W Total Words **5202**	**C** Total Characters **32993**		
P Plagiarized Sentences **97**	**U** Unique Sentences **223**	**30%** Plagiarized	**70%** Unique

Content

Universal Journal of Educational Research 8(11): 5388-5394, 2020 http://www.hrpub.org DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2020.081141 The Impact of Digitally Regulated Peer Corrective Feedback (CF) on Students' English Writing Bambang Agus Darwanto*, Herman Dwi Surjono, Dyah Setyowati Ciptaningrum School of Graduate Studies, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia Received July 21, 2020; Revised August 19, 2020; Accepted September 29, 2020 Cite This Paper in the following Citation Styles (a): [1] Bambang Agus Darwanto, Herman Dwi Surjono, Dyah Setyowati Ciptaningrum , "The Impact of Digitally Regulated Peer Corrective Feedback (CF) on Students' English Writing," Universal Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 8, No. 11, pp. 5388 - 5394, 2020. DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2020.081141. (b): Bambang Agus Darwanto, Herman Dwi Surjono, Dyah Setyowati Ciptaningrum (2020). The Impact of Digitally Regulated Peer Corrective Feedback (CF) on Students' English Writing. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 8(11), 5388 - 5394. DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2020.081141. Copyright©2020 by authors, all rights reserved. Authors agree that this article remains permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License Abstract This qualitative research investigated if corrective feedback (CF) through a digitally regulated collective evaluation mechanism can generate appropriate revisions in the student's English essays regarding 1 . Introduction language components. The research used a self-developed learning management system (LMS). Students of an The idea to develop a new learning management system Academic Writing class participated in the study and were (LMS) with e-portfolio functionalities was initially required to upload 5-paragraph essays to the LMS and motivated by the fact that teacher-student single traffic participate in giving CF. The minimum words for every paper correction was sometimes found uninteresting and text and the minimum evaluators for each essay were less beneficial to both the students and the teacher. The set-up digitally. Learning artifacts of three students were students have to wait for long to get feedback from their randomly selected using an MS Excel formula and then teacher, which is usually given in prints with the teacher's content-analyzed for the CF of language aspects using marks here and there and they are composed of NVivo12. The peer CF was then traced back in the final single-angle input to improve the students' knowledge and essay. Results show that most of the final revisions do not skills of English. Actually, the teacher can involve other take on the CF from peers especially regarding the students to push participation to promote language practice high-order feedback like content (idea), organization, and and to provide richer feedback. However, when carried out diction. However, such low-order feedback as typo, in prints this idea will be highly cumbersome. In the capitalization errors, subject-verb agreement, and traditional assessment practice, correcting writing works is preposition-noun agreement are identified in the revisions. commonly done on paper and is carried out by the teacher In conclusion, not all peer-CFs were adopted and the only. low-order CF is found more pronounced than the Then, some teachers at the school where this research high-order one. The finding suggests that online collective was conducted tried to find LMSs to complement this weak point. They searched for a medium for collective CF with a regulated mechanism to an extent can trigger evaluation practice. Some tried to use the Google editing skills especially when focused on the low-order Classroom and Schoology, and some others prefer using errors. Moodle Cloud to mediate this idea. However, integrating a Keywords Corrective Feedback (CF), High-order vs. systemic continuous collective evaluation into the LMSs is Low-order CF, Language Components, Collective not yet possible. They have not been equipped with a Evaluation feature to enable all students in an across classes to get Universal Journal of Educational Research 8(11): 5388-5394, 2020 5389 involved in providing CF and other suggestions to a project, corrective feedback to language learning and studies on one that all system inhabitants can view and give recorded corrective feedback (CF) have been found abundant. In the comments or evaluation. The peer-evaluation receivers can research, CF is usually mainly given by the class teacher as improve their work in the self-evaluation page based on all reported by [3], [2], [4], and [5]. the received evaluative words. For this reason, the new There are also researches on the benefits of corrective LMS was then developed. feedback with peers as the feedback providers as reported Research about the impact of systemic and sustainable by [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], and [11]. For instance, a study online collective CF via an asynchronous technology of an carried out by [12] found out that using technology and the LMS is new. Asynchronous e-learning is a internet in teaching writing could increase students' learner-centered learning approach that takes the participation and collaboration. Also, [13] similarly wrote advantage of computer-mediated