maintain or respond to the same and on the next activity can increase again. [9] states "Feedback is sensory information that a person receives as a result of a response". Rink's feedback was more general in nature as sensory information that someone receives as a result of responding to it.

With this feedback students can also correct their own abilities, or in other words as a corrective tool to the progress of student learning itself. As for the teacher, with feedback he can know and assess the extent to which the material taught has been mastered by students [9]

The other most frequent feedback functions presented the teacher is as a tool to motivate students. In that expression briefly Rink (1985: 35) states "Feedback often serves as motivational function". The same phrase was put forward by Rink (1985: 34). Feedback serve three functions: (1) informing, (2) reinforcing, and (3) motivating. This means that feedback has three functions, namely notification or information, reinforcement, and motivation. Even so the teacher must pay attention to two things when giving feedback, namely: the first, the age of students, related to moral development, it is mean that student age is related to growth and development rate, in particular related to cognitive and mental abilities.

[10] the steps of directive feedback method in teaching writing: (1) The teacher brainstorms the students and utilize review directive feedback method. (2) After brainstorm the students, the teacher gives the topic of descriptive text. (3) The teacher asks to the students to write paragraph. (4) The students write the paragraph and prepare students carefully for peer response consistently. (5) After write the descriptive paragraph. (6) The sixth way is review directive feedback method and the students correcting the assignments among them based on the

teacher guidance so that they know what to look at in their classmates work. (7) The teacher correcting and giving the comment and feedback for the students' assignment about a piece of student writing on tapes provided by the students. (8) The last, the teacher announce the result for the students.

[10] found facts that feedback has some important roles in the writing process to develop students' writing skill. The benefits of feedback are as follows: (1) the feedback from teacher can give a general guideline to improve their writing. (2) Feedback can motivate the students in a positive way and give them confidence. (3) Feedback can help students to review their mistakes because they get transparent idea of what the students have acquired. (4) Feedback can make the students understand their strength and weakness. (5) Feedback can make the interaction between students and teacher grows stronger.

## **METHOD**

Collaborative Classroom Action Research (CAR) with the Directive Feedback Method of Implementation was used in this study. A descriptive research conducted by a teacher in the classroom, without the involvement of others, that aims to increase our understanding rather than change the phenomenon under investigation would not be considered action research by these commentators, as stated by [11]

Collaborative Classroom Action Research is defined by Asrory, who is cited in [12] as "action research in which numerous stakeholders, including the classroom instructor, are actively engaged." The purpose of doing collaborative classroom action research is to improve either the quality of teaching that actually takes place in classrooms, the theory that underpins it, or the educator's personal education and pedagogical progress.

The research takes place at SMAN 1 Peudada. The subject of the study was the second-year SMAN 1 Peudada students. There are numerous concurrent second-year classes, but the researcher chooses just one as the focus of his or her study. The researcher chose the 25-student Class X1 IPS 2 to study.

The steps involved in conducting the Collaborative Classroom Action Research (CCAR), as described by Kemmis and Taggart (1988:78), can be broken down into the following phrases for each cycle: (1) the planning of action, (2) the carrying out of that action, (3) the observation of that activity, and (4) the analyzing and reflecting on that action.

In collecting data, there are several instruments such as: (1)Test, (2)Questionnaires and (3) Observation checklist.

### Setting up the Criteria of Success

The criteria of success were setting up in order to guide whether the implementation of the action is being effective or not. Therefore, the criteria used to see whether implementation teaching writing successful or fail, there are some of criteria were as follows:

1. The students average score in writing descriptive text test was 75%or good level.
2. The students' fell happy during the teaching writing process that are measure by the questionnaire in the score of 2,00-3,00 or agree level.

### Technique of Collecting Data

In collecting data, the researcher was giving the subject of this research post test at the end of the cycle. There are one kind of test used in this research. The researcher used observation checklist to obtain information how the practice are implemented the prepared plan and procedures, especially to find information whether or not the assessment instruments prepared can be used as well as possible.

### Technique of Data Analysis

While the data gathered from the result of the students' test were analyzed quantitatively. To find the mean score of data, the researcher used formula introduced by Winarsunu (2002:32) gives the following formula below:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fx}{N}$$

Where  $\bar{x}$  = Mean score

$\sum fx$  = total score of all students'

$N$  = the number of samples

Categories:

Level 4=76-100= Excellent

Level 3=50-75= Good

Level 2=26-49= Fair

To analyzed the result of observation checklist, the researcher certain constituent introduced by Heaton (1988:146) it can be seen as follow:

Scale:

1= Very Poor = no one do

2= Poor = only some students do

3= Fair = about half students do

4= Good = most of students do

5=Very Good = all students do

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Data and Researcher Findings in Cycle 1

The beginning of the first cycle was on August 2, 2021, and its conclusion was on August 5, 2021. It was accomplished through the following steps: (1) planning the action, (2) carrying out the action, (3) monitoring the action, and (4) deliberating on the action. During the first cycle, the action was carried out in the course of three sessions by the researcher. At SMAN 1 Peudada, the purpose of the sessions was to discuss the implementation of the directive feedback approach, which aims to improve the writing abilities of second-year students. The following table summarizes the schedule of meetings held during the first cycle.

