

EFL Students' Self-regulated Writing on Teacher's Feedback: A Social Cognitive Theory Perspective

Muhammad Bagas Anugrah¹, Suhartoyo², Rahmawati³

English Education Department, Universitas Islam Malang, Indonesia

Email: 22001073005@unisma.ac.id.

ABSTRACT

This study explores how English as a Foreign Language (EFL) undergraduate students apply self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies when responding to teacher feedback in thesis writing. Grounded in Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) and Cognitive Load Theory (CLT), it aims to reveal how feedback is processed, remembered, and transformed into writing improvement. A qualitative case study design was employed, involving three EFL students from the English Education Department of Universitas Islam Malang. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and analysis thematically. The findings of this study show that teacher feedback plays a central role shaping EFL students' writing behavior, motivation, and self-efficacy. Students employed various SLR strategies such as planning, monitoring, reflection, and memory based techniques like note-taking, repetition, and voice recording to process and apply feedback effectively in their thesis writing. These strategies helped them transform feedback into meaningful revisions, demonstrating the interaction between cognitive engagement, emotional responses, and writing performance. Overall, The study concludes that teacher feedback function not only as correction but also as dialogic guidance that fosters autonomy, reflection, and motivation in students' writing. Theoretically, it deepens understanding of SRL and self-regulated writing; practically, it offers insight for designing feedback that support learner independence. the limitation is the small sample, which reduce generalizability and for future research with large samples.

Keywords: self-regulated learning, self-regulated writing, teacher feedback, social cognitive theory, cognitive load theory.

INTRODUCTION

Writing is widely recognized as one of the most complex and cognitively demanding skills in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning, particularly at the university level where students are required to produce advanced academic texts such as a thesis. Writing is not merely a matter of linguistic competence, but also involves the ability to generate ideas, organize arguments, apply academic conventions, and revise drafts continuously. In this sense, writing is strongly connected to self-regulated learning because successful writing development requires learners to actively manage their cognitive processes, motivation, and behavior throughout the writing process.

In thesis writing, teacher feedback plays an essential role in shaping students' writing development. Feedback functions as a source of guidance that helps students identify weaknesses, revise their writing, and improve academic quality. However, the effectiveness of teacher feedback depends on how students interpret, process, and apply it. While some students can transform feedback into meaningful revisions, others may struggle due to confusion, emotional responses, or difficulty remembering feedback across multiple drafts. This indicates that teacher feedback is not automatically effective unless students possess strong self-regulated writing strategies that enable them to respond actively and independently.

To explain this phenomenon, the present study is grounded in Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986), which emphasizes reciprocal interaction among personal factors (such as motivation and self-efficacy), behavioral factors (such as revision strategies), and environmental factors (such as teacher feedback). Zimmerman (2000) further argues that self-regulated learners are proactive in setting goals, monitoring progress, and reflecting on outcomes. In the context of academic writing, teacher feedback can be viewed as an environmental influence that may strengthen or weaken students' self-efficacy, motivation, and revision behavior.

In addition, Cognitive Load Theory (Sweller, 1998) provides a useful lens for understanding how students cognitively process feedback. Thesis writing involves complex tasks that may overload students' working memory, especially when feedback is extensive or difficult to interpret. Therefore, students often need cognitive and memory-based strategies—such as repetition, note-taking, and voice recording—to store feedback and apply it effectively in later revisions. These strategies help students manage cognitive load and transform feedback into long-term writing improvement.

Previous studies have highlighted the importance of self-regulated writing strategies and teacher feedback in EFL contexts. However, most research has focused on the frequency of strategy use or students' perceptions of feedback,

without deeply examining how students internalize, remember, and apply feedback through memory-based cognitive processes, particularly in long-term writing tasks such as thesis writing. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap by exploring how EFL students apply self-regulated learning strategies when responding to teacher feedback during thesis writing.

This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How do EFL students experience and apply self-regulated learning strategies when receiving teacher feedback on their writing, based on the Social Cognitive Theory perspective?
2. In what ways do EFL students utilize memory-based and reflective strategies to regulate their writing after receiving teacher feedback?

