ISSN No:-2456-2165

The Effectiveness of Metacognition Strategy Instruments for Writing in French at Level A2 with Blended Learning

Dwi Astuti
Post Graduate of Language Education Science
Universitas Negeri Semarang
Semarang, Indonesia

Subyantoro
Post Graduate of Language Education Science
Universitas Negeri Semarang
Semarang, Indonesia

Ida Zulaeha
Post Graduate of Language Education Science
Universitas Negeri Semarang
Semarang, Indonesia

Astini Su'udi
Post Graduate of Language Education Science
Universitas Negeri Semarang
Semarang, Indonesia

Sri Handayani
French Language Education
Universitas Negeri Semarang
Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract:- This study implements a metacognitive strategy instrument for writing in French at A2 level with blended learning. This study examines: (1) the effectiveness of the application of the metacognition strategy instrument in learning to write French at A2 level with blended learning; (2) significant differences in learning achievement between synchronous and asynchronous learning in the experimental class; and (3) significant differences in learning achievement between synchronous and asynchronous learning in the control class. The research design used was Pre-Experimental Intact-Group Comparison. This is population research. The respondents were second-semester students of the French Language Education at the State University of Semarang. The study used two classes: control, and experiment. The data was obtained through a writing test. The collected data were analyzed using N-Gain Score and Anova. The results of the analysis show that: (1) learning to write by applying an effective metacognitive strategy instrument; (2) In the experimental class there is no difference in learning outcomes in synchronous and asynchronous learning; (3) In the control class there are differences in learning outcomes in synchronous and asynchronous learning.

Keywords:- *Metacognition Strategy Instrument, Writing Level A2, Blended Learning, Synchronous, Asynchronous.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The pandemic requires learning to be done remotely, including in the *Francais écrit élémentaire* course. The learning applied blended learning: synchronous and asynchronous. This course requires adequate and controlled practice because writing is one of the productive language skills. Compared to the other three language skills, namely listening, speaking, and reading, writing skills are generally more difficult to master even for native speakers of the language concerned [1]. In learning French in college, in general, students have difficulty mastering writing skills.

It has prompted several researchers to improve the writing skills of French learners, as was done by [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], and [10]. These studies were done because students have not received maximum achievement (good category) in learning writing skills.

The same problem happened to the students of the French Language Education study program at Unnes. For example, for students in 2019/2020, 36 out of 65 (55%) students had scored less than 70.01 (minimum score in the good category) in writing skills.

Based on interviews conducted by researchers on synchronous learning, it was known that many students attend the course without the mental preparation needed to support their learning success. They did not focus on learning and did not practice the material they have learned. Learning on writing requires a lot of practice, as stated by [11] and [12].

Therefore, lecturers must make students have the mental preparation needed to support successful learning, by monitoring the foreign language learning strategies that they should apply in learning French. The strategy is metacognition, carried out by raising awareness of the needs of learners through monitoring from the planning, implementation, and evaluation stages of the learning process.

Research on metacognitive strategies has been carried out by several researchers, including [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20] and [21]. Bosson and Escorcia are more inclined to correlation research, while others use experimental research. Their results show that metacognitive strategies contribute to learning outcomes.

Research on blended learning has been conducted by [22] [23]; and [24]. The three studies used blended learning, but there has been no similar research related to writing in French.

Based on the literature review described, this research has never been conducted by previous researchers. The novelty of this research is the use of an instrument to monitor the metacognition strategies in learning to write French at A2 level with blended learning.

The research that will be discussed in this article, has been preceded by development research, which produces an instrument for applying metacognition strategies for writing skills [25]. The product has been applied in synchronous and asynchronous learning. For this reason, this study aims to examine: (1) the effectiveness of applying the metacognition strategy instrument in learning to write in French at level A2 based on blended learning; (2) significant differences in learning achievement between synchronous and asynchronous learning in the experimental class; and (3) significant differences in learning achievement between synchronous and asynchronous learning in the control class.

Before describing the methods and results, we will discuss metacognition theory and metacognitive strategy instruments produced in previous research, writing competence at A2 level, and blended learning.

The definition of metacognition put forward by researchers in the field of psychology, in general, emphasizes a person's awareness of thinking about his thought process [26]. In education in general, metacognition is recognized as very important to improve students' abilities in dealing with school situations [27].

In learning languages, especially foreign languages, the use of metacognitive strategies is needed, because this strategy allows learners to monitor (supervise), plan, and evaluate a learning process. Foreign language learners should apply these strategies to achieve the learning objectives. This is following the opinion of O'Malley, et al. (1985) quoted by [28] that without a metacognitive approach, learners do not have the goals and skills to see the progress that has been achieved, as well as the direction to be directed in the learning process.