communication (CMC) that peer feedback encourages students to hold one another and employs online resources to provide information of the work and to see each other as collaborators. sharing not limited by time, place, and the constraints of Furthermore, [9] noted that peer feedback has proven to be the classroom [1]. Asynchronous e-learning emphasizes an effective means of aiding writing development since it the importance of peer-to-peer interaction and can actively involves learners in the learning and teaching promote active-interactive discussions. However, the process. In all these studies, however, CF is not yet module for discussion in a LMS is usually provided in the systemically pushed. In addition to this, it has not been form of "Question" and then the groups or the whole class clear yet what the teacher did when students were not members can give responses. Students cannot yet access interested in joining the CF activity. and give evaluative comments to all posts by all students Furthermore, in the aforementioned works, the in the discussion forum, the teacher's tech-based peer CF mechanism that can incorporate role is not yet clear whether s/he serves as an students of intra-class and inter-class within a LMS to rater) or simply another commenter. collectively provide CF to a

learning evidence needs to be In the new LMS for this study, students are given explored. The idea of collective evaluation mechanism has privileges to view their peers' posts of their interest and been made possible with the advent of online give feedback. Students by system or automatically have to teaching-learning technology, and this tech-aided process comply with the systemically demanded activities of teaching and learning can be facilitated with a learning otherwise, the collective completion of the posted project management system (LMS) to serve as a virtual ecology cannot be fulfilled. This is because the system dictates that for evaluative interactions. By collective evaluation, it is a one's negligence (poor collaborators) can risk every process of feedback-giving by not only the class members student's online processes that have been set-up digitally but also by the other students (and teachers) of other and it will risk the collective success. classes so long as they are all registered in one technological ecology or one collectively-shared LMS. 2. Theoretical Perspectives This should be highly probable by integrating the functionalities of an e-portfolio into a LMS. Evaluation of the student's works of English provided by According to [14], a digital LMS is of two kinds: the teacher and inside a classroom is necessary yet never synchronous LMS and asynchronous LMS. The latter is sufficient. In the traditional learning model, the feedback is intended to support the learning activities such as the singly provided by the teacher whereas there should be provision of learning materials, a discussion forum, tests, other feedbacks that may also be worth considering. In and assignments, and the assignment features are the addition to this, reciprocally, other students can ripe common features among the LMSs; however, such benefits from giving their views about their own learning straightforward functionalities as those offered by an evidence and others'. They can create output for new input e-portfolio are not yet found in them. A module that allows both for himself and for other students. Students can be the system's members including students and teachers provided with chances to get evaluative-corrective within one class and across classes to evaluate a student's feedback from the teacher himself and from peers and this project is not yet commonly found. Many LMSs do not yet idea is now made possible with the help of online give the privilege to all students in the class let alone in technology. other classes to view a work and to give feedback to the The term feedback in this research is any reactions work. positive and negative towards students' learning evidence As for this new e-portfolio LMS, first, it is built on the intended to provide responses for work or competence web platform to ease up access and operation and can allow improvement provided directly or indirectly. And, all artifacts to be shared within the LMS both in and across feedback giving can be classified into its direct and classes. Second, this LMS architecture enables all system indirectness [2], types of media (offline vs. online), inhabitants to communicate in every interactional phase, involved parties (teachers, students, or both). from the project submission (upload) to the scoring phase A growing body of studies shows the strategic values of in one evaluative cycle as illustrated below. 