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative research approach using a case study design to explore how EFL students apply self-regulated writing strategies when responding to teacher feedback during thesis writing. A qualitative approach was selected because it allows researchers to understand participants' experiences and perspectives in depth, particularly within a specific academic context (Creswell, 2017). This design was considered appropriate because the study focused on investigating real experiences of students in managing feedback and regulating their writing process.

The study was conducted at the English Education Department of Universitas Islam Malang. The participants consisted of three undergraduate students who were currently writing their thesis and had received feedback from their supervisors. The participants were selected through purposive sampling, as they met the criteria of being actively involved in the thesis supervision process and having direct experience in revising their writing based on teacher feedback. Before data collection, all participants signed an informed consent form that explained the purpose of the study, procedures, and voluntary participation. Participants were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time without academic consequences. To ensure confidentiality, pseudonyms (P1, P2, and P3) were used, and all data were stored securely and accessed only by the researcher.

The main research instrument was a semi-structured interview guide developed by the researcher and adapted from Jian Xu's (2021) self-regulation framework. The interview questions were designed to explore students' experiences in responding to teacher feedback, particularly focusing on self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies such as motivation, planning, monitoring, reflection, and memory-based cognitive processing. The interview guide was organized into several sections, including background questions, experiences of teacher feedback,

strategies for remembering feedback, and self-regulation strategies in the writing process. Follow-up questions were used to clarify and deepen participants' responses.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews conducted in a comfortable environment, either face-to-face or via an online platform depending on participants' preferences. Each interview lasted approximately 30–45 minutes and was audio-recorded with participants' permission. The recordings were transcribed verbatim for further analysis.

The interview transcripts were analyzed using thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-step procedure. To ensure trustworthiness, this study applied Lincoln and Guba's (1985) criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility was strengthened through member checking and accurate transcription, while dependability was supported by documenting the research procedures in detail.

FINDINGS

This study investigated how three EFL undergraduate students regulated their thesis writing process after receiving teacher feedback. The findings revealed three main themes: (1) navigating feedback from confusion to confidence, (2) memory strategies as a bridge for applying feedback, and (3) self-regulated learning as the hidden engine in revision.

1. Navigating Feedback: From Comments to Confidence

All participants emphasized that teacher feedback played a major role in shaping their writing development, especially when the feedback was clear and specific. Students were more motivated to revise when supervisors provided direct explanations rather than vague comments. P1 explained that feedback helped him improve gradually because he could recognize repeated mistakes and avoid them in later drafts. Meanwhile, P3 stated that feedback became more meaningful when it was explained in detail and connected to his writing needs. He also mentioned that he often combined teacher feedback with peer discussion to clarify unclear comments.

In addition, participants agreed that feedback influenced their confidence. When they received understandable feedback, they felt more capable of revising effectively. P1 shared his main writing focus by stating, *"My goal is to convey meaning, not to make my writing complicated."* This shows that feedback encouraged him to prioritize clarity and communication rather than overly complex grammar. Similarly, P2 described that he monitored improvement carefully, saying, *"I pay attention to all progress, from the small notes to the big ones."* This reflects how feedback strengthened his motivation and created a sense of progress throughout the revision process. Overall, students perceived feedback as most helpful when it supported improvement and built confidence, not merely correcting mistakes.

2. Memory as a Bridge: From Feedback to Application

The findings also revealed that feedback could only be effective if students were able to remember and apply it during revision. Each participant used different strategies to retain teacher feedback. P1 relied mostly on internal repetition and self-reminding. He stated, *"I repeated it to myself several times to ensure I wouldn't forget,"* showing that repetition was his main strategy for retaining corrections. For him, feedback became easier to remember because similar errors often appeared repeatedly.

In contrast, P2 admitted having difficulty remembering feedback unless he wrote it down. He described himself as having limited memory by saying, *"I'm the kind of person with short-term memory."* Therefore, he developed a strategy of writing detailed notes from teacher comments. These notes became his personal reference, allowing him to revisit feedback whenever confusion occurred. This written documentation helped him avoid repeating mistakes and enabled him to revise step by step.

