

ICARE Learning Model in Improving the Students Writing Ability

Ammang Latifa¹, Rafi'ah Nur², Ahmad Rizal³

Universitas Muhammadiyah Parepare, Indonesia^{1,2,3}

Email : latifa_ammang@yahoo.com¹

Submitted: 29/02/2020

Revised: 15/03/2020

Accepted: 02/05/2020

E-ISSN : 2579-4574

P-ISSN : 2549-7359

Abstract. This research explored the use of the ICARE Model to studying the writing ability at the Senior high school in Parepare. ICARE includes five essential elements of a good learning experience, can be applied to children, teenagers, and parents, namely Introduction, Connection, Application, Reflection, and Extension. This research involved a population from Senior high school in Parepare in the academic year 2015/2016. The students consist of two classes, an experimental class, and a control class. Each class consists of 36 students. This research utilized a cluster random sampling technique to select the sample. The instrument used in this research is the writing test. The data were analyzed by using t-test. The research reveals that there was a significant increase in students writing ability. This finding indicates that the mean score of the post-test of the experimental group is getting much better than the control class. It meant that using ICARE developed the students' ability in writing, and the writing component increased the highest is in the vocabulary aspect.

Keywords: ICARE, Learning strategy, writing ability

<https://ojs.unm.ac.id/eralingua>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a very challenging skill where second-language learners expected to acquire a variety of linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural competencies to learn this skill (Hussain, 2017; Mantasiah et al., 2019; Tonapa et al., 2018). As many teachers in evaluation activity, teaching L2 writing is a challenging task as well. Motivating students to write frequently can be a tricky task. However, teachers need to attend to both cognitive and motivational factors in the L2 writing classroom (Underwood, 2017). Motivational factors include learners' beliefs about the nature and importance of writing, the differences between L1 and L2, their attitude to the L2, and about their writing competence, which in turn influence learners' engagement, effort, and learning in the L2 writing classroom (Godwin-Jones, 2018).

Furthermore, (González, 2018) stated that teachers need to be aware of these affective factors and to help their students become more motivated than before. Motivation should help learners want to increase their practice time and to set new writing goals for themselves. Therefore, learning and teaching writing in a second language are very challenging tasks (Javadi-Safa, 2018), at least a number that must be considered, for example, is the affective, linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural factors involved (Ahmed, 2019). Teachers also need to raise learners' awareness and need to have a successful writing process. Moreover, they need to motivate learners by facilitating models to them, clearly and specific learning goals and meaningful contexts to practice writing, carefully structured activities, clear presentation of materials, useful feedback, encouragement, and high standards (Sieberer-Nagler, 2015).

In this research, the researcher's attention focuses on English writing competence. Some of the research studies revealed that in a conclusion that writing activity is considered as a difficult subject for students; (Rahmatunisa, 2014) in her research about the problems of EFL learners to write an argumentative composition. She found that most of the students met problems in linguistic, psychological, and cognitive aspects to write a composition. The next researcher is, (Mathew & Mahasneh, 2017), who investigate the students' basic competence in writing. George Mathew, in his finding, students were in a phobia of making grammar errors in writing an essay; this situation often leads the student to hinder their progress in a writing activity. Belkhir & Benyelles (2017) studied about the EFL learners' essay writing. Their study shows that the problem frequently occurs in the students' writing essay is coherence and cohesion; the primary source of problems is the lack of writing practice activity.

In English language learning and acquisition, there are four skills, namely speaking, reading, writing, listening play important role as a medium of communication; writing one of them is categorized as foreign language learning (Akbari, 2016). Through writing, we can inform others, carry out transactions, persuade, infuriate, and tell what we feel (Fishman, 2019). However, we know that writing or learning to write primarily in a second language is not merely a matter of "writing things down" (Mohanty et al., 2019).

Some research studies of writing with themes such as writing perspective, problems in writing activity, and additional views of writing as language learning become as one reason for the researcher to carry out this study. The different thing of this research project is exploring the students' ability to write through an approach to study, which is called the ICARE learning model, while (Rahmatunisa, 2014) and (Belkhir & Benyelles, 2017) explore the writing study on its problem to write. Another researcher is George Mathew, who focuses his research on the perspective of students' learning in writing.

