

LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 24, No. 1, April 2021



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

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROCESS APPROACH COMBINED WITH SCREENCAST-O-MATIC AND BOOKCREATOR TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING

Anak Agung Putri Maharani and Made Hery Santosa

Ganesha University of Education, Indonesia

agungputrimaharani@gmail.com; mhsantosa@undiksha.ac.id

correspondence: agungputrimaharani@gmail.com

DOI: doi.org/10.24071/llt.v24i1.2516

received 10 April 2020; accepted 1 October 2020

Abstract

Within the 21st-century learning framework, pupils are demanded to argue more reasonably over the massive information that they receive. This study was conducted due to the imperative function of argumentative writing skills within this century by utilizing innovative argumentative writing approaches combined with screencasting and bookcreating projects. Involving 31 sophomores in English Language Education Study Program, a descriptive qualitative research design was utilized. Their progress in argumentative writing classroom and views were gauged to reach the conclusion. Threefold methods of collecting data were administered; observation, interview, and questionnaire. The collected data from, afterward, were filtered, presented, analyzed, and verified. It was found that the use of the process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator had a crucial contribution to argumentative writing development. The participants responded positively towards the implementation of the process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator.

Keywords: argumentative writing; process approach; Bookcreator; Screencast-o-matic

Introduction

Within the 21st century, teaching and learning are filled with challenges and opportunities. It is the effect of globalization which brings new scenarios of the political, social, cultural, and economic sectors that dependable on the contributions of pupils. Singh (1991) argues that in regarding education to deal with rapid changes at the twenty-first century's threshold, innovation, technology, and research are obligatory tools of education. It emerges an assumption on which the education role for the future is construed which is about the consequences and imperatives for the development of education. In this case, education is the lead which plays a major role in the growth and future development.

To be proficient and global citizens who cooperate and collaborate with many people around the world, one must become competent users of English (Hidayati, 2018). Being skillful in English assists people to communicate and express what

they have in mind properly. Even though all English skills are in fact important regarding communication, but related to the 21st century, people nowadays write as never before – in print and online form (Yancey, 2009). Stuart (2019) argues one very old skill that seems to be only increasing in importance is writing even though much fuss was made about newfangled twenty-first-century skills. Powell (2012) states that writing is always a technology of explosive force, a cultural artifact based not in nature (whose rules we did not create) but sprung from the human mind. Additionally, writing is the lens through which literate people perceive the world, feel the world, hate the world, love the world, defy the world, and imagine change.

At the university level, one important type of writing learned is argumentative writing. As Vygotsky (1986) as cited in Neff-van Aertselaer (2013) pointed out argumentation is a pivotal societal interaction key point as well as for the individual's cognitive development. Pupils who deal with creating a paper for daily routine tasks or thesis usually get involved in an argumentative writing atmosphere. They do it because a paper deals with fresh or up-to-date and original ideas, and it must be based on resilient and convincing argumentation. Furthermore, argumentative skill is indispensable when pupils engaged in a professional working environment wherein they have to convince and persuade colleagues related to their professions in well-behaved argumentation (Hasani, 2016). The purpose is to convince, obtain an adhesion, justify a way to see facts, refute interpretations about an event, as well as encourage readers to change an opinion about a subject (Maharani, 2019).

Unfortunately, the argumentative essay is the most complex and challenging essay amongst others since it needs critical thinking skills (Pei et al., 2017). Whatever the writing types are, they have been regarded as difficult to teach and learn both for the teachers and learners in the EFL context (Rubiyah et al. (2018). Additionally, Blankenship and Margarella (2014) argue a writer must master indirect communication ability, language structure, writing techniques, and the ability to extract ideas from the text. Gonye et al., (2012) argue that the complexity of writing activity requires systematic and well-ordered thinking of pupils which finally will be the way of their behavior. Furthermore, all pupils do not enjoy learning English writing (Kusumaningrum, 2015). Moreover, Antika (2014) as cited in Indrilla and Ciptaningrum (2018) states that in Indonesia, the learning of writing which frequently occurs in the classroom is dominated by teachers within the teaching practice.

The new understanding of EFL writing classroom is that writing instruction must emphasize more on writing activity rather than writing theory. Too much theory in writing leads to passivity and reluctance on connecting prior knowledge, creativity, and idea to form a quality writing product. The goal of every pupil when they have a writing assignment is to produce good writing (Chandra & Ignasia, 2018). It means that writing needs a process to produce a product (Febriyanti et al., 2018). It is in line with Indrilla and Ciptaningrum (2018) who state that the perspective in the teaching and learning process, writing should be changed from using the teacher-centered approach to the student-centered approach.

