

## The Contribution of Electronic Feedback In L2 Multicultural Writing Class Using the Edmodo

Tazkiyatunnafs Elhawwa

[tazkiyatunnafs.elhawwa@gmail.com](mailto:tazkiyatunnafs.elhawwa@gmail.com)

Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangka Raya, Indonesia

### Abstract

Corrective feedback is very helpful to EFL learners since it helps learners to acquire grammatical features (Ellis, 2008). The focus of the research attempted to investigate the contribution of Electronic feedback in multicultural writing class using the Edmodo. The electronic feedback was classified into three types, namely; direct, indirect, and metalinguistic as proposed by Ellis (2009) and 3 different sources, namely; teacher, peer, and self. The study was descriptive quantitative and qualitative research; whose subjects were 25 learners of three different ethnic groups (Dayaknese, Banjarese, and Javanese). The instruments were questionnaire and observation. The data were in their progress on An academic essay writing of electronic feedback. The concerns of the electronic feedback were on language form, organization, and content. The finding confirmed that the most area contribution of electronic feedback at a whole was on language form, the source and type of feedback that most contributed to EFL writing class was electronic teacher direct feedback. It showed that L2 learners preferred that their teachers provided direct electronic feedback on grammatical error corrections and attended to all of their mistakes.

**Keywords:** contribution; electronic feedback; multicultural writing class; Edmodo

### INTRODUCTION

The implementation of technological tools in L2 writing class has been related to the progress of high technology. Nowadays, the use of laptop is very familiar on university students. An easy contribution to communication through internet has given knowledge sources. In the future, many subjects are delivered through internet and it has become an important role of college activity. Nowadays, information technologies have become widely used in EFL classes. In the past decade much research has focused on the influence of giving feedback in the EFL learners. For example: Guénette, (2007), Ferris and Roberts (2001); Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H., & Azizifar, A. (2015); Karim, (2013); Sheen & CF (2010); Storch & Wigglesworth (2010); and Chandler (2003); and Bitchener & Ferris, (2012). The result remains unclear and focuses on non- electronic feedback. On the contrary, the fast changing of technology in education establishes a new spectrum of teaching method, which involved technology in a classroom setting. This emerges a mutual relationship between technology and writing in the idea of electronic ones. With the emerge of high technology in second language writing, some EFL teachers begin to consider to integrate the use of internet in applying electronic feedback as an effort to effective class. Moreover, Saadi and Saadat (2015, p. 2054) comment that technological development increases the need to use the computer to correct learners' writings. Similarly, Sain et al. (2013, p.834) state that

---

Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Palangka Raya Indonesia, 17<sup>th</sup> of November 2021

<http://e-proceedings.iain-palangkaraya.ac.id/index.php/inacelt>

Copyright © 2021 by INACELT

electronic corrective feedback has advantages such as: developing writing skills and saving time. In my point of view, the students mostly got benefit from the use of technology in classrooms. technology increasingly helps the society access the internet via computers, laptops, mobile phones, tablets, and other devices (Nobles & Paganucci, 2015). Therefore, I become motivated in investigating potentials computers for the SFL classroom. This paper will review some of the studies done in this field, and attempt to suggest some practical ideas for use of electronic feedback in L2 multicultural writing classroom.

Electronic feedback, in this study I called e-feedback becomes a new trend in L2 writing because of the fast development of the internet contribution in L2 writing instructions. It becomes familiar for writing lecturers to require students to submit their writing assignment electronically and then to give feedback through electronic tools (Elola & Oskoz, 2017; Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Electronic feedback is an automatical feedback helped by a high technology (Paige D. Ware, 2004). The use of computers in EFL class has become familiar and learners and teachers (Hyland, 2010) use it. It becomes familiar for teachers to order learners to handle the composition through electronic tools, like the Edmodo class, and for teachers to provide feedback on learners' writing electronically. Some experts such as Liu and Sadler (2003), Schultz (2000), and Tuzi (2004) have conducted studies on electronic feedback in SLW. The finding confirmed that Electronic feedback is more helpful than others are.

There are some other studies investigating the contribution of electronic feedback in L2 writing. Studies also indicate that electronic feedback provides to improve writing better (Sullivan & Pratt, 1996), emphasize on larger chunks of writing and work on macro-revisions (Tuzi, 2004). Experts also conducted studies on electronic feedback. The finding is that students considered electronic one as helpful tool (Elola & Oskoz, 2016; Liu & Sadler, 2003; Lu & Bol, 2007).