5390 The Impact of Digitally Regulated Peer Corrective Feedback (CF) on Students' English Writing Figure 1. One-cycle Collective CF Mechanism The interaction process starts with the initial (presage) different activities by different system inhabitants. learning phase that is composed of feeding the system and Through the colors, the teacher, the peers, and the students validating the upload. In the body of the process, students are pushed to provide the demanded action. Each of the and teachers are involved in rich interactions by giving colors appears on each of the progress pages of the online comments, evaluation, self-reflection, and extending score interaction with one's upload serving as an object of the petition. As for the conclusion phase, students can print discussions. By looking at the colors, the lecturer in charge both their transcript containing the titles along with their (LiC)/teacher and the students and peers can always scores and the certificate of all cycles completion. The monitor up to which stage their project has been processing LMS allows other classes to participate in the including whether it has been appropriately peer-evaluated. internet-mediated communication (IMC). When one class Students are involved in the online CF in cyclical steps. runs, other students and teachers in other classes who have Each step requires different activities depending on the been registered in the system and interested in the upload learning evidence that the students have fed into the system. (texts, videos, images, and audios) can read, view, watch, The types of corrective feedback to texts can be different and give evaluative comments to the project. This way, the from that of a video, audio, or images. presence of readers or viewers, and even evaluators of a Corrective feedback is also known as peer feedback, project, an artifact, or learning evidence can be guaranteed. peer review, or peer evaluation. [9] noted that it can In the system, the artifact of English use must receive effectively help aid writing development because it evaluations from the teacher, peers, and the student himself. involves learners in the teaching and learning process in the If a project has received a minimum number of evaluators, classroom. They continued that CF can also enhance project evaluation completion can be guaranteed. The LMS learner autonomy, cooperation, interaction, learning can also admit videos, audios, or images. It can responsibility, and collaboration and these benefits can be accommodate all kinds of media formats. Students can promoted by using e-portfolio learning mechanism. choose any uploads of his preference to evaluate. E-portfolio-based learning design has proven to bring Collective evaluation can be given to any artifacts of any of various benefits to teaching and learning as reported in [15] these formats. and since digital portfolio brings various benefits Cram et To maximize language interaction, this LMS carries a al. [16] suggest the integration of e-portfolio into a hold-system mechanism through which students and the curriculum. This is to upload, organize, store, showcase, teacher are systemically pushed to give provide chances for feedback from peers and teachers to feedbacks/comments/evaluations to the uploaded project. improve the 'product' quality. This mechanism helps push teachers to be responsive to Research by [17] investigated assessment through an students' uploads. This hold-system mechanism dictates or e-portfolio. The study investigated the impact of preconditions that the required activity is met by each e-portfolio assessment on students' writing performance. corresponding system's member so that one project can be The experimental group was given a treatment of released to reach the scoring phase. Ignoring the required e-portfolio assessment, while the control group was given responses can end-up in project holding. It will be held traditional methods of teaching and assessing students' immovable until the necessary reaction is provided. In this writing. After logging into the Telegram app, the students way, the presence of evaluators is guaranteed. This in the experimental group wrote up each of the assignments mechanism can ensure that every project is viewed in a single post. Other students and the teacher put (watched), read, listened, commented, and evaluated. With comments and gave error correction. The results showed this mechanism, language production, online interactions, that the experimental group outperformed the control and collaborations can be promoted. group and it proves that e-portfolio assessment can develop This mechanism uses numerical settings and the project students' writing skills and can raise learning motivation. progress is notified using colors. The colors are to indicate In this research, however, collective error correction in the the current interactional movement of an artifact. Different assessment process has not been illustrated as to which colors (grey, red, yellow, blue, green, black, and pink) call correction was actually accepted and reflected in the final Universal Journal of Educational Research 8(11): 5388-5394, 2020 5391 document. Are all the corrective feedbacks worth selected randomly to be content-analyzed. The random considering by the student? This is because students do not selection was conducted using the formula of the MS Excel: commonly consider their peer's comments as worth =INDEX($A$2:$A$18,RANDBETWEEN(1,COUNTA($ attending compared to their teacher's feedback let alone A$2:$A$18)),1). When applied to the list of the students, when the teacher's comments and correction are given this formula would give one name for each click and the simultaneously with the comments from the students, for process was repeated 3 times to get 3 students. this can be pre-empting or priming similar responses from C. The analysis his students themselves. CF can be very straightforward attending simple, factual, The text data were downloaded from the interlanguage and readily detected errors in linguistic aspects such as corpus storage in the LMS and the datasets were composed capitalization of an initial word of a sentence, spelling, of (1) the original drafts, (2) the validation comment by the verbal-nominal distinction, passive-active cases, and other teacher, (3) the CF from peers (peer-evaluation data), (4) similar errors. The feedback is highly uncomplicated to the CF from the teacher, and (5) the revised essays. process and in this sense, it belongs a low-order CF. Some This research looked at only three different datasets: CF can be too vague to pinpoint to follow