To support the student-centered approach and promote autonomous and collaborative learning, technology in EFL writing classrooms is imperative. The immersion of technology in the teaching and learning process provides an abundance of opportunities for learners to study independently and collaborate with

their peers (Warni et al., 2018). Technology in writing enables learners to write and share information everywhere and every time (Gamble, N & Easingwood, 2000). The use of technology narrows the boundaries of distance and time as offered by traditional writing. It has been further argued that with the advanced technology in learning and the emphasis on the importance of learners' independence in finding the proper solutions towards problems, teachers should make adjustments and changes to student-centered learning.

Twofold applications can be used which meet the requirement of nowadays writing trends, namely Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator. First of all, the Screencast-o-matic is a free and intuitive tool to record video and edit it. This tool is intriguing since learners can create a screencast video with the screen recorded. It means that they can capture their screen and narrate it to customize the video. Other features provide are learners can edit the video and publish it. In EFL writing classroom, this application is not only used as a playful tool but also can assist the lecturer in teaching especially in discussing the materials of the day, and giving interesting verbal and written feedback on the screen towards the learners' writing.

Then, Bookcreator is, on the other hand, a free and simple internet-based application that helps learners to create enticing digital books. Differ with Screencast-o-matic, this application can be accessed by connecting to the internet. The learners create their argumentative writing product and decorate it as creative and innovative as possible. Bookcreator is a brand new application that the lecturer brought into the EFL writing class even though its emergence is not the newest internet-based tool. What makes the book creator becomes intriguing is the feature it provides to learners. They can share their book, send messages, and publish their work in a forum to be read by other members. This application, in this study, was used as the medium to publish the learners' writing product after they experienced a collaborative discussion session as well as obtained feedback recorded by Screencast-o-matic.

Then, in operating and collaborating the aforementioned applications as well as in dealing with the writing challenges, the writing class requires proper the implementation of process approach as the way to conduct the EFL writing class. Coffin et al., (2003) recommend a process approach to constructive writing which consists of pre-writing, drafting, reflecting, peer or tutor reviewing, revising, and publishing. It has been advocated that the process approach to English writing teaching is in contrast with the traditional product-oriented method of teaching writing, thus brought to a new insight that this approach has been generally accepted and applied by English teachers in their English writing classroom (Sun & Feng, 2009).

To wrap up, the potential use of technology to support the enhancement of learners' argumentative writing encourages the researcher to investigate the use of technology for English writing inside and outside the classroom. Therefore, in line with the previous elucidation, research on innovating the EFL writing classroom by using Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator which were immersed within the process approach to delve the learners' argumentation towards surrounding latest issues was conducted. It was, subsequently, intended to investigate the argumentative writing of the learners as well as to gauge their responses towards the combination of these innovations.

Based on the aforementioned elucidation, the research questions can be formulated as follows: First, how was the impact of process approach implementation combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator towards the learners' argumentative writing in EFL writing classroom? Second, how were the learners' responses towards the implementation of the process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator towards the learner's argumentative writing in EFL writing classroom?

Method

This present study was designed as a descriptive qualitative study. The respondents were 31 sophomores in class 3A who had enrolled in the Essay Writing course in English Language Education Study Program (hereafter, ELESP), Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Mahasaraswati Denpasar University.

To collect a rich set of data, the method of data collection involved the use of observation, in-depth interview, and questionnaire. Thus, based on the method of collecting the research data, the researcher administered three kinds of research instruments, namely observation sheet, interview guidance, and questionnaire. The observation involved the interaction of all participants offline and online. Offline interaction was done in the classroom where the participants discussed their writing progress. In contrast, online interaction was mostly done outside the writing classroom because the researcher and the participants had discussed the writing progress by collecting all writing products (Microsoft word form) in the Google classroom forum. Moreover, Screencast-o-matic was used to deliver the materials as well as give feedback towards the learners' argumentative writing posted on the Google classroom forum. Responses were also gained in the discussion forum section in Bookcreator. In that site, the researcher jotted down the phenomenon that happened especially in the Bookcreator forum.

