



Language Awareness, Writing Self Efficacy and Writing Performance in English Major University Students: Think Aloud Protocol

Kesadaran Berbahasa, Efikasi diri dalam Menulis, dan Hasil Penulisan Pada Mahasiswa Jurusan Bahasa Inggris: Menyuarakan Pikiran

Fatma Sari*, Murni Mahmud, Asfah Rahman

Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia

*Penulis Koresponden: fsari4995@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Menulis adalah keterampilan kompleks yang berkembang dari waktu ke waktu melalui interaksi sehingga menimbulkan serangkaian masalah yang unik misalnya kesadaran bahasa dan efikasi diri untuk menulis berdasarkan alasan tersebut peneliti bermaksud untuk mendapatkan informasi di antara ketiganya dan bagaimana responden melakukan kesadaran bahasa pada tulisan mereka dengan menerapkan protokol menyuarakan pikiran. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode campuran dimana peneliti menggabungkan antara penelitian kualitatif dan kuantitatif. Purposive sampling dipilih untuk menentukan responden kemudian mereka diberikan kuesioner tentang efikasi diri (yaitu, ideation, convention, self-regulation). Tiga responden dipilih yang mendapat skor tertinggi, sedang, dan terendah. Responden diminta untuk menulis 2 teks dengan menerapkan protokol menyuarakan pikiran selama penulisan dan direkam. Hasil tulisan diperiksa untuk melihat hubungan antara kesadaran berbahasa dan efikasi diri dianalisis dengan pearson correlation dan multiple correlation. Peneliti menemukan beberapa cara bagaimana responden mengungkapkan kesadaran bahasa pada tulisan mereka dengan menerapkan protokol menyuarakan pikiran. Hubungan antara kesadaran bahasa dan tulisan mahasiswa menunjukkan korelasi positif sedangkan korelasi negatif antara efikasi diri dan tulisan mahasiswa, namun ketika mereka digabung bersama-sama antara kesadaran bahasa, efikasi diri dan tulisan siswa, R square menunjukkan hubungan yang kuat antara ketiga variabel.

Kata Kunci: Menulis, kesadaran berbahasa, efikasi diri, menyuarakan pikiran

ABSTRACT

Writing is a complex skill that develops over time through interaction hence it raised a unique set of issues for example language awareness and self- efficacy for writing entrenched the reason the researcher intended to gain the information among them and how the respondents did language awareness on their writings by applying think aloud protocol. This Study employed mix method where the researcher combined between qualitative and quantitative research. Purposive sampling was chosen for deciding the respondent then they were given questionnaire about self-efficacy (i.e., ideation, convention, self-regulation). Three respondents were selected who got the highest, midst, and the lowest score. The respondents were asked to write 2 texts by applying think aloud protocol during the writing and it was recorded. The results of the writings were checked to see the relation between the language awareness and the self-efficacy analyzed by Pearson correlation and multiple correlation. The researcher discovered several styles how respondents revealed language awareness on their writing by applying think aloud protocol. The relation between language awareness and students' writing showed positive correlation while negative correlation between self-efficacy and students' writing, yet when they came together between language awareness, self-efficacy and student's writing, the R square presented strong relation among the three variables.

Keywords: writing, language awareness, self-efficacy, think aloud protocol

1. PENDAHULUAN

Writing is one of the primary language skills. It is a complex skill that develops over time through interactions between the child's cognitive resources, the instructional context, and the writing task's demands. Not surprisingly, given its complexity, many students struggle with learning to write (Graham & Harris, 2004). It takes time to develop and is not mastered until well into the teenage years and beyond. Yet, lower-level processes such as handwriting and spelling constrain the text production in the beginning writer and those struggling with writing (Dockrell et al., 2015).

The problems vary. They are writing instruction (Graham et al., 2008) and the assessment of written products. They raise a unique set of the issues for practitioners and researchers alike (Huot, 1990). For example, language awareness analysis represents children's knowledge about the concept of words about written language (Justice & Ezell, 2001). Otherwise, one could perhaps argue that any language instruction approach to raising conscious awareness of how linguistic systems work is a language awareness approach. Yet, in the literature, it tends to have certain more specific characteristics (Svalberg, 2007).