Metacognition strategies in foreign language learning include (1) anticipation or planning, (2) paying attention, (3) self-management, (4) self-monitoring, (5) problem identification, and (6) self-evaluation. The six stages are used in the instrument with the following indicators.

Table 1:- Grille of instrument metacognitive strategy

Strategy	Indicator
Planning	Have preparation before taking the course
	Carry out activities to add insight related to the courses followed
Paying attention	Pay attention to all aspects of language that support learning (grammar, vocabulary)
Self-management	Putting the material into practice
Self-monitoring	Check your posts generated
	Asking others to rate/check their writing
Identification of problem	Identify the material mastered
	Identify the material that has not been mastered
Self-evaluation	Evaluating self-performance in learning to write

The indicators are described in a multiple-choice and short-form questionnaire to guide learners to identify themselves, their needs, and competencies.

Production écrite élémentaire course, referring to *Cadre Européen Commun de Référence pour les Langues* (CECRL) level A2, guides learners to have the competence to make various simple texts to convey ideas simply, namely the ability to explain options, describe vacation plans, describe places and directions, interacting in daily situations (offering, accepting, refusing), explaining daily habits, comparing, giving short opinions, and telling events/experiences.

The writing competencies that language learners must master in this course are following the opinion of [29] and [30] that: (1) Learners can write a series of simple expressions and sentences connected by simple conjunctions such as "and ", "but", and "because", in daily activities with related sentences; (2) The learner makes a brief and basic description of an event, past activity, and personal experience; and (3) Write very simple and short personal notes, messages and letters.

Learning for the Production ecrite elémentaire course is held online because, since 2020, the learning process has been carried out entirely through the Learning Management System by utilizing the internet network. In online learning, [31] describe four learning spaces, namely: live synchronous, virtual synchronous, self-faces asynchronous, and collaborative asynchronous. Mixing the use of the study room is blended learning.

ISSN No:-2456-2165

Live synchronous is learning that is carried out directly face to face in real-time and in the same place. Virtual synchronous learning is carried out directly face to face in real-time but in a different place. Learning takes place face to face using various video conferencing technologies. Self-faces asynchronous is learning that is done independently anytime and anywhere. Collaborative asynchronous learning is carried out together anytime and anywhere.

In this research, we used virtual synchronous and asynchronous learning. Virtual synchronous learning allows students to ask directly to the lecturer if they have difficulty, and they could have the solution immediately. In asynchronous learning, students cannot ask questions directly to the lecturer, but they must go through chat or other media which sometimes requires students to wait. It makes students reluctant to ask even though they do not understand the material studied.

II. METHOD

This research uses a Pre-Experimental Intact-Group Comparison design. It is a population study: 65 students of the second semester in the French Language Education study program at Universitas Negeri Semarang. We divided them into two classes. The experimental class was treated with a metacognitive strategy instrument, and the control class was treated without the metacognitive strategy instrument.

The metacognitive strategy instrument was constructed from O'Malley's theory which includes: (1) anticipation or planning, (2) paying attention, (3) self-management, (4) self-monitoring, (5) problem identification, and (6) self-evaluation. To get the data, we use tests. The treatment was given in four meetings, twice synchronously, and twice asynchronously. The materials given at the four meetings were (1) to describe vacation plans, (2) to describe vacations, (3) to describe places, and (4) to describe directions.

Before treatment, both classes (experimental and control classes) received a pretest. In each treatment, before learning begins, respondents in the experimental class fill out the metacognition strategy instrument through a google form with a processing time between 5-7 minutes. After filling the instrument of metacognition, the lecturer carries out the learning process as in the control class. After four treatments, the experimental class and the control class received a posttest. The results of the pre-test and post-test of the control and experimental classes were analyzed using the N-Gaine Score to determine the effectiveness of the application of the metacognition strategy instrument. To test the difference in learning outcomes in synchronous and asynchronous learning, in the control and experimental classes, Anova analysis was used.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

(1) The effectiveness of the application of the metacognition strategy instrument in learning to write French at A2 level with blended learning.

The data used to test the effectiveness of the implementation of the metacognition strategy instrument in learning to write French at level A2 are the results of the pretest and posttest from the control and experimental classes. Data analysis used N-Gaine Score. However, previously conducted prerequisite tests included tests of normality and homogeneity. The results of the normality test are shown below

Table 2:- One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Control	Experiment
N		25	25
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	69,4800	85,0800
	Std. Dev	7,28080	6,33061
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,128	,185
	Positive	,085	,185
	Negative	-,128	-,135
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		,642	,925
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,804	,359

In the Asymp row in table 2, it was described that Sig. for the two sides obtained from the control and experimental classes with a value of 0.804 and 0.359, respectively. Asymp value. Sig. In the Asymp row in table 2, it was described that Sig. for the two sides obtained from the control and experimental classes with a value of 0.804 and 0.359, respectively. Asymp value. Sig. (2-tailed) > 0.05 means that the data are normally distributed.