The findings from observation and the concept of the process approach, Screencast-o-matic as well as Bookcreator were detailed into questions that made up the interview. The guided questions were constructed from three main points; the learners' opinion about the new concept of learning and writing, learner autonomy, and the intensity of using technology. The interview was targeted to 10 respondents who were identified as being interested in further follow up.

Further, to gain the respondents' responses towards the implementation of the process approach wherein Bookcreator and Screencast-o-matic were conducted, the questionnaire was administered via accessing Google form questionnaire. It was targeted to all respondents of the study. This questionnaire was administered in an attempt to figure out the learners' perception of the implementation of the process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator. Twofold aspects that had been adapted from Yujing (2015) were used to construct the items of the questionnaire namely, meaningfulness and competence. Each dimension was developed into 5 items; therefore, there were 10 items overall. All items were structured with responses varying from strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, to strongly disagree. Afterward, the data collected from conducting observation, interview, and questionnaire were reduced, presented, analyzed, and verified (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Findings and Discussion

Essay Writing Course is a compulsory 4 credit course that must be taken by the sophomores in the odd semester. In a week, the course was conducted twice, and, especially in the observed writing class, the course was conducted on Monday and Wednesday. Each meeting was allocated in 100 minutes. The core lesson was the Argumentative Essay.

It has been stated that the researcher administered 3 distinctive research instruments to gain purposeful and sufficient data in answering the research questions. They were observation sheet, interview guidance, and questionnaire. The observation sheet was used to jot down every detail of teaching and learning process both inside and outside the writing classroom. The interview session was used to collect data about the learners' perceptions towards the implementation of the process approach and the technology tools. Finally, the questionnaire provides quantitative data related to the learners' responses.

The threefold instruments were used to answer the formulated research questions; a) How was the impact of process approach implementation combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator towards the learners' argumentative writing in EFL writing classroom? and b) How were the learners' responses towards the implementation of process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator towards the learner's argumentative writing in EFL writing classroom? The findings which answered the questions can be explicated as follows.

The impact of process approach implementation combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator towards the learners' argumentative writing in EFL writing classroom

The impact of the process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator was firstly issued by the observation. It was focused on the process and progress that the respondents experienced in writing class through getting involved in the process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator forum. It was done in 2 meetings where each meeting happened in 100 minutes. Jotting down every detail phenomenon helps the researcher in elucidating the result of the investigation.

The first offline EFL writing classroom was divided into 3 cohorts, namely pre-activity, whilst activity, and post-activity. Generally, in the pre-activity, the researcher initiated the class by posing a question related to the material. A video about the rubbish issue presented to get the learners' curiosity and build their argumentation. It was continued to whilst activity where the researcher applied the process approach. Amongst the 5 steps, the step of the process approach which was firstly conducted was the prewriting. Prior to pre-writing, they have introduced the art of argumentative writing. It was done through familiarizing them with basic terms of argumentative which allow them to practice establishing the relationship between claims, reasons, and evidence; and analyzing an author's use of argument in a text; therefore, they were able to formulate an argument with a claim and counter-claim as well as reach a logical conclusion.

Afterward, individually, the learners were instructed to search for relevant yet intriguing free topics as their argumentative writing. They, then, were grouped into several groups which consisted of 5-6 members. They discussed and commented on each preferred topic. This activity was done to ensure that all learners finally

chose the proper topic to be developed into draft argumentation. After that, the next activity was pre-writing wherein the learners wrote down every idea that came up in their mind related to the chosen topic. After writing the points attentively, they deleted or revised the inappropriate ones, and its outcome was a better outline. The writing process in the first meeting ended in outlining.

In teaching writing, it is believed that the process approach is in contradiction with the traditional product-oriented approach. It has been pointed out by Harmer (2007) and Badger & White (2000) that an effective method for teaching writing needs appropriate approaches. Stanley as stated in Sun & Feng (2009) argues that the process approach treats all writing as a creative act that necessitates time and positive feedback to be done well. Therefore, it is impossible to have the steps of the process approach in a solely 100-minute meeting.

In the post-activity, the learners and the researcher discussed the obstacles they found and the writing process they underwent. Further discussion was done to find the proper solution to the faced obstacles. Here, the researcher also informed the learners to develop their outline into a draft. Then the material would be posted on the Google classroom forum which was delivered in the form of Screencast-o-matic video. By having a video lecture, the lecturer's instruction in the class is lesser; therefore, more communicative activities are created (Afrilyasanti et al., 2017).