The essential of language awareness is developing an ability to think critically about language and create a challenging and inspirational environment in which pupils are encouraged to realize that learning is a process related to oneself (Soons, 2008). It is like language awareness can be known by analyzing in students' writing that has been arranged by the pupils in this research. Besides, the think-aloud protocol will be used during student arrange the writing.

Think-aloud protocols have been considered as interesting tools to study the writing process. Nevertheless, the use of TA protocols to study the writing process has been questioned because the participants' situation is unnatural. The procedure may interfere with such a cognitively demanding process. Other criticisms present in the literature are that the information they provide is incomplete (Armengol & Cots, 2009) and that their interpretation might be misleading if researchers and informants do not share the same cultural history (Smagorinsky, 2001).

Therefore, the researcher avoids the pitfalls mentioned earlier to make the best use of the think-aloud protocol in composing process research. It requires considering the issues of immediacy and contextual specificity by observing think-aloud protocol during the correspondent complete the writing task, asking questions immediately after the correspondent finish the writing. Whereas this research will focus on the students' writing arrange by the students majoring English department. The correspondents will be given current issues then the correspondents are asked to write the issue while verbalizing the words (think-aloud protocol). Language awareness is needed to analyze the students' writing.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Previous Related Finding

In 2019, Abdel Latif conduct research trying to address the gap between retrospective interviews, think-aloud protocols, and the five aspects of second language writers composing: pre-writing stage, while-writing planning, first language (L1) use, composing problems and problem-solving, and text reviewing and changing. The result shows concurrent verbalizations provide much richer data than retrospective interviews about L2 writers' composing processes. Retrospective interviews were found to be a valuable source for revealing the 'why' of such processes. The gap between the two sources' data differed from one composing aspect to another (Abdel Latif, 2019). While this research will only focus on think-aloud protocol and the students' writing of the correspondent, the writer will add language awareness to analyze the result of the students' writing.

Armengol and Castells (2001) compare some of the writing behaviors present in three male Spanish university students' think-aloud protocols while writing in Catalan, their mother tongue, Spanish, and English. An analysis of the three subjects' composing behaviors based on the think-aloud protocols shows that their planning and other text-generating strategies are consistent across the three languages. It also shows that each subject similarly approached the three writing tasks, highlighting his individuality. The potential of individual writing and think-aloud protocols promote language and writing process awareness. In this research, the similarities have been found where the writer analyzes think-aloud protocol

in writing and promoting language and writing process awareness are discussed. The differences are about the correspondent of the research. Students who take the English program as their major will be in English only, and the students will submit two students' writings, including the revision.

Another research critically reviews the literature on using protocol analysis to understand cognitive processes students engage in while writing language tests. To synthesize the applicability and significance of protocol analysis invalidating language tests, the author first discusses the concepts' potential, including validity, language test validation, and protocol analysis. Terminological classifications of different approaches of test validation are elaborated. The author then critically examines the state of evidence by interpreting studies that employed protocol analysis in language tests. This paper is intended to stimulate discussion on the merits and inadequacies of protocol analysis in different ESL/EFL tests, especially when the tests are designed for test-takers with culturally different backgrounds (Zheng, 2009).

Suh bo-ram (2020) focus on concurrent data elicitation procedures (e.g., think-aloud, eye-tracking, response time) to investigate learners' cognitive processing and processes are becoming more prominent in research designs as researchers seek to acquire a better understanding of how second language (L2) learners process L2 data, at the same time, an increasing number of studies have empirically investigated the reactivity of think-aloud protocols in second language acquisition. The correspondents are fifty-nine Korean university English learners as a foreign language, randomly assigned to either a think-aloud or to a non-think-aloud (silent control) condition. L2 development was measured by a written story-retelling task and a multiple-choice receptive test. Results showed that thinking aloud while processing written corrective feedback during three feedback sessions did not affect learners' development of receptive knowledge and their ability to produce the target structure in a new piece of writing compared to a non- think-aloud condition.