such as, "Your original essays, CF from peers, and final essays. The writing needs improvement". This type of CF belongs to dataset of the CF was content-analyzed through the coding high order feedback that is hard to take on. process using NVivo12. The codes were of the five language aspects by [18] of (1) content, (2) language use, (3) organization, (4) mechanics, and (5) vocabulary as 3. Research Questions presented below. This study was to find out answers to the following Table 1. Areas of Corrective Feedbacks research question: No. Aspects Focus of the Aspects   Do CF receivers take on their peers' CF into the final 1 Content Relevance to topic and topic development essay? 2 Organization Logical sequencing, coherence, cohesion Range of words and idioms and the 3 Vocabulary 4. Research Method appropriateness Agreement, tense, number, word order, Language 4 articles, pronouns, prepositions, run-ons, A. Participants use and fragments, etc. Sixteen students of an Academic Writing class Capitalization, punctuation, spelling, 5 Mechanics participated in the study. These students were those in their paragraphing, etc. second-to-final semester, which means that they were The CF datasets were coded according to the 5 areas by already holding a TOEFL prediction score of min 475 as [19] and the results were then traced in the final essay to required by the English department as a prerequisite to find out if proofs of relevant corrective input were attested. register in the semester. But before being traced, the initial draft and the final work B. The procedures were compared for a text similarity test using the CopyLeaks application. This was to ensure that there were The students were required to construct 5-paragraph differences detected in the two texts, otherwise a further argumentative writing of any topic of their interests. This process of analysis on the particular text would not be strategy of topic selection should avoid learning undertaken. When differences were found, tracing over the apprehension since they were writing something they are CF of the 5 English language aspects as given by the peers interested in and familiar with. This should lessen students' in the final text were continued. This was to prove if the CF anxiety. was taken on. After being uploaded (published) into the LMS, the essay was readily viewable by all LMS inhabitants including those in other classes yet still within the system. 5. The Findings Students may click "My Class" or "All Classes" to view any topic of interest. As for the guidance for writing, it was All students submitted the required 5-paragraph presented as pop-up help. When they were writing, it argumentative essays into the system and all had would be dropping down on the screen and remain there undergone the grammar and plagiarism check as required until the student closed the help box. When uploads and by the LMS procedures. Furthermore, their works were peer CF were completed, the artifacts that they had made already validated (by the teacher) for sensitive wordings were automatically stored to be then downloaded for a containing racism, inter-religion issues, and obscenity. further analysis. Students gave CF to any topic of their The main content (ideas) of each essay had also been interest. fully supplied in the narration box (numerically regulated) Out of the 16 participants, 3 students' artifacts were that must be completed along with an uploaded essay to 5392 The Impact of Digitally Regulated Peer Corrective Feedback (CF) on Students' English Writing make it viable for the next project processes. The next Data indicates feedback about contents (high order process was the peer evaluative feedback phase. The feedback) is the most pronounced (34%). The students number of evaluators was set to 6 for the minimum before seem to be also confident to give feedback about the project can move to the next phase (the teacher grammar/language use (28%). On the contrary, they are not evaluation). The peers (and the student himself) and the quite interested in giving CF on the essay organization and teacher can provide feedback here as well. A discussion vocabulary use (e.g. word choice). about the uploaded essay took place on this page. Next, we will look at the data if the peer CFs were taken The analysis using the CopyLeaks application indicates on by the students as reflected in the final texts. Below are that the original work and the final revision were found one initial text, the CF, and its final revision. different regardless the level, which means that efforts for Data indicates that high order CF like feedback to improving their essays were detected. Revisions were content and organization is hardly taken on. Conversely, found but not yet clear if they accommodated the CFs from even though not found pervasive, corrections on low order peers. CF are detected. The common areas of correction are as The next analysis with NVivo12 was then carried out follows. and results showed the feedback regarding the 5 linguistic 1. subject-verb (S-V) agreement, aspects. Some entries proved not to carry CF. Entries 2. capitalized words, without CF are exemplified as follows (copied as is). 