The main reason for the researcher chooses this model because ICARE learning steps strategy can be used in large classes and encourages students to be reflective about course content, allows students to formulate their thought before sharing them with others privately. A variety of interactive learning methods has been used through each module to not only motivate teachers in training but also to provide a model of different methods that teachers can use in their classrooms. Therefore, the module uses a straightforward framework called ICARE. The ICARE system covers the five critical elements of any good learning experience (whether with children, youth, or adults) such as Introduction, connection, Application, Reflection, and Extension. Using the ICARE system ensures that learners have the opportunity to apply what they have learned. The ICARE model pedagogical framework derives from the basic concepts of practice and instructional design by adopting various teaching steps. This teaching concept seems to be a beneficial component of online courses (Hoffman & Ritchie, 1998).

ICARE LEARNING MODEL

The ICARE model was consequently adopted given to its 'flexible system of development,' which 'was needed to account for the many types of instruction' that could be offered within a creative, innovative, or practice-oriented learning context (Dimitrova et al., 2004). The ICARE method of designing instructional material had also been discovered to be particularly helpful for those students who were novice learners 'working on their first project' (ibid). At the same time, since the models utilized by (Behlol & Dad, 2010; Rashidi & Faham, 2011) were similar to the module-matrix theory propounded by (Kelly, 2009), It produced effective results in the Pakistani Higher Education context; the sample Creative Writing module was seeking to incorporate additional elements in its design.

Hoffman & Ritchie (1998) at San Diego State University first introduced the ICARE Learning Model in 1997. At first, the ICARE learning model functioned as online learning at San Diego State University. However, over time this learning model is increasingly developing, so it is possible to apply in schools. In Indonesia in 2006 through the Decentralized Basic Education (DBE) program began to introduce and, at the same time, use the ICARE pedagogical framework in teacher training and learning processes in Schools. Wildemeersch et al, (2017) states that the ICARE learning model is a learning model that is student-centered and has five stages. These stages are extensions of (Introduction), (Connection), (Application), (Reflection), and (Extension) Hidayat (2017) states that the ICARE system includes five essential elements of a good learning experience, which can be applied to students. Therefore, the ICARE system is perfect to be applied not only in training

wherever it happens carried out but also in-depth the learning process at school. Rianawati (2017) states that the use of the ICARE learning model is to ensure that learners possess the opportunity to apply what they have learned. Guidelines for developing learning materials are the fulfillment of learning components that are relevant to the need to learn students (Schunk, 2012). The components of learning materials are in our expectation to be able to motivate and facilitate students in learning and motivating the contents of learning the materials (Darling-Hammond et al., 2019).

The ICARE Learning Model is available as providing many opportunities for students to have the opportunity to apply what they have learned in learning (Carni, 2016). Besides, Carni explained each stage of the ICARE learning model that has adapted to physics learning:

1. Introduction: At this stage of the learning experience, the teacher instills an understanding of the contents of the lesson to students (Anderson et al., 2018). This section must contain an explanation of the lesson objectives and the results expected during the lesson. The teacher makes apperception to the students by showing some phenomena that are important in contextual learning. Then, students observe and ask the phenomenon being displayed; besides that, the motivation must also be given at this stage so that students feel interested in learning the material of the future session.
2. Second Phase, connection: At the connection stage of the lesson, the teacher tries to connect new knowledge with something that is already known to students from learning or previous experience (Darling-Hammond et al., 2019). The teacher does a demonstration, and questions and answers occur, for example, asking students to tell what they remember from previous learning experiences. The most important thing at the connection stage is the inculcation of concepts, that is by inviting students to plan and do activities independently or groups to make examples of applications in real-world contexts based on incurred (Wan Chai, 2017).
3. Third Phase, application: This stage is the most critical stage of learning. After students acquire new knowledge or skills through the connection phase, they need to be allowed to practice or apply their knowledge and skills (Schunk, 2012). The application part must last the longest in this learning process because students are required to carry out experimental activities or apply their knowledge in a real-world context, which is undoubtedly different from the sample applications that have applied out at the previous connection stage.
4. Fourth Phase, reflection: This section is a summary of the lesson, while students have the opportunity to reflect on what they have learned. The teacher's task is to assess the extent of the success of learning (Darling at al., 2017). Reflection or summary activities can involve group discussions where instructors ask students to make presentations or explain what they have learned. They can also do independent writing activities where participants write a summary of the learning outcomes. This reflection can also take the form of a short quiz where the teacher gives questions based on the content of the lesson or session (Chin

& Osborne, 2008). An important point to remember in reflection is that teachers need to provide opportunities for students to express what they have learned.