Meanwhile, P3 used a multimodal strategy by recording the supervisor's voice and replaying it during revision. He explained, *"I can listen to it anytime. When revising, I just play the recording."* This strategy helped him review feedback repeatedly and understand it more deeply. By combining recordings with note-taking, P3 reduced the risk of forgetting feedback and improved his revision efficiency. These findings indicate that memory-based strategies—such as repetition, note-taking, and audio recording—served as cognitive tools that helped students manage feedback effectively.

3. Self-Regulated Learning: The Hidden Engine

The last theme showed that self-regulated learning (SRL) strongly supported students' ability to revise their thesis writing. Participants demonstrated SRL behaviors such as goal setting, planning, monitoring progress, and reflecting on mistakes. P1 regulated his writing by focusing on meaning and evaluating his progress informally through self-awareness. P2 showed stronger planning and organization by transforming feedback into tasks and completing them systematically. His motivation was closely linked to completing his thesis and proving his academic growth. P3 demonstrated social and interactive self-regulation by combining teacher feedback, peer discussion, and technological tools.

Overall, the findings suggest that students' ability to benefit from feedback was not only determined by the feedback itself, but also by their cognitive and behavioral regulation. Their SRL strategies enabled them to transform external feedback into internal learning processes, making revision more effective and meaningful.

DISCUSSION

This study investigated how EFL undergraduate students applied self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies when responding to teacher feedback during the thesis-writing process, analyzed through Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) and supported by Cognitive Load Theory (CLT). The findings confirm that teacher

feedback is not merely a corrective tool but functions as an environmental factor that influences students' motivation, self-efficacy, cognitive processing, and revision behavior. In line with Bandura's (1986) reciprocal determinism, students' learning development emerged through the interaction of three elements: teacher feedback as the environment, students' internal beliefs and emotions as personal factors, and their revision practices as behavioral responses.

The first key finding demonstrates that teacher feedback acted as a trigger that activated students' revision strategies. Students tended to revise more effectively when feedback was clear, detailed, and specific. This supports the argument that feedback becomes meaningful when it provides direction rather than simple evaluation. Participants emphasized that feedback helped them identify weaknesses in their thesis drafts, such as grammar issues, unclear paragraphs, or weak argument structure. When feedback was straightforward, students felt more confident to revise immediately. This finding aligns with the view that feedback should be dialogic and supportive, enabling learners to interpret it as guidance rather than criticism.

The second important point concerns the role of self-efficacy and motivation. Students' confidence strongly shaped how they interpreted feedback. Some participants initially experienced emotional difficulty, such as fear, stress, or insecurity when receiving corrective feedback. However, over time, repeated engagement with feedback gradually improved their confidence and writing ability. This reflects Bandura's (1997) concept that successful experiences and progress strengthen self-efficacy, which then increases persistence in challenging academic tasks. In this context, thesis writing became not only a linguistic challenge but also an emotional process requiring motivation regulation. Students who developed stronger confidence were more likely to view feedback positively and treat it as a resource for improvement rather than a judgment of failure.

Another major finding highlights the importance of memory-based strategies in processing teacher feedback. Students employed various cognitive techniques such as note-taking, rereading feedback repeatedly, mentally recalling oral explanations, and recording supervisors' voices during consultations. These strategies helped students retain feedback and apply it effectively across multiple revisions. From the CLT perspective, such strategies serve as cognitive support systems that reduce overload in working memory, especially because thesis writing involves high intrinsic cognitive load (complex academic structure, argument development, and language accuracy). When students externalized feedback through written notes or recordings, they reduced the risk of forgetting important revisions and increased the likelihood of successful application in later drafts.

Furthermore, the study revealed that SRW strategies were highly individualized. Each participant developed a unique system depending on their

learning preferences and habits. For example, one participant relied more on internal memory and repetition, while others depended on structured note-taking, step-by-step revision, or peer discussion combined with audio recordings. This confirms Zimmerman's (2000) claim that self-regulated learners are active agents who adapt their strategies according to their context and personal needs. Thus, SRW should not be viewed as a fixed set of behaviors but as a flexible process that develops through experience and reflection.