The focus of the research attempted to investigate the contribution of Electronic feedback in multicultural writing class using the Edmodo. Holland and Muilenburg (2011) confirm that learners perceive Edmodo as a well-known of academic platform. Edmodo provides for both teacher-learner interactions directly (Kongchan, 2012). With the popularity of social networking website such as Facebook, providing feedback online via Edmodo class has its potential benefit.

## **METHOD**

The study belonged to descriptive research (Ary, 2010). The data were in the form of percentage to describe the contribution of electronic feedback. The types of data were in the form of quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative ones dealt with the number of errors and the area contribution of electronic feedback in L2 multicultural class. Meanwhile, the qualitative ones dealt with the samples of learners' errors in writing an academic essay and the learners' view on the contribution of in L2 writing. This provided the researchers to understand and interpret on the contribution of electronic feedback in multicultural class.

The site of the study was at L2 class program at Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangka Raya consisting 25 EFL learners of multicultural class 2021/2022 academic years. The different type of feedback is considered to be the novelty because the prior research on the electronic feedback did not consider it. Here, the electronic feedback was classified into

three different types: direct, indirect, and metalinguistic and three different sources: teacher, peer, and self-feedback.

The data were gathered from the online interviews, test, questionnaire, and observations. In the first step, the researcher implemented electronic feedback in L2 writing class. Then, the participants were asked to compose an essay. An academic essay was chosen, since the respondents took the course at the fourth semester. The areas of revision applied in the study were content, language forms, and organization, as proposed by Bitchener, Basturkmen, & East (2010).

At the early step, the researcher discussed with the writing lecturer about the material to be taught covering the knowledge and practiced writing an academic essay. This covered introduction to an academic writing, body paragraphs, and concluding. Then, she trained the writing lecturer about the three models of electronic feedback: direct, indirect and metalinguistic CF. At the end, the researcher explored the contribution area of electronic feedback in the process of writing. Here, the questionnaire was distributed to the participants electronically. The questionnaire covered several aspects on the potential contribution of three types of electronic feedback. Finally, the discussion and conclusion were done to clarify the research findings.

## **FINDINGS**

### **1. Finding from Observation**

The findings on the area contribution of electronic feedback to the students in L2 writing were obtained from observation and questionnaire results. To begin with, the researcher examined the learners' writing results dealing with samples of learners' errors. Based on the result of the students' writing product, it was found many errors in the learners' composition. The errors also included language forms, content, and organization. Some of them made some grammatical errors, such as articles, missing words, tenses, subject-verb agreement, punctuation, capitalization, pronoun agreement, and misspelling. After examining the learners' errors, then, the errors were calculated. Based on the output, it could be stated that: (1) teacher direct electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language form was 71% (554 out of total errors amount 780), (b) content was 19% (148 out of 780) and (c) idea organization was 10% (78 out of 780); (2) teacher indirect electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language form was 67% (582 out of total errors amount 869), (b) content was 22% (191 out of 869) and (c) idea organization was 11% (96 out of 869); and (3) teacher metalinguistic electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language form was 31% (237 out of total errors amount 763), (b) content was 53% (404 out of 763) and (c) idea organization was 16% (122 out of 763). To conclude, it could be stated that the most area contribution of teacher direct and indirect electronic feedback were on language form; and teacher metalinguistic feedback was on content.

The output also found: (1) peer direct electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language form was 53% (325 out of total errors amount 613), (b) content was 21% (129 out of 613) and (c) idea organization was 26% (159 out of 613); (2) peer indirect electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language

from was 49% (160 out of total errors amount 327), (b) content was 18% (59 out of 327) and (c) idea organization was 33% (108 out of 327); and (3) peer metalinguistic electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 60% (91 out of total errors amount 152), (b) content was 13% (20 out of 152) and (c) idea organization was 27% (41 out of 152). To conclude, it could be stated that the most area contribution of electronic peer direct, indirect, and metalinguistic electronic feedback were on language form. The study found that: (1) self-direct electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 81% (205 out of total errors amount 253), (b) content was 12% (31 out of 253) and (c) idea organization was 7% (17 out of 253); (2) self-indirect electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 77% (95 out of total errors amount 123), (b) content was 9% (11 out of 123) and (c) idea organization was 14% (17 out of 123); and (3) self-metalinguistic electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 59% (55 out of total errors amount 93), (b) content was 17% (16 out of 93) and (c) idea organization was 24% (22 out of 123). To conclude, it could be stated that the most area contribution of self-direct, indirect, and metalinguistic electronic feedback were on language form.