3. the use of period in a sentence, 1. Thank you Mary, you have given me new information 4. "be" overuse about planting. 5. missing "to" (for "to + infinitive") 2. I learn about cutting corner from you essay. 6. preposition + noun (verb +ing/gerund) 3. Very good. Keep up the good work. These areas were the most frequently attended by the CF While entries with CF are as follows (copied as is). receivers. The CF on the diction domain was left neglected. 1. (Organization) - And then, if there is any sources or references, you can put it at the end session of your writing. 6. Discussion 2. (Mechanics) - I think you should revise your writing format on your title, because you have used small Data shows that not all students create the same number letter, except the first letter of entries and not all the entries carry CF. This is because 3. (Grammar) - From the grammatical, you could some students may not have felt secure to give CF to their change the article on the words 'an cheerful song' into peers. They might feel that their current language 'a cheerful competence has not been ready to venture into giving CF to 4. (Content) - Then in the third paragraph, I think you their classmates. Despite so many previous research could explain it more. findings indicating the advantages of employing peer 5. (Vocabulary) - In my opinion, the word 'is' can correction in the teaching of writing as reported by [9], [20], replace in to 'has' or you can change 'reason' in to [3], data indicates that not all students are similarly willing 'reasoning'. or confident to provide corrective entries to their peers. As Data shows that not all students were similarly a result, they would go around CF that does not really give enthusiastic about the online activities as seen in the clear ways to solve the errors in their friends' works. It is number of entries. It ranges from 5 to 96 and not all entries possible that these CF providers have knowledge about the carry CF. It is also accounted that those who wrote more error areas. Even so, they might not have enough courage entries gave a bigger percentage of CF. For instance, N1 to 'criticize' their friends' works for unknown reasons yet. gave 83% CF of all his entries and N16 gave only 1 CF out These students are more interested or more confident in of his 5 entries (20%). giving indirect CFs than direct CFs and this is the reason This class made 45 pages of CF entries. When classified why they are interested in giving feedback to content and into the 5 linguistic aspects by [18], the amount of CF of organization. The two areas are high order CFs that the each of the 5 areas is as follows. feedback receivers may not want to use because the CF is less mathematical as opposed to such CFs on subject-Table 2. Rates of CF by Language Components verb agreement and verbal-nominal issues that are rule-based No Nodes CF of All Entries and not ambiguous. For the CF providers, it is safer to 1 Content 34% provide indecisive CF that the preciseness can still be 2 Language Use/grammar 28% argued rather than providing direct CF that the correctness can be directly debated. 3 Mechanics 19% Further reasons for not providing direct CF can be 4 Organization 10% assumed, however. As already slightly mentioned above, 5 Vocabulary 9.7% that students do not venture into giving direct CFs can be TOTAL CF 100% because they are not sure if their feedback is worth giving Universal Journal of Educational Research 8(11): 5388-5394, 2020 5393 and they might not be confident enough with their own peers' works. Second, the online collaboration to attain English competence. Direct CFs around high order cases mutual success proves to work effectively. No students are avoided. They may feel that they are not ready to give refrain from giving CF because ignoring it can result in open/public feedback to their peers that all system 'retaliation'. Other students may not want to give inhabitants can view/read. The sample CFs below are reciprocal CF either and this will cause project jam. One copied as is. project will stay in one page or immovable and cannot 1. Then in the third paragraph, I think you could explain reach the final step of project recognition system. Third, it more. CF receivers even though not following all the CF given, 2. I think you need to be more thorough with your work prove to take on some of the CF especially one that 3. It is also better to use more data in explaining your provides clear-cut solution not those that do not provide reasons and put the references below. Good job. straightforward way outs. In conclusion, the collective 4. But, clarify the topic in each paragraph so that it will evaluation mechanism in the LMS by intra and inter-class be more easy to understand. students prove to be effective to raise language production These high order CFs are not readily taken on. It is and internet mediated