2.2. Some Pertinent Idea

2.2.1. Language Awareness

A current definition of LA is that of the Association for Language Awareness (ALA), which states that language awareness can be defined as "explicit knowledge about language, and conscious perception and sensitivity in language learning, language teaching, and language use" (Ellis, E. M., 2012). Here, the theory of Thornbury (1997) who presents language awareness to analyze such as lexical, syntactic level and discourse.

a. Lexical

Lexical refers to vocabulary size, depth of vocabulary knowledge, and the accessibility of core lexical items (Meara, 2005). Measuring lexical proficiency benefits are from using assessments that evaluate more than just simple lexical classification, such as the amount or variety of used of words, the frequency of used of words, or the ability to match dictionary definitions with strings of letters (Nation, 2005).

b. Syntactic level

Syntax is defined as the study of sentence structure (Gelderen, 2016; Tallerman, 2015; Valin, 2004), albeit a more specific definition proposed by Adger (2019) pointing out that syntax is a cognitive capacity allowing humans to connect linguistic forms with meanings. The definition of syntax, however, remains debatable since it depends on the perspective of defining language. But they all share something in common: syntax is about forms.

c. Discourse

Hymes (1972) proposes that discourse is sequenced and the ability to structure discourse effectively. So, it is the knowledge of rules regarding the cohesion and coherence of various types of discourse. Canale and Swain (1980) emphasize that rules of discourse are crucial in interpreting utterances for social meaning, particularly when the literal meaning of an utterance does not lead to the speaker's intention easily. Discourse competence entails knowledge of how language is used in social settings to perform different communicative functions.

2.2.2. Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is personal judgment of personal capabilities. Bandura (1997) explained that self-efficacy is people's belief in their capabilities to organize or carry out an action to achieve a goal set or complete a

given task. Higher self-efficacy levels relate to multiple positive outcomes, including setting higher goals, using more effective learning strategies, and having lower anxiety (Bong, 2006). Self-efficacy becomes especially critical when domain-related tasks are demanding and motivational conditions are less than ideal. Bruning et al. (2013) proposed 3-factor modes of self-efficacy grounded in theoretical models and empirical findings highlighting the cognitive, procedural, and strategic processes underlying successful performance in writing, they are: Ideation beliefs about their abilities to produce and elaborate upon ideas. Flower and Hayes's (1984) argue that one likely dimension of writing self-efficacy is writers' beliefs about their abilities to generate ideas, their ideation. Conventions, the second factor, refers to writers' beliefs in their ability to follow the commonly accepted rules and standards of writing. Self-efficacy for writing self-regulation, measures writers' beliefs in their ability to regulate their writing behavior and affective responses to writing.

2.2.3. Writing

Writing is the process or result of recording language in the form of conventionalized visible marks or graphic signs on a surface. "Writing is functional communication, making learners possible to create imagined worlds of their design." It means that, through writing, learners can express thought, feeling, ideas, experiences, etc., to convey a specific purpose. The purpose of writing is to give some information (Kern, 2000). Meanwhile, Harris (1996) points out that there are four writing components they are: (1) content is place where the idea expressed. In line with this, Heaton (1989) says that content is a part where writers must think creatively to develop ideas into a writing. (2) Form is the organization of the content. Organization requires the writer to know about paragraph, topic and supports, cohesion and unity. (3) Kane (2000) states that our language arranged by the rules of grammar. Grammar also has an important role in producing good writing. In grammar, writers or students should master the rules for verbs, agreements, articles, pronouns, etc. (4) Style talks about how the author gives a certain sense of writing through the selection of structures or lexical items.

2.2.4. Think Aloud Protocol

Think-aloud protocols (or simply think aloud) is used to refer to an activity in which individuals verbalize the

thinking they use in completing a task (e.g., solving problem. responding to an item). Think-aloud protocols are appropriate in situations in which teachers are interest in understanding the thinking of specific students. They are can be concurrent or retrospective. In the former, student is asked to "think-aloud" while they complete the task. In the letter, they are asked to report the reasoning they used task after they complete the task. According to Kathleen using think aloud protocol students share their ideas and extend each other's thoughts. It means think-aloud protocols is one of method to make student verbalize or say what is in their mind while they are reading the text and think aloud protocols will lead students to extend their understanding on the text and pour it into writing. The writer concludes that Think-Aloud Protocols during a usability test, in reading at which the concern of this method is to make student verbalized or say what is in their mind while they are reading the text. It is very useful in capturing a wide range of cognitive activities. According to an information processing model proposed by Ericsson and Simon (1993), these verbal protocols (or verbal reports) are generated by "a subset of cognitive processes that generate any kind of recordable response or behavior". This model holds that the information that is stored in short-term memory (i.e., thoughts) while one is performing a task is the information that is reportable. In addition, information that is kept in long-term memory can also be reported after it has been retrieved. Based on this assumption, it is claimed that these types of verbal protocols, either concurrent or retrospective, are "the closest reflection of the cognitive processes" (Ericsson & Simon, 1993), and that they can accurately reflect cognitive processes if appropriate techniques are used to elicit them (Ericsson & Simon, 1993).