Similar to the first meeting, in the second offline meeting, three cohort activities were done. The pre-activity initiated the lesson. On this occasion, the learners were told to recall their experience of the writing process in the first meeting. The integration of technology in this meeting broadens their insights about the benefits of technology within learning. Cahyani & Cahyono (2012) state that learners are able to connect classroom learning and outside language use by means of the technology, and; therefore be stimulated to use the target language. The learners were, furthermore, asked to share their thoughts on the Screencast-o-matic video on delivering the materials. Most of them said that it was a new way to visualize and hear the materials at the same time.

Next, in whilst activity, the learners were instructed to work in pairs. They exchanged their draft, and they were supposed to comment on others' drafts. Various feedback is also given by several learners voluntarily themselves to write their handwriting on the board. Then, all classmates were told to contribute to giving feedback to improve the writing potency of the volunteers. The researcher also gave feedbacks and highlighted what the learners have achieved and done during the activity. After giving comments, they returned their work, and they revised theirs based on the researcher's feedbacks and their friends' feedbacks. They continued the writing step onto revising their draft.

In the post-activity, the learners were instructed to polish their revised draft to be final writing products. It was posted on the Google classroom forum to be given feedbacks by the researcher through Screencast-o-matic video. The learners demand the feedbacks which used as the reference of correcting and revising since they had been able to improve their writing quality as well as their performance (Zainuddin, 2004)

In the next meeting, they brought their final product. The meeting was focused on scrutinizing the Screencast-o-matic videos which presenting the evaluation of the writing product. After watching the video and getting the explanation, all learners (outside the classroom) started to create and decorate their own book in

Bookcreator. The writing product was broken down into several pages which were constructed based on the organization of the argumentative writing (introduction, body, and conclusion).

The posted decorated assignment in Bookcreator was given feedback wherein all learners contributed within the Bookcreator online discussion forum. The interaction in the online environment decreases the barrier of delivering feedbacks or revealing opinions. Cahyono & Mutiaraningrum (2015) argue pupils enrich their language complexities and knowledge originated from the online learning environment interaction. Additionally, the pupils' writing quality is certainly enhanced in line with their attempts to comprehensibly communicate within the text-based online environment.

The learners' responses towards the implementation of the process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator towards the learner's argumentative writing in EFL writing classroom

The students' responses in regard to their perceptions towards the use of process approach in writing and the technology tools were deeply yielded through the interview session. Ten respondents were included in the interview. The interview was done after offline classroom and online individual discussion is done. The obtained findings through conducting interview resulted in the following discussion:

1. New concept of learning and writing that learners obtain by using the combination of process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator

The learners experience a new concept of learning and writing which led them obtained insights and knowledge through following the continual steps of writing, sharing, and giving feedback. A study by Graham & Sandmel (2011) indicates that the process writing approach significantly contributes a crucial role in any serious effort to reform writing instruction in the writing classroom. In writing classroom, as stated by Li & Razali (2019), a persistent practice that is consistent with stages leads to a good writing habit that will be mirrored through a piece of adequate final writing. Further, it is also a necessity that writing should be taught as an enjoyable and meaningful developmental process rather than just merely focusing on the final product. Zhou (2015) points out the process writing approach focuses on providing pupils the opportunity to discuss topics and share the ideas with peers as well as regards the activity as a recursive writing process that intertwines planning, drafting, and revising.

Moreover, it is always enticing to work with technology when dealing with writing. They could share their ideas, feedback, and watch new strategies in scrutinizing the writing product. They also said that having written feedbacks deactivated their interest to delve their writing potency. Thus, they preferred watching and hearing the feedbacks through the video rather than seeing the handwritten of the peers or the lecturer on their writing. Furthermore, they argued that posting feedbacks online helps to better their grammar. Vikneswaran & Krish (2015) figure out that online platform assisted the pupils to gain free spellcheck and grammar check features. In return, it reveals that the online class page is an effective tool as it enables the pupils to produce coherent writing pieces online and offline.

2. The learner autonomy in writing

They argued that they were more independent in continuing their own writing progress. As stated by Yeung (2019), compared with the other approaches in writing, theoretically, the process approach holds the major potential in supporting the learner autonomy development. Additionally, Hayland (2000) states that following the process and getting peer feedback, teacher feedback and self-evaluation play integral parts in developing autonomous writers.