communication (IMC). The pushed harder than correcting such errors in *He is come from CF mechanism in the LMS increases the amount language Jakarta, *Mary always happy, or *i was there at that time as output and can brush up students' analytical skills found in the texts and it is accounted in the data. regarding the 5 linguistic areas as explored in this study. Conversely, the CF providers seem to be highly confident when they give direct low-order feedback as exemplified below (copied as is). 1. From the grammatical, you could change the article on the words 'an cheerful song' into 'a cheerful song'. REFERENCES 2. In my opinion, the word 'is' can replace in to 'has' or [1] M. M. Shahabadi and M. Uplane, "Synchronous and you can change 'reason' in to 'reasoning'. asynchronous e-learning styles and academic performance 3. But, I found some grammatical errors such as "it is do of e-learners," Proceida, Soc. Behav. Sci., vol. 176, pp. 129– not", you may revise it into "it does not". 138, 2015. These sample cases indicate that the students would [2] E. Eslami, "The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' writing," Procedia - confidently provide feedback to simple and straightforward Soc. Behav. Sci., vol. 98, pp. 445–452, 2014. grammatical errors, but not really to those that may bring contra-feedback to them. [3] S. Tangkiengsirisin and R. Kalra, "The effect of corrective That the CF receivers do not fully comply with the CF Feedback on grammatical accuracy in a Thai University context," Asian EFL J., vol. 20, no. 7, pp. 228–233, 2018. given by their peers suggests several issues. First, these students do not really trust the CF given by peers especially [4] D. Ferreira, "Written corrective feedback and peer review in regarding the errors that pertain to complicated the BYOD classroom," EUROCALL, no. 2013, pp. 86–92, 2013. grammatical issues. Probably, they are not quite sure that the CF is worth attending. [5] B. Jabu, N. Noni, A. Talib, and A. Syam, "Lecturers' use of Second, they might think that the CF is just too extensive corrective feedback and students ' uptake in an Indonesian coming from so many parties that they can hardly discern EFL context," vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 82–87, 2017. and follow all of them at all. Besides, there is also CF given [6] M. J. Itmeizeh, "Impact of peer correction on reducing by the teacher(s). They might want to take on the CF from English language students' mistakes in their written essays the teacher, instead. However, this still needs to be in PAUC and learners' attitudes towards this technique," Theory Pract. Lang. Stud., vol. 6, no. 11, pp. 2068–2078, explored in the next study since this paper does not take 2016. that issue into this research. [7] J. P. Lantolf and S. L. Thorne, Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development. Oxford: Oxford University Press., 2006. 7. Conclusions [8] O. Birgin and A. Baki, "The use of portfolio to assess student' This research has revealed several findings regarding the s performance," J. Turkish Sci. Educ., vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 75– benefits of numerically regulated collective CF for writing 90, 2007. works. First, the mechanism of numerical setting in the [9] I. R. Balderas, P. María, and G. Cuamatzi, "Self and peer LMS has managed to push all students to participate in the correction to improve college students' writing skills," online communication (interaction) and English Profile, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 179–194, 2018. production. All students by system have complied to the [10] S. E. K. Otto, "Toward langua-technocultural competence," digital settings in the LMS. All students ventured into in The handbook of technology and second language creating a project, uploading it, and providing CF to their teaching and learning, C. A. Chapelle and S. Sauro, Eds. 5394 The Impact of Digitally Regulated Peer Corrective Feedback (CF) on Students' English Writing 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK: their students on teaching and learning," Int. J. ePortfolio, Wiley-Blackwell, 2017, pp. 10–25. vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 101–109, 2017. [11] B. Bram, "Self and peer revisions in students' narrative [16] M. McNeill and A. Cram, "Evaluating e-portfolios for paragraph writing," Asian EFL J., vol. 20, no. 8, pp. 232– university learning: Challenges and opportunities," Chang. 237, 2018. Demands, Chang. Dir. Proc. ASCILITE, no. January 2011, pp. 862–873, 2011. [12] I. M. Rajeg and I. B. P. Yadnya, "TEFLIN CONFERENCE 2014 -Book 3," in English Language Curriculum [17] M. R. Khodashenas and F. Rakhshi, "The effect of electronic Development: Implications for Innovations in Language portfolio assessment on the writing performance of Iranian Policy and Planning, Pedagogical Practices, and Teacher EFL learners," Int. J. Res. English Educ., vol. 2, no. 3, pp. Professional Development, 2014, pp. 946–950. 67–77, 2017. [13] M. Hismanoglu et al., "The influence of formal language [18] H. L. Jacobs, S. A. Zinkgraf, D. R. Wormouth, V. F. Hartfiel, learning environment on vocabulary learning strategies," J. and J. B. Hughey, Testing ESL composition: A practical Lang. Teach. Res., vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 23–29, 2012. approach. Rowley, M.A.: Newbury House of Publsihers, Inc., 1981. [14] Y. Wang and N. Chen, "Criteria for evaluating synchronous learning management systems: arguments from the distance [19] B. Ghanbari, H. Barati, and A. Moinzadeh, "Rating scales language classroom," Comput. Assist. Lang. Learn., vol. 22, revisited: EFL writing assessment context of Iran under no. 1, pp. 1–18, 2009. scrutiny," Lang. Test. Asia, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 83–100, 2012. [15] C. R. Kilbane and N. B. Milman, "Examining the impact of [20] C. A. Chapelle and S. Sauro, The handbook of technology the creation of digital portfolios by high school teachers and and second language teaching and learning. 2017.

0.31% UntitledUntitled

https://news.agropages.com/news/ggtj.aspx?id=861

0.31% UntitledUntitled

https://news.agropages.com/news/ggtj.aspx?id=861