Based on the output, it was obvious that (1a) teacher direct electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 71% (554 out of total errors amount 780), (b) content was 19% (148 out of 780) and (c) idea organization was 10% (78 out of 780); (1b) teacher indirect electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 67% (582 out of total errors amount 869), (b) content was 22% (191 out of 869) and (c) idea organization was 11% (96 out of 869); and (1c) teacher metalinguistic electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 31% (237 out of total errors amount 763), (b) content was 53% (404 out of 763) and (c) idea organization was 16% (122 out of 763). To conclude, it could be stated that the most area contribution of teacher direct and indirect electronic feedback were on language form; and teacher metalinguistic electronic feedback was on content.

Meanwhile, (2a) peer direct electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 53% (325 out of total errors amount 613), (b) content was 21% (129 out of 613), and (c) idea organization was 26% (159 out of 613); (2b) peer indirect electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 49% (160 out of total errors amount 327), (b) content was 18% (59 out of 327) and (c) idea organization was 33% (108 out of 327); and (2c) peer metalinguistic electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 60% (91 out of total errors amount 152), (b) content was 13% (20 out of 152) and (c) idea organization was 27% (41 out of 152). To conclude, it could be stated that the most area contribution of peer direct, indirect, and metalinguistic electronic feedback were on language form.

Then, (3a) self-direct electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 81% (205 out of total errors amount 253), (b) content was 12% (31 out of 253) and (c) idea organization was 7% (17 out of 253); (3b) self-indirect electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 77% (95 out of total errors amount 123), (b) content was 9% (11 out of 123) and (c) idea organization was 14% (17 out of 123); and (3c) self-metalinguistic electronic feedback gives contribution to EFL learners in terms of (a) language from was 59% (55 out of total errors amount 93), (b) content was 17% (16 out of 93) and (c) idea organization was 24% (22 out of 123). To

conclude, the most area contribution of self-direct, indirect and metalinguistic of electronic feedback were on language form.

## 2. Findings from questionnaire

To investigate further detailed information on the area contribution of electronic feedback to the students in L2 writing the researcher also used questionnaire to collect the data. The questionnaire was distributed to the EFL learners. The questionnaire covered some aspects of the area contribution of electronic feedback in L2 writing. There were 10 closed ended questions distributed to the respondents. Then, the answers drawn from the questionnaires were counted and expressed as percentages of the total amount of respondents in each data set. In the statement: "electronic feedback helps me improve my composition.", the learners responded *strongly agree* 68% (17 out of 25), *agree* 28% (7), and *don't know* 4% (1). None of the respondents preferred to *strongly disagree* and *disagree* (0%). This meant that respondents mostly agreed to the idea that electronic feedback improved their composition skills.

Dealing with the questions: "Which of the following areas of electronic feedback do you like best to emphasize more?" Respondents gave various opinions. The majority of learners responded: *language form* 76% (19 out of 25), *content* 12% (3), and *idea organization* 12% (3). None respondents prevailed choice to *none of the above* (0%). This expressed that almost all respondents agreed to the idea that language form was the area of WCF that they liked best to emphasize more.

Dealing with the questions: "Which of the following areas of electronic feedback do you like best to emphasize less?". Respondents gave some opinions: *idea organization* 60% (15 out of 25), prevailed in choice. It was followed by *content* 24% (6), and *language form* 16% (4). This showed that all respondents agreed to the idea that *idea organization* was the area of WCF that they liked best to emphasize less.

In line with the question: "What areas does electronic feedback focus on in your electronic corrective feedback?" Respondents gave variety of opinions: *language form* 76% (19 out of 25), prevailed in choice, followed by *content* 16% (4), and *idea organization* 8% (2). This evidenced that almost all respondents agreed to the idea that *language form* was the area of electronic feedback that should be focused on in their electronic corrective feedback.