Table 4.1 The Schedule of Meetings in Cycle 1

CYCLE 1	
Meeting	Date
The First Meeting	Monday, August 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2021
The Second Meeting	Tuesday, August 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2021
The Third Meeting	Thursday, August 5 <sup>th</sup> , 2021

### Implementing of the Action

In the process of putting the action plan for the first cycle into effect. The steps involved in using the directive feedback method to teach writing are as follows: (1) The instructor facilitates group brainstorming with the students and uses review as a method of providing directive feedback. (2) After the students have participated in a brainstorming session, the instructor will present the topic of the descriptive text. (3) The instructor gives the students the assignment to write a

paragraph. (4) The students are responsible for writing the paragraph and consistently preparing themselves for peer feedback with care. (5) After that, write the paragraph describing the event. (6) The sixth approach is called the review directive feedback method, and it involves the students correcting each other's homework based on the direction of the instructor, so that they are aware of what to look for in the work of their classmates. (7) The instructor making corrections to, as well as providing commentary and feedback on, a piece of student writing that was recorded by the students themselves and submitted as part of their assignment. (8) The final statement that provides the result based on the writing scoring rubric.

### **The Data and the Research Findings in Cycle 2**

The second cycle was conducted in two meetings between the 9th and 10th of August. This cycle also included planning, implementation, analysis, and reflection, similar to the previous cycle. Using the findings from the first cycle, the Directive Feedback Method was used to design all of the activities.

All of these objectives were designed to assist students with writing descriptive texts and enhance their mastery of writing skills.

Table 4.3 The Schedule of Meeting in Cycle 2

CYCLE 2	
Meeting	Date
The First Meeting	Monday, August 09 <sup>th</sup> 2021
The Second Meeting	Tuesday, August 10 <sup>th</sup> 2021

### **Reflection**

#### **An Analysis of the Implementation of the Directive Feedback Method in the Teaching and Learning of Descriptive Text Writing**

The teaching and learning process was analyzed using information obtained from students through observation of the teacher's performance checklist and the student's observation checklist.

#### **The Analysis of Researcher Performance in Teaching Writing Through Directive Feedback Method in Cycle 2**



According to the results of the observation sheet, the researcher could do better in a few areas. The students' familiarity with writing meant that the researcher didn't need to explain the topic via the Directive Feedback Method. She was able to teach and learn efficiently and on schedule because of her time management skills. The students' descriptive writing improved secondly because they had been taught fundamentals of grammar and vocabulary. The students also knew their way around the dictionary and could easily look up the necessary terms. Researchers then used the Directive Feedback Method, in which students provided humorous captions, to foster an engaging classroom environment. The researcher may be able to force some apathetic students to take an active role in the study. At some point throughout the course of instruction, it became apparent that the classroom had a generally upbeat vibe. As a result, the research-and-teaching-and-learning process improved so long as the researcher employed the Directive Feedback Method. The classroom atmosphere improved greatly. Everyone benefited tremendously from every spare second while they worked on their projects. As a group and as individuals, the students gave it their all to succeed. The researcher had little trouble keeping the pupils on task and didn't become weary of repeating herself as she had in the classroom. The use of the Directive Feedback Method will, therefore, facilitate the educational process. The researcher's performance in the second cycle was 62%, placing them in the good criterion according to the results of the collaborator's observation checklist of the teacher's performance (see appendix 13). Thus, the researcher's performance in this cycle had met the success indicator.

### **The Analysis of the Students' Activities in Learning Writing through Directive Feedback Method of Cycle 2.**

Student activity during the writing instruction and learning process was assessed based on data collected from observation checklists and field notes. The second cycle's use of the Directive Feedback Method helped boost student descriptive text writing in a number of ways. They did; for starters, they got a lot of information out of the picture. Second, they were able to compose an efficient descriptive paragraph with the help of a dictionary and some elementary text-related grammar. Third, they accomplished the mission successfully by providing constructive criticism to one another. Students' ability to produce descriptive writing improved greatly as a result of the associating session, when they completed projects independently, shared their work with classmates, and received feedback. Students' participation in class has increased once they began using the Directive Feedback Method to learn to write. The observation checklist and field notes

showed that when the same approach was used for both teaching and learning, both the process and the outcome improved. According to the observation checklist (see appendix 10), the total score for the second cycle's two meetings, as given by the collaborator, is 62. This shows that the students participated actively and were enthusiastic about learning this method. In conclusion, the criteria for students' performance in cycle 2 were appropriate. Thus, it had accomplished its intended purpose.