3. RESEARH METHOD

3.1. Research Design

Mix method was arranged for this study because Creswell (2009) explains that mixed method is defined as the procedure of research for collecting, analyzing, and mixing quantitative and qualitative data at the stage of research process in a single study to understand a problem more completely. This was related with the research have been discovered correlation between language awareness and students' writing and the correlation between self-efficacy and students' writing.

3.2. Instrument of the Research

The instruments of the research were data recording, questionnaire, and writing test. The researcher prepared stuffs to record all the activities on writing process then it recorded and transcribed to fill the data. A questionnaire is defined as a document containing questions and other types of items designed to solicit information appropriate to analysis (Babbie, 1990:377). Questionnaire is equally used in survey research, experiments, and other modes of observation. Indeed, people ask different questions in their daily life to satisfy their queries (Acharya, B. 2010). the writing test was the writing performances were done by respondents.

The researcher asked the respondents to do writing with think aloud protocol and all the activities are recorded then the data was analyzed. Questionnaire were given to fill the respondent's self-efficacy. It consisted of three factors and items and four different answers they were strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The result of the writing focused on the content, organization, vocabulary and mechanics, and grammar

3.3. Data Analysis

The researcher has modified the procedure analysis suggested by Ellis (1994): (1.) The researcher collected the data. (2) Identified the students' writing about language awareness (3) Describing the students' writing about language awareness. In this study, language awareness was classified into three elements lexical, syntactic level and discourse. While to find out result of language awareness on students' writing and the correlation between self-efficacy and students' writing will be analyzed by Pearson correlation. The Pearson product-momentum correlation coefficient is a measure of the linear dependence between two random variables (real-valued vectors).

To find out the result of relation between language awareness, self-efficacy and students' writing will be analyzed by multiple correlation. The multiple correlation coefficient generalizes the standard coefficient of correlation. It is used in multiple regression analysis to assess the quality of the prediction of the dependent variable. It corresponds to the squared correlation between the predicted and the actual values of the dependent variable. It can also be interpreted as the proportion of the variance of the

dependent variable explained by the independent variables. When the independent variables (used for predicting the dependent variable) are pairwise orthogonal, the multiple correlation coefficient is equal to the sum of the squared coefficients of correlation between each independent variable and the dependent variable (Abdi, 2007).

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Result of the Study

Think aloud protocol reveals the language awareness in students writing. The result seemed to vary across raters. It reported some of the respondents did several ways to reveal their lexical, syntax, and discourse on their writing. For lexical they did *translation*, most of the time the respondent said the word in Bahasa then tried to translate into English, *uttered the experience*, the respondent asked herself what to write for the next words, *mentioned several words until get an appropriate word*, the respondent brought up certain word to choose which fit perfectly for the writing, *remained silent or mumbling*, the respondent just silent or mumbling when they stuck what to write. Syntax on language awareness varied in reveal the sentence they were *uttered the experience*, the respondent asked herself what to write for the next sentence, *mentioned several words until get an appropriate word*, the respondent brought up certain word to start new sentence, *remained silent or mumbling*, the respondent just silent or mumbling when they stuck what to write, *Read the previous sentence*, the respondent seemed to read the previous sentence before continuing to write the next sentence.

Discourse applied several styles in revealing language awareness on paragraph. For instances *uttered the experience*, the respondent asked herself what to write for the next sentence, *mentioned several words until get an appropriate word*, the respondent brought up certain word to start new sentence, *remained silent or mumbling*, the respondent just silent or mumbling when they stuck what to write.