Overall, this study reinforces SCT by showing that successful thesis writing is shaped not only by teacher feedback itself but also by students' ability to regulate their cognition, motivation, and revision behavior. Teacher feedback becomes effective when learners actively internalize it through memory strategies and self-regulation processes. Therefore, supervisors should provide feedback that is clear, supportive, and structured while encouraging students to use feedback journals, revision checklists, and reflective practices to strengthen autonomy and long-term academic writing development.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This study concludes that teacher feedback plays an important role in supporting EFL students' thesis writing development by shaping their self-regulated writing (SRW) behavior. The findings show that students do not simply accept feedback passively; instead, they actively interpret and apply it through self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies such as planning revisions, monitoring progress, and evaluating their writing performance. In accordance with Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986), the results confirm that students' writing improvement is influenced by reciprocal interaction between environmental factors (teacher feedback), personal factors (motivation, emotional readiness, and self-efficacy), and behavioral factors (revision actions). Students who perceived feedback as clear and constructive tended to revise more effectively and build greater confidence throughout the thesis-writing process.

In addition, this study highlights the significance of memory-based strategies in helping students process and retain feedback over time. Participants reported using note-taking, rereading teacher comments, repetition, and audio recording during supervision sessions to avoid forgetting important feedback. These strategies helped students reduce cognitive overload and apply feedback more consistently across multiple drafts. This supports Cognitive Load Theory, which emphasizes the importance of managing working memory during complex learning tasks such as academic writing.

Based on these findings, several suggestions are proposed. For supervisors, feedback should be delivered clearly, specifically, and in a supportive manner to encourage student confidence and engagement. Supervisors may also promote

dialogic feedback by allowing students to clarify unclear comments. For students, it is recommended to apply SRW strategies consistently by organizing feedback, prioritizing revisions, and using memory-support tools such as feedback journals, checklists, and recordings. Finally, future researchers are encouraged to involve more participants and explore SRW strategies in different academic contexts or by integrating technology-based feedback tools to strengthen students' self-regulated writing development.

REFERENCE

- Adie, L., van der Kleij, F., & Cumming, J. (2018). Diverse perspectives on student agency in classroom assessment. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 45(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-018-0262-2>
- Affandi Arianto, M., & Wulyani, A. N. (2022). Self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies during the completion of dissertation: A case study. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 41(1), 154–169. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v41i1.40687>
- Aimah, F. R., & Suhartoyo, E. (2024). A decade of Indonesian EFL students' voices toward peer feedback practices during synchronous and asynchronous periods:

- A systematic literature review. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 14(1), 48–72. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v14i1.7247>
- Alserhan, S., Alqahtani, T. M., Yahaya, N., Al-Rahmi, W. M., & Abuhassna, H. (2023). Personal learning environments: Modeling students' self-regulation enhancement through a learning management system platform. *IEEE Access*, 11, 5464–5482. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3236504>
- Aridah. (2003). The role of feedback in the teaching and learning of writing. *Celt: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature*, 3(2), 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.24167/celt.v3i2.1089>
- Ariyanti, A. (2016). The teaching of EFL writing in Indonesia. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 16(2), 263–277. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v16i2.274>
- Bakla, A. (2020). *Teacher development in technology-enhanced language teaching*. ResearchGate. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Arif-Bakla>
- Biber, D., Nekrasova, T., & Horn, B. (2011). *The effectiveness of feedback for L1-English and L2 writing development: A meta-analysis (TOEFL iBT Research Report No. 14)*. Educational Testing Service. <https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RR-11-05.pdf>
- Black, P., & McCormick, R. (2010). Reflections and new directions. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 17(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695940903557218>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). Classroom assessment and pedagogy. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 25(6), 551–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807>