On the other hand, Wulandari (2015) reveals that writing assisted by online activity through the internet can promote autonomous yet collaborative learning as the students rely much on themselves in learning. Yujing (2015) argues that the intense use of the internet in writing increases autonomy and self-reported learning. Their gadgets and personal computer have become the primary tools in assisting themselves to be better in writing. In the past, they used their gadgets to do personal chatting or searching for materials via Google. However, the use of Bookcreator and Screencast-o-matic changed their perception in which writing could be done without the traditional paper and pen strategy. It is in line with Benson et al., (2002) who reveal that Web-based e-learning has resulted in changes related to the instructional design for formal training.

3. The intensity of using technology in process approach implementation

In relation to the intensity of using technology, the learners said that they had frequently accessed the website. They merely checked the notifications or comments they got from others. The use of the website in learning has been argued to provide huge impacts on their learning.

To delve the learners' responses towards the implementation of the process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator, the questionnaire was administered. The result could be wrapped up in the following table:

Table 1. The Summary of the Pupils' Responses

	Response (%)				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Participants	42	34	10	6	8

It could be seen that most pupils strongly agreed to the implementation of the process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator in developing their writing. Most of the pupils accepted the innovation in EFL writing classrooms to support their writing. It is proven by the pupils' active participation during class. They were increasingly more creative in expressing their ideas. Dokchandra (2018) figures out that the lessons using the process approach eliminated the pupils' negative views about writing. It is therefore worthy to note that the feedback provided to the pupils' writing product is not simply in the forms of symbols or short phrases indicating if the checked parts are correct or incorrect, but long sentences to explain why the errors are counted.

Graham & Sandmel (2011) point out several potential advantages to the process approach in writing. First of all, the learners are scaffolded to plan, draft, and revise to yield quality writing which promotes the cognitive process of the

learners. Second, the steps in the process approach provide instruction in writing through mini-lessons, conferences, and teachable moments which result in the quality of writing enhancement. Third, since collaboration, learner autonomy, personal responsibility, personal attention, and a positive learning environment are highlighted in process approach implementation, the learners' motivation is gradually increased. Thus, it can be wrapped up that the steps of the process approach facilitate the value of the learners' learning progress.

The immersion of technology is also effective in a writing activity. It is in line with Tham (2016) who believes that peer review can be a more immersive experience with online feedback compared to traditional written feedback as its boundary can make more efficient use of any communicative resources everywhere and every time.

Conclusion

To wrap up, the result of this study recommends the use of the process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator for teaching argumentative writing within the 21st century. The success of the process approach combined with Screencast-o-matic and Bookcreator depends largely on their collaboration, including process modeling of how to write arguments, analytical scoring rubric, pupils' self-monitoring, and judgment of the argumentation procedure, and feedback from the lecturer and peers.

To revive the use of process approach combined with technology in argumentative writing, it is of vital concern for educators to search for possible means in focusing on process approach and technology within EFL writing. To ensure that the students' argumentative writing will be best performed, the process approach and the implemented technology have to be rejuvenated to its best form and performance. Additionally, technology is surely not an absolute replacement for the classroom because it will be beneficial if educators combine it with meaningful offline and online activities to fathom its potential.

References

- Afrilyasanti, R., Cahyono, B. Y., & Astuti, U. P. (2017). Indonesian EFL students' perceptions on the implementation of flipped classroom model. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(3), 476–484. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0803.05>
- Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153–160. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153>
- Benson, A. D., Johnson, S. D., & Kuchinke, K. P. (2002). The use of technology in the digital workplace: A framework for human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 392–404. <https://doi.org/10.1177/152342202237518>
- Blankenship, M. U., & Margarella, E. E. (2014). Technology and secondary writing: A review of the literature. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 5(2), 146–160.
- Cahyani, H., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2012). Teachers' attitudes and technology use in Indonesian EFL classrooms. *TEFLIN Journal*, 23(2), 130–148. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v23i2/130-148>
- Cahyono, B. Y., & Mutiaraningrum, I. (2015). Indonesian EFL teachers' familiarity