Table 1. Relation between Language Awareness and Students Writing

		Language Awareness	Writing
Language Awareness	Pearson Correlation	1	.992**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	6	6
Writing	Pearson Correlation	.992**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	6	6

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2. Relation between Language Awareness, Self-Efficacy and Students Writing

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	1.000 ^a	1.000	1.000	.039	1.000	14136.000	2	3	.000

Table 3. Relation between Self Efficacy and Students Writing

		SE	W
Self-Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	1	-.644
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.168
	N	6	6
Writing	Pearson Correlation	-.644	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.168	
	N	6	6

Table 4. Relation between Language Awareness, Self-Efficacy and Students Writing

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	1.000 ^a	1.000	1.000	.039	1.000	14136.000	2	3	.000

So, in this case, the relation between language awareness and writing of the respondents reveal a positive correlation of .992 (level of significant at the 0.01) as the language awareness goes up then so does the writing. The relationship is statistically significant at the .000. In words, between language awareness and writing they are in line together.

The case displays the relation between self-efficacy and writing have a negative correlation of -.644 as the score of self-efficacy goes higher, in reverse the score of writing goes lower. The significance relationship does not occur remain that the significant level more than .005. it is .168 means there is no significant relation.

The results of the table lead to the conclusion that the level of self-efficacy is not in line with results of writing. it is proved by the outcome of questionnaire

that have been responded in three section ideation, convention, self-regulation, one of the respondent counters with strongly agree for several questions but the result of the writing reveal in reverse. Other respondent never awards strongly agree for all the section, yet exceptionally she does better. Yet in table above when they came together between language awareness, self-efficacy, and students' writing, it shown positive correlation and The R Square has shown a strong relation among the three variables, they are language awareness, self-efficacy, and students' writing.

4.2. Discussion

Based on the finding above the researcher concluded that think aloud protocol reveals the language awareness in students writing. The result seemed to vary across raters. It reported some of the respondents

did several ways to reveal their lexical, syntax, and discourse on their writing. For lexical they did *translation*, most of the time the respondent said the word in Bahasa then tried to translate into English, *uttered the experience*, the respondent asked herself what to write for the next words, *mentioned several words until get an appropriate word*, the respondent brought up certain word to choose which fit perfectly for the writing, *remained silent or mumbling*, the respondent just silent or mumbling when they stuck what to write. Syntax on language awareness varied in reveal the sentence they were *uttered the experience*, the respondent asked herself what to write for the next sentence, *mentioned several words until get an appropriate word*, the respondent brought up certain word to start new sentence, *remained silent or mumbling*, the respondent just silent or mumbling when they stuck what to write, *Read the previous sentence*, the respondent seemed to read the previous sentence before continuing to write the next sentence. Discourse applied several styles in revealing language awareness on paragraph. For instances *uttered the experience*, the respondent asked herself what to write for the next sentence, *mentioned several words until get an appropriate word*, the respondent brought up certain word to start new sentence, *remained silent or mumbling*, the respondent just silent or mumbling when they stuck what to write.

The relation between language awareness and writing of the respondents reveal a positive correlation of .992 (level of significant at the 0.01) as the language awareness goes up then so does the writing. The relationship is statistically significant at the .000. In words, between language awareness and writing they are in line together.

the relation between self-efficacy and writing have a negative correlation of -.644 as the score of self-efficacy goes higher, in reverse the score of writing goes lower. The significance relationship does not occur remain that the significant level more than .005. it is .168 means there is no significant relation.

In the finding section is the presentation of relation between self-efficacy and writing. The results of the finding lead to the conclusion that the level of self-efficacy is not in line with results of writing. it is proved by the outcome of questionnaire that have been responded in three section ideation, convention, self-regulation, one of the respondent counters with

strongly agree for several questions but the result of the writing reveal in reverse. Other respondent never awards strongly agree for all the section, yet exceptionally she does better. Yet in Table 4.2.6 when they came together between language awareness, self-efficacy, and students' writing, it shown positive correlation and The R Square has shown a strong relation among the three variables.

5. CONCLUSION

The researcher discovered several styles how respondents revealed language awareness included lexical, syntax, and discourse on their writing by applying think aloud protocol. The relation between language awareness and students' writing showed positive correlation while the relation between self-efficacy and writing have negative correlation, yet when it came together between language awareness, self-efficacy, and students writing, it shown positive correlation.