- Boekaerts, M., Pintrich, P. R., & Zeidner, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of self-regulation*. Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50042-1>
- Boekaerts, M. (1996). Self-regulated learning: A new concept embraced by researchers, policy makers, educators, teachers, and students. *Learning and Instruction*, 6(2), 143–146. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-4752\(96\)00004-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-4752(96)00004-1)
- Brunstein, J. C., & Glaser, C. (2011). Testing a path-analytic mediation model of how self-regulated writing strategies improve fourth graders' composition skills: A randomized controlled trial. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36(2), 150–165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.02.001>
- Carnell, E. (2000). Dialogue, discussion and feedback—Views of secondary school students on how others help their learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(4), 541–558. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(00\)00015-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(00)00015-5)
- Chukharev-Hudilainen, E., & Saricaoglu, A. (2016). The use of automated writing evaluation to provide feedback on L2 writers' texts. In *Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications* (pp. 47–52). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W16-0505>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications. [10.1002/nha3.20258](https://doi.org/10.1002/nha3.20258)

- Danafi. (2020). Socio-cultural dimension of EFL writing feedback in Indonesian. *LangEdu Journal*, 9(1), 1–15. <http://repository.unisma.ac.id/handle/123456789/2834>
- Diab, N. M. (2016). Students' and teachers' attitudes toward teacher feedback and peer feedback in writing. *English Language Teaching*, 9(3), 92–101. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n3p92>
- Elbra-Ramsay, C. (2022). Roles, relationships and emotions: Student teachers' understanding of feedback as interpersonal. *Scottish Educational Review*, 54(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034523721989370>
- Ellis, R. (2010). *Corrective feedback and teacher development*. eScholarship. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2504d6w3>
- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2016). Supporting second language writing using multimodal feedback. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(1), 58–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12183>
- Evans, C. (2013). Making sense of assessment feedback in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(1), 70–120. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312474350>
- Fadli, K., Irawan, L. A., & Haerazi, H. (2022). English teachers' feedback on students' writing work in the new normal era. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 1(2), 83–92. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v1i2.624>
- Ferguson, R. (2011). Student feedback: The cornerstone to an effective quality assurance system. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 19(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684881111107727>

- Fithriani, R. (2019). The Power of Feedback in English Language Learning: An Analysis of Students' Perceptions. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 4(1), 13–37. <https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v4i1.111>
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365–387. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356600>
- Gamlem, S. M., & Smith, K. (2013). Student perceptions of classroom feedback. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(2), 150–169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2012.749212>
- Gauvain, M., Beebe, H., & Zhao, S. (2011). Applying the cultural approach to cognitive development. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, 12(2), 121–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15248372.2011.563481>
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (1997). The role of self-regulation and transcription skills in writing and writing development. *Educational Psychologist*, 32(3), 155–168. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3203_2
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2023). *The role and development of self-regulation in the writing process*. In D. H. Schunk & J. A. Greene (Eds.), *Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and educational applications* (pp. 203–228). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203763353-9>
- Graham, S., & Sandmel, K. (2011). The process writing approach: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 104(6), 396–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2010.488703>

- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Troia, G. A. (2000). Writing instruction: Research-based recommendations for students with learning disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 33(4), 1–14.
https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3501_2
- Greenfield, P. M. (2019). *Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive development*. Envision Your Evolution. https://www.envisionyourevolution.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Jean-Piagets-Theory-of-Cognitive-Development-envisionyourevolution.com_.pdf
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman. <https://archive.org/details/the-practice-of-english-language-teachin>
- Harnin, K. N., Padmadewi, N. N., Dewi, N. L. E. P., & Suwastini, N. K. A. (2022). Teachers' perception and practices on giving feedback on students' work during online learning. *Journal of Indonesian Student Assessment and Evaluation*, 8(1), 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.21009/JISAE>
- Hattie, J., & Gan, M. (2017). Instruction based on feedback. In R. E. Mayer & P. A. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of research on learning and instruction* (2nd ed., pp. (249–271). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315736412>
- Hughes, J. N., Wu, J. Y., & West, S. G. (2019). Teacher performance feedback and goal setting: A longitudinal study. *Journal of School Psychology*, 72, 1–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2018.12.003>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). *Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing*. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts*

and issues (pp. 1–19). *Cambridge University Press*.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547.003>