- with and opinion on the internet-based teaching of writing. *English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 199–208. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n1p199>
- Chandra, S. O., & Ignasia, Y. (2018). The use of Google Translate in EFL essay writing. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 21(2), 228–238. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2018.210212>
- Coffin, C., Curry, M. J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lillis, T. M., & Swann, J. (2003). *Teaching academic writing: A toolkit for higher education*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820403500212>
- Dokchandra, D. (2018). The effects of process writing approach on performance of an overcrowded EFL writing class at a university in Thailand. *KnE Social Sciences*, 191–206. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i4.1931>
- Febriyanti, R., Inderawati, R., & Fiftinova, F. (2018). Enhancing descriptive writing achievement by applying process approach through environmental observation. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 21(Suppl), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2018.suppl2103>
- Gamble, N., & Easingwood, N. (2000). *ICT and Literacy: Information and Communications Technology, Media, Reading and Writing*. London: Continuum.
- Gonye, J., Mareva, R., Dudu, W. T., & Sibanda, J. (2012). Academic writing challenges at universities in Zimbabwe: A case study of Great Zimbabwe University. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 3(3), 71–83. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ijel11.092>
- Graham, S., & Sandmel, K. (2011). The process writing approach: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Research*, 104(6), 396–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2010.488703>
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). London: Pearson Longman. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1987.11075294>
- Hasani, A. (2016). Enhancing argumentative writing skill through contextual teaching and learning. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(16), 1573–1578. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2016.2806>
- Hidayati, K. H. (2018). Teaching writing to EFL learners: An investigation of challenges confronted by Indonesian teachers. *Langkawi: Journal of The Association for Arabic and English*, 4(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v4i1.772>
- Indrilla, N., & Ciptaningrum, D. S. (2018). An approach in teaching writing skills: Does it offer a new insight in enhancing students' writing ability. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 21(2), 124–133. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2018.210201>
- Kusumaningrum, M. A. D. (2015). Using English movie as an attractive strategy to teach senior high school students English as a foreign language. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 18(01), 11–18. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2015.180102>
- Li, K. L., & Razali, A. B. (2019). Idea sharing: Process-based approach to writing in Malaysian English education. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 58, 319–341.
- Maharani, A. A. P. (2019). An argumentative essay scale: Its assessment criteria to employ. *KnE Social Sciences*, 3(10), 299–308. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i10.3911>

- Neff-van Aertselaer, J. A. (2013). Contextualizing EFL argumentation writing practices within the Common European Framework descriptors. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(2), 198–209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.010>
- Pei, Z., Zheng, C., Zhang, M., & Liu, F. (2017). Critical thinking and argumentative writing: Inspecting the association among EFL learners in China. *English Language Teaching*, 10(10), 31–42. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n10p31>
- Powell, B. B. (2012). *Writing: Theory and history of the technology of civilization*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rubiyah, R., Ping, M., & Syamdianita, S. (2018). Implementing concept mapping technique to improve students' descriptive writing ability. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 21(1), 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2018.210107>
- Singh, R. R. (1991). *Education for the twenty-first century: Asia-Pacific perspectives*. Bangkok, Thailand: UNESCO.
- Sun, C., & Feng, G. (2009). Process approach to teaching writing applied in different teaching models. *English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 150–155. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n1p150>
- Tham, J. C. K. (2016). Wearable writing: Enriching student peer review with point-of-view video feedback using Google Glass. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281616641923>
- Vikneswaran, T., & Krish, P. (2015). Utilising social networking sites to improve writing: A case study with Chinese students in Malaysia. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2015.1030441>
- Warni, S., Aziz, T. A., & Febriawan, D. (2018). The use of technology in English as a foreign language learning outside the classroom: An insight into learner autonomy. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 21(2), 148–156. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.24071/llt.2018.210203>
- Wulandari, M. (2015). Moodle-based learning model for paragraph writing class. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 18(02), 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2015.180201>
- Yancey, K. B. (2009). *Writing in the 21st century: A report from the National Council of Teachers of English*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Yeung, M. (2019). Exploring the strength of the process writing approach as a pedagogy for fostering learner autonomy in writing among young learners. *English Language Teaching*, 12(9), 42. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n9p42>
- Yujing, N. (2015). Influence of flipped classroom on learner's empowerment - A study based on English writing courses in China. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 12(1), 1–7.
- Zainuddin, M. (2004). The effect of giving feedback to students' writing. *TEFLIN Journal*, 15(2), 117–126. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v15i2/117-126>
- Zhou, D. (2015). An empirical study on the application of process approach in non-English majors' writing. *English Language Teaching*, 8(3), 89–96. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n3p89>