5. Fifth Phase, extension: the lesson time has finished; it does not mean that all students who have learned can automatically use what they have learned. Extension section activities are activities where the teacher provides activities that participants can do after the lesson ends to strengthen and expand learning at school, extension activities are usually considered a homework assignment (Gnawali, 2008). Extension activities can include the availability of additional reading material, the task of summarizing the next material, or exercises.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research applied a quasi-Experimental design that employs the on equivalent control group design. The collected data were reported after treating using quantitative analysis process. The population of this research was the twelfth year students of senior high school Parepare. It consists of two classes; each class consists of 36 students, so the number of population is 72 students. The sampling technique in this research was a cluster random sampling technique because the researcher considered that the populations were heterogeneous members. Therefore, the researcher chooses one class as the experimental group (36 students) and one class as a control group (36 students) as the sample. Therefore, the total number of sample was 72 students

In measuring the writing ability, the researcher used a written test. The test was given in two sections. The pretest was given before the treatment to get the data on the students' prior knowledge, and the posttest was given to know the student's ability to write narrative text after the treatment. In the pre-test and post-test, the students choose one of three topics and write their ideas (composition) based on the topic minimally 150 words. The function of this test was to know the students' content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics in writing narrative text.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. The Students' Achievement of Writing in The Pre-Test

No	Classification	Range	Experimental		Control	
			F	%	F	%
1	Very good	86-100	0	0	0	0
2	Good	71-75	4	11.11	1	2.78
3	Fair	56-60	30	83.33	16	44.44
4	Poor	41-55	2	5.56	19	52.78
5	Very poor	0-40	0	0	0	0
	Total		36	100	36	100

Table 2. Students' Achievement in The Pre-Test

Group	Mean score	Standard Deviation
Experimental	58.83	3.57
Control	58.91	4.90

Table 3. The result of T-test Analysis in the Pre-test

Variable	t-test value	t-table value
Pre-test	-0.07	1.671

The data in Table 1 shows the students' writing achievement both in the experimental class and in the control class, both of which have achievements under the expectation or the category of understanding is still low. In this achievement table, the reading achievement of students in both classes is generally between the levels of very poor to the fair while neither of the two groups is at the level of good to very good.

Table 4. The Students' Achievement of Writing in The Post-Test

No	Classification	Range	Experimental		Control	
			F	%	F	%
1	Very good	86-100	15	41.67	2	5.56
2	Good	71-75	21	58.33	31	86.11
3	Fair	56-60	0	0	3	8.33
4	Poor	41-55	0	0	0	0
5	Very poor	0-40	0	0	0	0
	Total		36	100	36	100

Table 5. Mean Score of Students' Achievement in the Post-test

Group	Mean score	Standard Deviation
Experimental	85.05	3.44
Control	77	4.76

Table 6. The result of T-test analysis in post-test

Variable	t-test value	t-table value
Post-test	8,139	1.671

Table 2 shows the reading comprehension ability experienced by students is a significant increase in both groups as either a class experiment or a particular group. Expressly, in the experimental class, it was noted that the reading comprehension achievement before being given special treatment showed that

reading comprehension achievement was in low-level achievement. It was only between the secondary and fair levels (see table 1). However, after being given special treatment (see table.3), the students' learning achievement in the Experiment group experienced a very significant increase, where their achievements were only at a good and very good level, none of the students were at a low level of achievement. Another case with the control group, even though it shows a pretty good, but after they learn to read with traditional methods, still shows the achievements of several children who are at an average level.

After calculating the students' score of the two groups after treatment, the researcher found that the t-test is greater (8.139) than t-table (1.671) for 5% (0.05) level of significance, the degree of freedom ($n_1 + n_2 - 2$) 70 (see table 6). This data analysis showed that there was significant different development between the two groups who were taught by the CARE learning model. From these findings above, it showed that the ICARE Learning Model implementation in the experimental class developed the students writing ability than the traditional technique (direct interaction technique) that applied in the control class. The writing ability of the experimental class improved, especially for the experimental group. It was also supported by the rate percentages and frequency of the students' writing achievement of pre-test and post-test results. Students score for the experimental group and control group was better than before the treatment. As Behlol (2010) and Rashidi (2011), The ICARE method of designing instructional material had also involved being particularly helpful for those students who were novice learners 'working on their first project' (ibid).