In line with the question: "Which methods do you prefer to use?" Respondents gave variety of opinions: *underline the errors* 48% (12 out of 25), prevailed in choice, followed by *underline errors*, and *provide corrections* 40% (10), and *giving a hint the errors* 12% (3). This indicated that more than half of respondents agreed to the idea that underlining or circling the errors and provide corrections for them should be used to respond the learners' errors in their electronic corrective feedback.

Dealing with the question: "What areas of electronic feedback do you prefer, in terms of language forms?" the majority of learners responded *grammar* 64% (16 out of 25), followed by *capitalization* 16% (4), *spelling* 12% (3), and *punctuation* 8% (2). This indicated that many respondents agreed to the idea that grammar was the focus area of WCF, in terms of language forms.

Dealing with the question: "In your opinion, what is the most contribution area of electronic feedback in your writing?" Here, the majority of learners responded *language form*

grammar 76% (19 out of 25), followed by *content* 12% (3), and *idea organization* 12% (3). This also indicated that almost all respondents agreed to the idea that language form (grammar) was the most contribution area of electronic feedback in their writing.

Dealing with the statement: “I can reduce my grammatical errors in writing, when I get electronic corrective.” The learners responded *strongly agree* 76% (19 out of 25), and *agree* 24% (6). None of the respondents preferred to *don't know*, *strongly disagree* and *disagree* (0%). This indicated that almost all respondents agreed to the idea that electronic feedback could reduce the learners' grammatical errors in writing when they got electronic corrective feedback.

Dealing with the statements: “I can make coherence and unity in writing, when I get electronic corrective feedback“, the learners responded *strongly agree* 56% (14 out of 25), and *agree* 44% (11). None of the respondents preferred to *don't know*, *strongly disagree* and *disagree* (0%). This meant that all respondents agreed to the idea that WCF made coherence and unity in writing when they are electronic corrective feedback.

Dealing with the statements: “I prefer my teacher or peer to correct my essays in ...” Respondents gave various opinions. The learners responded pencil 80% (20 out of 25), and *black pen* 20% (5). None of the respondents preferred to red pen and others (0%). This meant that all respondents agreed to the idea that the learners preferred to be corrected their essay using pencil.

To conclude, the most area contribution of teacher direct and indirect electronic feedback was on language form. Meanwhile, the most area contribution of teacher metalinguistic electronic feedback was on content. Based on the questionnaire result, it was found that: (a) electronic corrective feedback helps learners improve their composition (99%), (b) all respondents agreed that language form was the most area of electronic feedback that should be emphasized more (76%), and *idea organization* was the most area of electronic feedback that should be emphasized less (60%). (c) In terms of WCF focus, *language form* was the most area of electronic feedback that should be focused on in their electronic corrective feedback (76%). (d) Underlining or circling the errors and provide corrections for the learners was *the best method* to be used to respond the learners' errors in their electronic corrective feedback. (e) Grammar was the focus area of electronic feedback, in terms of language forms (64%). (f) the most contribution area of electronic feedback in their L2 writing was language form (grammar). (g) Another contribution was that electronic feedback could reduce the learners' grammatical errors (76%) and made coherence and unity in writing (100%). (h) Lastly, the learners preferred to be corrected their essay using pencil (80%) and they did not want using red pen (0%).

In addition, in responding the instruction: “Write about your opinion on feedback and the area contribution of feedback that your receive.” Most learners said that in general, electronic corrective feedback was helpful for them, especially in reducing the grammatical errors they made. Electronic corrective feedback also gave contribution in language improvement, especially revising errors such as subject-verb agreement, pronoun agreement, misspelling, using articles, and so on. Some examples of learners' statements were given below:

*“In my opinion, electronic feedback is helpful for my writing improvement. It presents my ideas clearly and it assists grammar accuracy. I can revise my grammatical errors after the teacher hints me the errors I made. In addition, I can get some advantages of electronic*

*feedback. For example, I can reduce spelling and capitalization in my writing draft. All in all, electronic feedback provides me some advantages.” (RM, a Dayaknese student’s comment).*