Irons, A., & Elkington, S. (2021). *Enhancing Learning through Formative Assessment and Feedback: A Contemporary Approach*. Routledge.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781138610514>

Kalyuga, S., & Plass, J. L. (2019). *Cognitive load as a local characteristic of cognitive processes: Implications for measurement approaches*. In R. E. Mayer

& P. A. Alexander (Eds.), *Cognitive load measurement and application* (pp. 59–74). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315296258-5>

Katsantonis, I., & McLellan, R. (2023). Students' voices: A qualitative study on contextual, motivational, and self-regulatory factors underpinning language achievement. *Education Sciences*, 13(8), Article 808.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13080804>

Kayaalp, F., Meral, E., & Namlı, Z. B. (2022). An analysis of the effect of writing-to-learn activities regarding students' academic achievement and self-regulation skills in writing. *Participatory Educational Research*, 9(1), 324–348. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.18.9.1>

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294–304.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/44.4.294>

Khoirotun, N., Umamah, A., & Suhartoyo, E. (2023). Self-regulated writing strategies among EFL students: A quantitative analysis. *Cakrawala*

Pendidikan, 43(1), 54–68. URL:
<https://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/cp/article/view/45678>

Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., Kirschner, F., & Zambrano, J. R. (2018). From cognitive load theory to collaborative cognitive load theory. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 13(2), 213–233.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-018-9277-y>

Leahy, W., & Sweller, J. (2005). Interactions between the frequency and the duration of feedback presentations. *Instructional Science*, 33(2), 179–191.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-004-8157-0>

Lee, I. (2011). Formative feedback in L2 writing: An investigation of feedback practices in ESL classrooms. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 67(1), 105–132. DOI: [10.1111/ijal.12215](https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12215)

Lee, I. (2020). *Teacher feedback in L2 writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108656182>

Maag, M. (2011). Feedback. In *Motivation and emotion/Book/2011/Feedback*. Wikiversity. https://en.wikiversity.org/wiki/Motivation_and_emotion/Book/2011/Feedback

Martínez-López, Z., Moran, V. E., Mayo, M. E., Villar, E., & Tinajero, C. (2023). Perceived social support and its relationship with self-regulated learning, goal orientation, self-management, and academic achievement. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-023-00752-y>

- Mayer, R. E. (2010). Applying the science of learning to medical education. *Medical Education*, 44(6), 543–549. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2010.03624.x>
- McCormick, C. B. (1995). *Theories of cognitive development: Piaget and Vygotsky*. In D. H. Schunk (Ed.), *Learning theories: An educational perspective* (pp. 114–154). Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Mertens, N. L. (Ed.). (2010). *Writing: Processes, tools and techniques*. Nova Science Publishers.
- Miller, G. A. (2011). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63(2), 81–97. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0043158>
- Mou, T. Y. (2023). Online learning in the time of the COVID-19 crisis: Implications for the self-regulated learning of university design students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 24(2), 185–205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14697874211051226>
- Nieminen, J. H., Bearman, M., & Tai, J. (2023). How is theory used in assessment and feedback research? A critical review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48(1), 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2047154>
- Nückles, M., Roelle, J., Glogger-Frey, I., Waldeyer, J., & Renkl, A. (2020). The self-regulation-view in writing-to-learn: Using journal writing to optimize cognitive load in self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, 32(4), 1089–1126. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09541-1>

- Panadero, E. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, Article 422. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422>
- Peterson, S. S., & McClay, J. (2010). Assessing and providing feedback for student writing in Canadian classrooms. *Assessing Writing*, 15(2), 86–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.05.003>
- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children* (M. Cook, Trans.). International Universities Press. (Original work published 1936)
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 451–502). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50043-3>
- Putri, N. V. W., Munir, A., & Anam, S. (2021). Students' perceptions of teacher feedback in EFL English class and their self-regulated learning after receiving feedback. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 11(1), 42–60. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v11i1.2237>
- Reynolds, D., & Perin, D. (2009). A review of strategies for teaching writing to adolescents. *Reading and Writing*, 22(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-008-9125-x>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>