Based on the students' work in the pre-test of both experimental and control groups, the researcher analyzed that on the five components of writing, the students had low ability to express their idea in constructing narrative writing. Most of them had difficulty in the pre-writing stage. Moreover, this should be an essential aspect to be considered, as Simard (1997) stated that the pre-writing stage could be the most important thing if the students can gather their information and begin to manage it into a cohesive unit. While most of the students had difficulty starting the writing task. Moreover, some of them were also confused about how to construct their paragraphs. Besides that, they also still had low comprehension about how to write mainly about the five components of writing. The productive writing skill focuses on a cognitive challenge because it helps to assess language competency, recalling capability, and thinking ability. The long-term memory plays an essential role in recalling all information in the language acquisition device (Collette, Van Der Linden, & Poncelet, 2000).

Moreover, the ability of productive writing requires the sound ability to think on comprehensible matters (Javed, 2103). The writing skill cons a well-structured way of the presentation of thoughts in an organized and planned way. Writing skills at an advanced level are highly required to obtain more academic results that can sustain other academic activities, which Relate to writing presentations (National Assessment of Educational Progress). Based on the data analysis, the researcher presented the discussion of data gained by students. Before giving the treatment, in the pre-test the students writing ability was still low

with a mean score of 58.83 for the experimental group and 58.91 for the control group based on the given pre-test (see table 2). On the other hand, the result of the statistical t-test was smaller (-0.07) than t-table (1.671) for 5% (0.05) level of significance (see table 3). It means that there was no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group. In post-test, they learned four times by using ICARE in the experimental group and without ICARE in the control group. Then, the result showed the students' writing achievement improved with a mean score of 85.05 for the experimental group and teaching without ICARE 77 for the control group based on the given post-tests result (see table 5). The student's score achievement of the experiment showed higher than score achievement in the control class. On the other hand, the result of the statistical t-test is more significant (8.139) than t-table (1.671) for 5% (0.05) level of significance (see table 6). It means that there was a significant difference in students' writing achievement between the experimental group and the control group in the post-test.

Based on the result of the analysis above, the researcher concludes that the t-test value (8.139) is higher than the t-table value (1.671) $\alpha = 0.05$, (see Table 6). It means that H_1 was accepted, and H_0 was rejected. From the explanations above, it could be concluded by the researcher that teaching writing by using an Introduction, Connection, Application, Reflection, and Extension (ICARE) was a practical approach to increase students' writing ability. The ICARE model was consequently adopted given to its 'flexible system of development,' which 'was needed to account for the many types of instruction' that could be offered within a creative, innovative, or practice-oriented learning context. The ICARE model pedagogical framework was derived from the basic principles of instructional design practice by "adopting various systems or steps of instruction to what seems to us to be useful components of an online course" (Hoffman & Richie, 1998).

Based on the data analysis, mostly, the students got difficulties in composing narratives text because they were a lack of understanding of the tense and the use of punctuation (comma and full stop). This phenomenon commonly occurs to the students because, in writing, there are many components that students should be mastered, and it was difficult for them. Writing is one of the necessary skills in the English language; it is generally considered one of the most complicated and challenges that other skills for foreign language students. Even native speakers feel difficulty in showing good command of writing (Lou et al., 2016).

The students wrote some themes of the narrative composition both in pre-test and post-test. The students writing composition are analyzed based on five aspects: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics considered (Fareed & Bilal, 2016) pointed out five kinds of components in writing. They are the content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. From the students in the test, most of them get improvement in each aspect. It means that the use of ICARE in teaching writing was useful for the students. Writing is generally considered a difficult skill for foreign language learners. Even

native speakers find it challenging to show useful writing competence (Lou et al., 2016).