REFERENCES

- Abdel Latif, M. M. M. (2019). Using think-aloud protocols and interviews in investigating writers' composing processes: Combining concurrent and retrospective data. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 42(2), 111–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2018.1439003>
- Acharya, B. (2010). Questionnaire design. *Central Department of Population Studies*.
- Adger, D. (2019). *Language unlimited*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Armengol-Castells, L. (2001). Text-generating Strategies of Three Multilingual Writers: A Protocol-based Study. *Language Awareness*, 10 (2–3), 91–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410108667028>
- Armengol, L., & Cots, J. M. (2009). Attention processes observed in think-aloud protocols: Two multilingual informants writing in two languages. *Language Awareness*, 18(3–4), 259–276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410903197330>
- Babbie, Earl, 1990. *Survey Research Methods*, Second Edition. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Batubara, F. A. (2018). *Improving students' ability in writing of announcement through gallery walk technique of eight grade at Mts Jam'iyatul Alwashliyah Tembung in academic year 2016/2017* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara).
- Bong, M. (2006). Asking the right question: How confident are you that you could successfully perform these tasks? In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 287–303). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Bruning, R., Dempsey, M., Kauffman, D. F., McKim, C., & Zumbrunn, S. (2013). Examining dimensions of self-efficacy for writing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(1), 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029692>
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980) Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1, 1-47
- Creswell, John W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, evaluating, quantitative and qualitative research* (Fourth Edition). *United State of America*: Pearson Education Inc.
- Dockrell, J. E., Connelly, V., Walter, K., & Critten, S. (2015). Assessing children's students' writings: The role of curriculum based measures. *British Educational Research Journal*, 41(4), 575–595. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3162>
- Ellis, E. M. (2012). Language awareness and its relevance to TESOL. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 7.
- Ellis, N.C. (Ed.). (1994a). A theory of instructed second language learning. In N.C. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages*. London: Academic Press.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1993). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. *College Composition and Communication*, 31, 21– 32. doi:10.2307/356630
- Gelderen, E. van (Ed.). (2016). *Cyclical change continued*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Graham, S. & Harris, K. (2004) *Writing instruction*, in: B. Wong (Ed.) *Learning about learning disabilities* (3rd edn) (San Diego, CA, Elsevier), 281–313.
- Graham, S., Morphy, P., Harris, K., Fink-Chorzempa, B., Saddler, B., Moran, S. & Mason, L. (2008) Teaching spelling in the primary grades: a national survey of instructional practices and adaptations, *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(3), 796–825. doi:10.3102/0002831208319722
- Harris, D. P. (1996). *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Heaton, J. B. (1989). *Writing English Language Test*. New York: Longman.
- Huot, B. (1990) The literature of direct writing assessment—major concerns and prevailing trends, *Review of Educational Research*, 60(2), 237–263. doi:10.3102/00346543060002237
- Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In Pride and Holmes (eds). *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Justice, L. M., & Ezell, H. K. (2001). Written Language Awareness in Preschool Children from Low-Income Households: A Descriptive Analysis. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 22(3), 123–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/152574010102200302>
- Kane, T. S. (2000). *Oxford Essential Guide to Writing*. New York: Berkley Books.
- Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Meara, P. (2005). Designing vocabulary tests for English, Spanish and other languages. In C. Butler, S. Christopher, M. Á. Gómez González, & S. M. Doval-Suárez (Eds.) *The dynamics of language use* (pp. 271–285). Amsterdam, John Benjamins Press.

- Nation, I. S. P. (2005). Teaching and learning vocabulary. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 581–595). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers
- Smagorinsky, P. (2001). Rethinking protocol analysis from a cultural perspective. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 233–245
- Soons, M. P. (2008). The Importance of Language Awareness. *Malmö Högskola Lärarutbildningen Kultur-Språk-Medier.*, 44.
- Suh, B.-R. (2020). Are think-alouds reactive? Evidence from an L2 written corrective feedback study. *Language Teaching Research*, 136216882096716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820967166>
- Svalberg, A. M.-L. (2007). Language awareness and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 40(4), 287–308. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004491>
- Tallerman, M. 2015. *Understanding Syntax* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Thornbury, S. (1997a). *About language: Tasks for teachers of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Valin, R.D.V. (2004). *An introduction to syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zheng, Y. (2009). Protocol Analysis in the Validation of Language Tests: Potential of the Method, State of the Evidence. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 5(1), 124–137. <https://doi.org/10.5172/ijpl.5.1.124>