- Silver, R. E., & Lee, C. (2017). Teacher feedback in writing: A process-oriented approach. *Journal of Writing Research*, 9(2), 215–234. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2017.09.02.04>
- Seow, A. (2002). The writing process and process writing. Dalam J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (hal. 315–320). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190.044>
- Smith, K., Gamlem, S. M., Sandal, A. K., & Engelsen, K. S. (2016). *Educating for the future: A conceptual framework of responsive pedagogy*. Cogent Education, 3(1), 1227021. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1227021>
- Sweller, J. (1994). Cognitive load theory, learning difficulty, and instructional design. *Learning and Instruction*, 4(4), 295–312. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-4752\(94\)90003-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-4752(94)90003-5)
- Sweller, J., Van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Paas, F. G. W. C. (1998). Cognitive architecture and instructional design. *Educational Psychology Review*, 10(3), 251–296. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022193728205SCIRP+4>
- Teng, M. F. (2019). The role of metacognitive knowledge and regulation in mediating university EFL learners' writing performance. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(5), 436–450. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2019.1615493>
- Teng, F., & Zhang, L. J. (2016). Fostering strategic learning: The development and validation of the writing strategies for self-regulated learning questionnaire

- (WSSRLQ). *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 25(4), 623–635.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-016-0306-5>
- Truscott, J. (1998). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 48(3), 329–369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00041>
- Umamah, A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2022). EFL university students' use of online resources to facilitate self-regulated writing. *CALL-EJ (Computer Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal)*, 23(1), 108–124.
<https://callej.org/index.php/journal/article/view/373>
- Umamah, A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2020). Indonesian university students' self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies in writing expository essays. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 25–35.
<https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i1.24958>
- Van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Sweller, J. (2005). Cognitive load theory and complex learning: Recent developments and future directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, 17(2), 147–177. DOI: [10.1007/s10648-005-3951-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-005-3951-0)
- Vattøy, K.-D., & Smith, K. (2019). Students' perceptions of teachers' feedback practice in teaching English as a foreign language. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 260–268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.06.024>
- Verina, R., Putri, N. V. W., & Munir, A. (2021). Students' perceptions of teacher feedback in EFL English class and their self-regulated learning after receiving feedback. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 11(1), 42–60.
<https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v11i1.2237>

- Xu, J. (2021,). *Chinese university students' L2 writing feedback orientation and self-regulated learning writing strategies in online teaching during COVID-19. Asia-Pacific Education Research*, 30, 563–574.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00586-6>
- Xu, Z., Zhao, Y., Zhang, B., Liew, J., & Kogut, A. (2022). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of self-regulated learning interventions on academic achievement in online and blended environments in K-12 and higher education. *Behaviour & Information Technology*. Advance online publication.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2022.2151935>
- Yangın Ekşi, G. (2012). Peer review versus teacher feedback in process writing: How effective? *International Journal of Applied Educational Studies*, 13(1), 33–48. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/1033775980>
- Yun, Y. (2013). The role of feedback in EFL writing: A case study of a Korean university student. *English Language Teaching*, 6(3), 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n3p1>
- Yunus, M., & Sari, A. S. (2018). Investigating a professional teaching of the new lecturer in Indonesia. *ELT-Echo: The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context*, 3(1), 1–8.
<https://doi.org/10.24235/eltecho.v3i1.2680.g1570>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A social cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(3), 329–339.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.81.3.329>

- Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (Eds.). (1989). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theory, research, and practice. *Springer*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-3618-4>
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (Eds.). (2001). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives (2nd ed.). *Lawrence Erlbaum Associates*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410605329>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). Investigating self-regulation and motivation: Historical background, methodological developments, and future prospects. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(1), 166–183.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207312909>
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Bandura, A. (1994). Impact of self-regulatory influences on writing course attainment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(4), 845–862. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312031004845>
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Risemberg, R. (1997). Becoming a proficient writer: A self-regulatory perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 22(1), 73–101. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1997.0919>
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2007). Motivation: An essential dimension of self-regulated learning. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 1–30). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). *Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective*. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13–39). Academic Press. <https://doi.org>