Mostly, the students could develop the content of the story and organized it based on the generic structure. They also used the proper vocabulary. It made the reader understood with their composition. To develop and organized the story, the students did not get into difficulties. They had already understood the generic structure of the narrative text. It made it easy to create the story. They also used the understandable vocabularies that could not make the reader confused. On the other hand, the students got difficulties in producing a sentence. The common mistakes that the students did were the use of to be and verb. Most of them did know the past form of the verb 1. Thus, it made their sentence became incorrect. They also made a mistake in putting to be. Although they got the wrong pattern of the sentence, the reader still understood the meaning of it. In the statement above, the teacher explained, including the difficulties of the students. It was done continuously. The teacher did it to make the students felt familiar with the materials. Hopefully, it could reduce the students' mistakes in producing a sentence. After teaching by using the ICARE model strategy, the researcher found that teaching writing by using the ICARE model strategy improved five components of writing in the experimental class. Its support of the t-test value of writing is higher than the t-table value. Therefore, the researcher believed that teaching writing by using the ICARE model strategy is better to improve the students writing ability.

CONCLUSION

The use of ICARE could increase the students' ability in writing; it revealed in the result of students' writing a composition. The students were able to improve their idea in the content, organization, language use, vocabulary selection, and mechanics significantly. The writing ability of students who taught using ICARE and those who taught without using ICARE had a significant difference. Therefore, the result conclusion is that the experimental group is getting much better of writing ability by using ICARE. From these data, the researcher concluded that the use of ICARE could increase the students' ability to write English. The use of ICARE can help the students in producing a good composition, primarily narrative writing. Moreover, ICARE learning models can create interesting learning for students so that they are active in the learning process. Learning becomes more meaningful for students so that the learning outcomes of students are increased. The indication improvement if from the result of the students writing a composition. The students have been able to develop the entire writing component: content, organization, vocabulary language use, and mechanics. However, they have not been able to use tenses and punctuation correctly.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I deliver my deepest gratitude to Dr. Amaluddin as director of the Postgraduate program at Muhammadiyah Parepare University; he shared their wisdom pearls with me during this study. Moreover, I thank all Postgraduate lecturers in the English language education department, whom I cannot mention individually for their insight that contributed to the completion of this paper. We are also very grateful to the Professor. Dr. Muhammad Siri Dangnga, M.S., for his unrelenting motivation to come to us to keep the spirit of completing this article

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, F. (2019). errors of unity & coherence in Saudi Arabian EFL university students' written paragraph: A case study of the College of Science & Arts, Tanumah, King Khalid University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 125–155. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.321555>
- Akbari, Z. (2016). The Study of EFL Students Perceptions of their Problems, Needs, and Concerns over Learning English: The Case of MA Paramedical Students. *Procedia - Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 232(April), 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.006>
- Anderson, J., Rainie, L., & Caiazza, T. (2018). The future of well-being in the tech-saturated world | Pew Research. (April). Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2018/04/17/the-future-of-well-being-in-a-tech-saturated-world/>
- Behlol, M., & Dad, H. (2010). Effectiveness of Structural Method of Teaching Vocabulary. *English Language Teaching*, 3(3), 125–135. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n3p125>
- Belkhir, A., & Benyelles, R. (2017). Identifying EFL Learners Essay Writing Difficulties & Sources: A Move towards Solution The Case of The Second Year of EFL Learners at Tlemcen University. *The International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 16(6), 80–88.
- Carni, J. M. and P. S. (2016). An Implementation Of Icare Approach (Introduction, Connection, Application, Reflection, Extension) to Improve The Creative Thinking Skills. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 755(1). <https://doi.org/doi:10.1088/1742-6596/812/1/012022>
- Chin, C., & Osborne, J. (2008). Students' questions: A potential resource for teaching & learning science. *Studies in Science Education*, 44(1), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057260701828101>
- Collette, F., Van Der Linden, M., & Poncelet, M. (2000). Working memory, long-term memory & language processing: Issues and future directions. *Brain and Language*, 71(1), 46–51. <https://doi.org/10.1006/brln.1999.2209>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2019). Implications for the educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 0(0), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>