### **The Analysis of Student Learning Results**

The cycle 2 post-test was held on Tuesday, October 10th, 2021. The test was designed in a format that described the image in writing descriptive text format. The results of tests were analyzed to see and evaluate the effect of using the Directive Feedback Method on the student's ability to write descriptive text. The analysis of the students' improvement in terms of individual score after using the revised method was then performed. This was done to see if the students' scores met the success indicators. This means that the researcher did not agree to move on to the next cycle if the students' scores exceeded the success indicators. Students' post-cycle 2 test scores and mean percentage gains are detailed in the table below ( see appendix 6) Using the same formula as in cycle 1, the researcher estimated the students' average gain in score divided by the total number of students.

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum fx}{N}$$
$$\bar{x} = \frac{1,922}{25}$$
$$\bar{x} = 76,88$$

It is clear that the students' mean score had increased to 76,88, indicating that they had met the success indicator of 75. As a result, the researcher did not need to proceed to the next cycle. Furthermore, it was discovered that the mean score of the students' post-test results for cycle 2 was 76,88 or 76 percent higher than the cycle 1 61,6 or 61 percent. It indicates that the students' writing abilities have improved.

### **Field Note**

Based on the collaborator observations of class activities, the researcher was able to get some lecture notes. The study found that when teachers helped their students with the grammar and some of the more difficult words, but not all of them, students had a better grasp of descriptive writings and were better prepared to write the next one. The study participants performed better when working independently, the researcher found. They were obviously paying attention and

taking part in class discussions. They looked up challenging terms in the dictionary and made an effort to use them in grammatical phrases. In addition, the teacher paid special attention to a few of the more apathetic and interfering students', and on multiple occasions visited with them, accompanied them, and inspired them to become more involved in the group's activities. The students' descriptive writing, activity, and creativity had all increased by the second meeting, and the researcher had seen fewer grammatical and vocabulary errors.

### Questionnaires

Data retrieval from the classroom is accomplished through the use of questionnaires. Two meeting cycles after the researcher has implemented the research. The researcher gave out a survey to the class to get their feedback on the methodology. The researcher distributed a questionnaire with a list of ten questions. The students were instructed to cross the options (a, b, c, and d) in the provided options that related to the learned method. The choice was crossed honestly and without repression. The questions were asked in four different ways: strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree statements about the activities ad test in order to determine whether or not students were active in the teaching and learning process.

The students completed the questionnaires using the Surapranata (2004:56) scale as follows:  
Table 4.5 The Mean Score of the Students' Responses to the implementation of Directive Feedback Method.

No	Variable Measured	Questionnaires Number	Total Score	Mean Score
1	Interested to the lesson	2,3,4,7	14,24	11,57
2	Easy to comprehend the lesson	1,5,9	10,36	8,17
3	Brave to give opinion	6,8,10	10,56	8,11
	Total Score		35,16	27,85
	Average		11,72	9,28

It was discovered that the result of the students' perceptions and their responses toward the implementation of the Directive Feedback Method in writing skill can be interpreted as follows based on the table that was presented earlier in this section:

1. The level of interest shown by the students in the lesson that was about writing text through the use of the Directive Feedback Method was 11.57.
2. The level of difficulty for the students to comprehend the lesson was an 8.17.
3. The students' willingness to voice their opinions in descriptive writing ranged from 8 to 11.

### **Reflection**

Both of the learning outcomes were analyzed as part of the process. The implementation of the method in the teaching and learning process occurred in three phases: pre-teaching, main-teaching, and post-teaching. The evaluation of the learning process centered on the activities that were carried out by the students during each of these phases. When evaluating the effectiveness of the learning product, the primary focus was on the students' level of comprehension and their ability to write.

Based on the findings of the study, and taking into account the findings of the study regarding the process of teaching and learning, there are two different progressions. To begin, the examination of the teaching and learning process performed extremely well. During the first and second cycle, the vast majority of students were actively participating in the teaching and learning process. It was clear from the results of the assessments in both cycles that the students had made significant progress in their writing ability. The students average proficiency in writing improved from 61 in the first cycle to 76 in the second. In conclusion, on the basis of the findings presented above, we can say that the students' accomplishment of improving their writing ability through the use of the Directive Feedback Method and the process of teaching and learning have met the criteria for success. In light of this fact, the action research was carried out to its conclusion.