*“In my views, providing electronic feedback is a helpful to learn rules of English grammar. Formerly, I thought writing English was more difficult than speaking. But now, writing English is joyful. Especially, after the teacher introduces the way to correct the errors. There are some benefits of feedback that I can get. First, it directs me to be aware with grammatical errors in writing. Second, it helps me organize the text easily. Third, electronic feedback helps me revise my first draft. Sometimes, when I write a certain topic, I have several problems with English electronic convention, such capitalization, punctuation or spelling. Those problems can be reduced through implementing electronic feedback.” (MGY, a Banjarese student’s comment).*

*“I think receiving corrective feedback is vital. Since I was given feedback, I take a note on the errors. Then, I revise the draft based on my teacher’s comments and suggestion. Through this way, I can write better. The grammatical errors can be reduced, the essay is easy to organize, and unity and coherence can be achieved. Finally, giving electronic feedback is really helpful. It really improves my composition skills. I have learned a lot of grammatical rules.” (DBM, a Javanese student’s comment).*

## **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

To conclude, the most area contribution of electronic feedback at whole was on language form and the source and type of feedback that most contributed to EFL writing class was teacher direct electronic feedback. The finding was relevant to (Rahimi, 2014) stating that giving feedback helps in writing. This finding was also supported by (Dilâra & Hakk, 2017) confirming that feedback had a positive influence on increasing writing skills. It was also in accordance with Hammad’ study (2014). He found that teacher direct feedback enhanced high achievers’ performance. Therefore, Elhawwa, Rukmini, Mujiyanto, and Sutopo (2019a, and 2019b) found that teacher direct feedback gave significant effects to learners’ writing ability for both during and after the treatment, the teachers determine the errors to be corrected, the way to correct them and involved the learners so that they could be a part of learning process, gender and different types of feedback had a vital thing in increasing learners’ writing accuracy. It was also in line with (Unaldi, 2017) and (Maryam Shafiee Sarvestani, Kian Pishkar, 2015)’s study. They found that the study demonstrated that direct electronic corrective feedback affected students’ performance on writing. This finding was also in accordance with (Ellis, 2012) and (Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). Schultz (2000) and Tuzi (2004) also supported this finding. They confirmed that the learners’ writing ability performed better in an on-line environment. Moreover, Elhawwa et al (2020) suggested that language instructors pay attention to the students’ cultural background in giving electronic feedback to learners. Schultz (2000) compared traditional feedback with computer-mediated feedback. Tuzi (2004) found that more revisions were made in response to the electronic feedback. Both studies offered electronic feedback in an L2 writing class. The present study investigated a scientific contribution of electronic feedback to L2 multicultural writing class. In the future, more researches on electronic feedback needed to be performed to validate this findings and add more variables such as gender, learners’ cultural background, social status and learners’ motivation.

## REFERENCES

- Alm, A. (2009). Blogs as protected spaces for language learners. In Same places, different spaces. Proceedings ascilite Auckland 2009.
- Amiri, E. (2012). A Study of The Application of Digital Technologies In Teaching And Learning English Language And Literature. *International journal of scientific & technology research* 1 (5), 103-107,
- Birch, D. & Volkov, M. (2007). Assessment of online reflections: Engaging English second language (ESL) students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 23(3), 291-306.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). Research on electronic cf in language classes. In *Electronic corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing* (pp. 49–74). New York: Routledge.
- Bitchener, John., Basturkmen, Helen., & East, Martin. (2010). The focus of supervisor electronic feedback to thesis/dissertation students. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10 (2), 79-97.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3) [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9), 267–296.
- Elhawwa, T, Rukmini, D, Mujiyanto, J, Sutopo. D. (2019). Effect of Focused and Unfocused Feedback on Learners' Writing Accuracy within Different Gender and Cultural Background Groups. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* 10(3).
- Elhawwa, T, Rukmini, D, Mujiyanto, J, Sutopo. D. (2019). The learners' writing progress Using Direct Feedback. *Proceeding of 5<sup>th</sup> International conference on Science, Education, and Technology*.
- Elhawwa, T, Rukmini, D, Mujiyanto, J, Sutopo. D. (2020). The learners perceive electronic feedback in writing multicultural class using Edmodo. [Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Advance & Scientific Innovation, ICASI 2020 \(20\), Medan, Indonesia.](#)
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, Rod. (2009). A typology of electronic corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2). <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>, 97–107.



- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2016). Supporting second language writing using multimodal feedback. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(1), 58–74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/flan.12183>
- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2017). Writing with 21st century social tools in the L2 classroom: New literacies, genres, and writing practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, 52–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.04.002>.
- Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161–184. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X).
- Ferris, D., & Bitchener, J. (2012). Electronic corrective feedback for L2 development: Current knowledge and future research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.62>, 855–860.
- Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct?: Research design issues in studies of Feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(1), 40–53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.01.001>.
- Holland, C., & Muilenburg, L. (2011, March). Supporting student collaboration: Edmodo in the classroom. In M. Koehler & P. Mishra (Eds.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference 2011* (pp. 3232–3236). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.
- Hourigan, T. & Murray, L. (2010). Using blogs to help language students to develop reflective learning strategies: Towards a pedagogical framework. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 26(2), 209-225.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524742>.
- Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H., & Azizifar, A. (2015). The effects of teacher-electronic direct vs. indirect feedback on students' writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.018>, 116–123.
- Karim, Khaled. (2013). The effects of direct and indirect electronic corrective feedback (CF) on English-as-a-second- language (ESL) students' revision accuracy and writing skills. University of Victoria In the Department of Linguistics.

- Kongchan, C. (2012, November). How a non-digital-native teacher makes use of Edmodo. Proceedings of the 5th Edition of the International Conference “ICT for Language Learning,” Florence, Italy (pp. 207–210).
- Kurzweil Educational Systems , Inc. (2004). White Paper. Using Technology as a Solution for English Language Learners in Higher Education.
- Liu, J., & Sadler, R. (2003). The effect and affect of peer review in electronic versus traditional modes on L2 writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2(3), 193–227. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585\(03\)00025-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(03)00025-0).
- Lu, R., & Bol, L. (2007). A comparison of anonymous versus identifiable e-peer review on college student writing performance and the extent of critical feedback. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 6(2), 100–115.
- Saadi, Z. and Saadaat, M. (2015). EFL Learners’ Writing Accuracy: Effects of Direct and Metalinguistic Electronic Feedback. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* [online]. 5(10), 2053-2063. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0510.11>
- Sain, N. et al. (2013). Utilizing Email for Online Corrective Feedback in Academic Writing Among ESL Undergraduates. 3rd International Conference on Foreign Language Learning and Teaching, March 2013, Bangkok, Thailand [online]. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263852239>
- Sauro, S. (2009). Computer-mediated corrective feedback and the development of L2 grammar. *Language Learning & Technology*, 13(1), 96–120.
- Schultz, J. (2000). Computers and collaborative writing in the foreign language curriculum. In M. Warschauer, & R. Kern (Eds.). *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice* (pp. 121–150). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524735.008>.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused electronic corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners’ acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255–283. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x>.
- Sheen, Y. (2010). The role of oral and electronic corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 169–179.
- Smalley, L, Regina., & Mary, K, Ruetten. (2008). Refining composition skills. *Heinle ELT*.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learner’ processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing: Case studies. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 303–334. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990532>.

- Sullivan, N., & Pratt, E. (1996). A comparative study of two ESL writing environments: A computer-assisted classroom and a traditional oral classroom. *System*, 29 (4), 491-501.
- Tuzi, F. (2004). The impact of e-feedback on the revisions of L2 writers in an academic writing course. *Computers and Composition*, 21(2), 217–235. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2004.02.003>.
- Ware, P. D. (2004). Confidence and competition online: ESL student perspectives on web-based discussions in the classroom. *Computers and Composition*, 21(4), 451–468. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2004.08.004>.
- Ware, P., & Warschauer, M. (2006). Electronic feedback and second language writing. In K. Hyland, & F. Hyland (Eds.). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 105–122). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524742.008>.
- Well, M., Pegler, C. & Mason, R. (2005). Use of innovative technologies on an e-learning course. *The Internet and Higher Education*. 8, 61-71.

### Acknowledgments

The highest appreciation is addressed to academicians for supporting conducive academic life.

### About the Author:

**Tazkiyatunnafs Elhawwa (Dr. S.Pd.I., M.Pd)**. She is a lecturer of the English Education at Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangka Raya, Kalimantan Tengah, Indonesia. She interests on the education and teaching method. Her research interests are in the teaching method, multilingualism, and English education. *ORCID ID*: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3631-5605>. *Scopus ID*: [57215671606](http://orcid.org/57215671606)