- Dimitrova, M., Mimirinis, M., & Murphy, A. (2004). Evaluation the flexibility of a pedagogical framework for e-learning. *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies, ICALT 2004*, (January 2004), 291–295. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICALT.2004.1357422>
- Fareed, M., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL Learners ' Writing Skills : Problems , Factors and Suggestions ESL Learners ' Writing Skills : Problems , Factors and Suggestions Introduction. (October). <https://doi.org/10.20547/jess0421604201>
- Fishman, J. (2019). Bad Ideas about Writing. In *Composition Studies* (Vol. 47).
- Gnawali, L. (2008). TEACHER DEVELOPMENT THROUGH REFLECTIVE PRACTICE. *Teacher Development*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.3126/jer.v1i0.7953>
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2018). The second language writing online: An update. *Language Learning and Technology*, 22(1), 1–15.
- González, A. (2018). Turning a traditional teaching setting into a feedback-rich environment. *International Journal of Educational Technology of Higher Education*, 15(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-018-0114-1>
- Hidayat, H. (2017). Implementation of the ICARE learning model using visualization animation on the biotechnology course. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 1911(December). <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5016020>
- Hoffman, B., & Ritchie, D. (1998). Teaching & Learning Online: Tools, Templates, and Training. Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education. *International Conference*, 119–123. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED421092.pdf>
- Hussain, S. S. (2017). Teaching Writing to Second Language Learners: Bench-marking Strategies for Classroom. *Arab World English Journal*, 8(2), 208–227. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no2.15>
- Javadi-Safa, A. (2018). A Brief Overview of Key the Issues in Second Language Writing Teaching & Research. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 6(2), 12. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.6n.2p.15>
- Javed, M. (2103). A Study of Students' Assessment in Writing Skills of the English Language. *International Journal of Instruction*. http://www.e-iji.net/dosyalar/iji_2013_2_9.pdf
- Kelly, R. (2009). A Modular Course Design Benefits Online Instructor and Students. Retrieved from <http://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/online-education/a-modular-course-design-benefits-online-instructor-and-students/>
- Lou, Y., Wu, L., Liu, H., & Chen, L. (2016). Improving Non-English-Majored College Students' Writing Skills: Combining a Know-Want-Learn Plus Model of Meta-Cognitive Writing Strategy Instruction and Internet-Based Language Laboratory Support. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 04(08), 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2016.48005>
- Mantasiah, R., Yusri, Y., Syaputra, A. F., Angreany, F., Hasmawati, H., & Anwar, M. (2019, December). Assessing Mistake Potential in Writing German Passive Sentences (An Approach of Language Error Analysis). In *Seminar Nasional LP2M UNM*.
- Mathew, G., & Mahasneh, A. (2017). Developing Competence in Basic Writing Skills: Perceptions of EFL Undergraduates. *The International Journal of Applied*

- Linguistics & English Literature, 6(7), 323.
<https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.7p.332>
- Mohanty, S., Venkatarao, E., Yasobant, S., & Vijaykumar, D. (2019). What lessons India must learn from Physical Activity promotion models?: An Integrative review of 2 successful Models. *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research*, 10(5), 32535–32539. <https://doi.org/10.24327/IJRSR>
- Rahmatunisa, W. (2014). Problems Faced By Indonesian Efl Learners in Writing Argumentative Essay. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 3(1), 1–9. Retrieved from <http://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE>
- Rashidi, N., & Faham, F. (2011). The effect of classical music in the reading comprehension of Iranian students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(1), 74–82. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.1.74-82>
- Rianawati. (2017). The Implementation of Education Character on Moral in MTsN (Islamic Junior High State School) 1 Pontianak in the Academic Year 2015/2016. *Journal of Education & Practice*, 8(9), 186–195.
- Schunk, D. H. (2012). Learning Theoris. In *Space Science Reviews*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00751323>
- Sieberer-Nagler, K. (2015). Effective Classroom-Management & Positive Teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 163. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n1p163>
- Tonapa, Y., Anwar, M., & Mantasiah, R. (2018). Analisis Kesalahan Penggunaan Deiksis dalam Karangan Sederhana Bahasa Jerman. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan Sastra*, 2(1).
- Underwood, P. R. (2017). Challenges and Change: Integrating Grammar Teaching With Communicative Work in Senior High School EFL Classes. *SAGE Open*, 7(3), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017722185>
- Wan Chai. (2017). English language education key learning area curriculum guide.
- Wildemeersch, D., Danny, & Jütte, W. (2017). Editorial: Digital the new normal - Multiple challenges for the education and learning of adults. *Danny Wildemeersch*, 8(1), 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.relae13>