### **Discussion**

This study's results showed that students' capacity to write descriptive prose increased after they were exposed to the Directive Feedback Method. It is important that the researcher adhere to a specific protocol. The idea of the Directed Feedback Method needs to be explained to the students in a way that is easily understood by them in order to ensure that they have a solid comprehension of the technique that is being used. During the process of carrying out the action, it was discovered that the typical level of performance exhibited by the teacher in cycle I was approximately 61,6, but that level rose to 76,88 in cycle II.

According to the findings of the investigation into the procedure of teaching and learning, the Directive Feedback Method resulted in very high levels of student motivation for the development of their writing skills. Most students' interest in writing improved after being taught using the Directed Feedback Method. The average activity level of the pupils was found to be 61.6% during cycle I and 76.8% during cycle II, according to the observation checklist. This data was gathered. If this is the case, then the goals set for the teaching and learning have been met. Because

of this, we decided the success was overall. The students' post-test results showed, among other things, an increase in their mean score from 61.6% in cycle I to 76.8% in cycle II on an assessment of their ability to write descriptively. That all the prerequisites for the product's success have been met is an indication of that.

## CONCLUSION

The following conclusion was reached by the researcher as a result of their investigation:

- 1) Students' capacity to compose vividly illustrative prose increased after being exposed to the Directive Feedback Technique. The results of the students' examinations show that they have improved with each cycle, from a mean score of 61.6 in cycle I to a mean score of 76.88 in cycle II. It satisfies the success criteria that are set at 1 or more.
- 2) The teacher's effectiveness in her classroom as a result of using the Directive Feedback Method with her students' writing improved. According to data gathered from an activity observation sheet, 3.61 out of 5 (or the middle) is about how well teachers performed in the first cycle. The instructor scored a 6.75 out of 10 in the second cycle, placing them in the good category. What this means is that the instructor can improve the quality of her writing classes by using the Directive Feedback Method.

## REFERENCES

- [1] V. P. H. Pham, "The Effects of Collaborative Writing on Students' Writing Fluency: An Efficient Framework for Collaborative Writing," *SAGE Open*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2021, doi: 10.1177/2158244021998363.
- [2] Nurrachma and Misnawati, "Improving Students' Ability in Mastering Writing Through Capitalization, Overall, Punctuation, Spelling (Cops) Strategy to the First Year Students of SMAN 1 PEUDADA," *J. Sains Ekon. dan Edukasi*, vol. V, no. 2, pp. 23–28, 2017.
- [3] A. and H. Oshima, *Witing Academic English 3rd Edition*. 1999.
- [4] M. Oslon and M. Kapović, "Vowel lengthening in Juraj Križanić's subdialect in comparison with Čakavian and Kajkavian data," *Slav. Balk. Linguist.*, no. 3, 2019, doi: 10.31168/2658-3372.2019.3.8.
- [5] M. Sharma Yadav, "Role of the Transformational Generative Grammar and other Language Learning Theories in English Language Teaching," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2020, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3567848.
- [6] A. Oshima and A. Hogue, *Writing Academic English, Fourth Edition*. 2006.
- [7] M. A. D. Syahputra and N. Mahdiana, "ANALYSIS OF HISTORY TEXTBOOKS BASED ON BENEDICT ANDERSON'S APPROACH," *HISTORIKA*, vol. 22, no. 2, 2019.
- [8] L. M. Luengo Pérez, J. M. Urbano Gálvez, and M. Pérez Miranda, "Validación de

- índices antropométricos alternativos como marcadores del riesgo cardiovascular,” *Endocrinol. y Nutr.*, vol. 56, no. 9, 2009, doi: 10.1016/S1575-0922(09)72964-X.
- [9] M. Wang and Y. Zhang, “‘According to...’: The impact of language background and writing expertise on textual priming patterns of multi-word sequences in academic writing,” *English Specif. Purp.*, vol. 61, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.esp.2020.08.005.
- [10] D. Carless and D. Boud, “The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback,” *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.*, vol. 43, no. 8, 2018, doi: 10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354.
- [11] A. Prihantoro and F. Hidayat, “Melakukan Penelitian Tindakan Kelas,” *Ulumuddin J. Ilmu-ilmu Keislam.*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2019, doi: 10.47200/ulumuddin.v9i1.283.
- [12] Z. Zuraini, M. Misnawati, A. Lisa, and E. Nofriati, “Boosting the Students in Mastering Writing Skill Through the Implementation of Ppie (Point, Presentation, Illustration, Explanation) Technique,” *J. Cult. (Culture, Lang. Lit. Rev.)*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 100–111, 2021, doi: 10.53873/culture.v8i1.230.