Furthermore, a homogeneity test was conducted to know whether the data in this study were homogeneous. The results of the homogeneity test of the experimental class are shown in table 3.

Table 3:- Test of homogeneity of variances in experiment class

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1,174	1	120	,281

The homogeneity test showed Sig. on the Test of Homogeneity of Variances (0.281) > 0.05. It means that the data obtained in the experimental class is homogeneous.

Table 4:- Test of homogeneity of variances in control class

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,223	1	119	,637

Based on the results of the homogeneity test, Sig. on the test of homogeneity of variances was (0.637) > 0.05. It means that the data obtained in the control class is homogeneous.

ISSN No:-2456-2165

After fulfilling the prerequisite test, we conducted data analysis using the N-Gain Score test. To determine the increase in the average score of the pretest and posttest, the normalized average gain formula is used, namely the ratio of the actual average gain to the maximum average gain. The actual average gain is the difference between the posttest average score and the pretest average score. The normalized gain formula is often also called the g factor or Hake factor.

$$\langle g \rangle = \frac{\langle \bar{S}_{post} \rangle - \langle \bar{S}_{pre} \rangle}{100\% - \langle \bar{S}_{pre} \rangle}$$

g = g factor (Hake factor) or normalized score gain value.

Wiyanto (2008) determines the criteria for the value of n-Gain as follows.

Table 5:- Criteria for the value of n-Gain

Value of N-Gain	Criteria
$g \geq 0,7$	Very effective
$0,3 \leq g < 0,7$	Effective
$g < 0,3$	Less effective

With this formula, the results of the N-Gain Score are obtained which are presented in table below.

Table 6:- Test of N-Gain score for control class

No	**Code**	**Pre Test** %	**Post Test** %	**N-gain**	**Criteria**
1	R-01	55	68	0,29	Less effective
2	R-02	65	80	0,43	Effective
3	R-03	63	70	0,19	Less effective
4	R-04	75	72	0,12	Less effective
5	R-05	77	76	0,04	Less effective
6	R-06	81	72	0,47	Effective
7	R-07	80	63	0,85	Very Effective
8	R-08	63	66	0,08	Less effective
9	R-09	65	80	0,43	Effective
10	R-10	63	67	0,11	Less effective
11	R-11	63	80	0,46	Effective
12	R-12	65	50	0,43	Effective
13	R-13	63	58	0,14	Less effective
14	R-14	89	72	1,55	Very Effective
15	R-15	83	76	0,41	Effective
16	R-16	67	75	0,24	Less effective
17	R-17	55	67	0,27	Less effective
18	R-18	65	58	0,20	Less effective
19	R-19	63	70	0,19	Less effective
20	R-20	67	71	0,12	Less effective
21	R-21	63	63	0,00	Less effective
22	R-22	55	76	0,47	Effective
23	R-23	63	70	0,19	Less effective
24	R-24	72	67	0,18	Less effective
25	R-25	63	70	0,19	Less effective
Average		67,32	69,48	0,07	Less effective

Table 7:- Test of N-Gain score for experiment class

No	**Code**	Pre Test %	Post Test %	N-gain	**Criteria**
1	R-01	72	85	0,46	Effectif
2	R-02	63	85	0,59	Effectif
3	R-03	66	91	0,74	Very Effectif
4	R-04	80	91	0,55	Effectif
5	R-05	67	100	1,00	Very Effectif
6	R-06	63	85	0,59	Effectif
7	R-07	77	90	0,57	Effectif
8	R-08	71	81	0,34	Effectif
9	R-09	72	85	0,46	Effectif
10	R-10	63	80	0,46	Effectif
11	R-11	66	80	0,41	Effectif
12	R-12	67	85	0,55	Effectif
13	R-13	60	93	0,83	Very Effectif
14	R-14	67	85	0,55	Effectif
15	R-15	66	78	0,35	Effectif
16	R-16	77	91	0,61	Effectif
17	R-17	67	80	0,39	Effectif
18	R-18	77	85	0,35	Effectif
19	R-19	68	72	0,13	Less Effectif
20	R-20	77	85	0,35	Effectif
21	R-21	81	91	0,53	Effectif
22	R-22	63	80	0,46	Effectif
23	R-23	62	76	0,37	Effectif
24	R-24	68	80	0,38	Effectif
25	R-25	67	93	0,79	Very Effectif
Rata		**69,08**	**85,08**	0,52	Effectif

The analysis presented shows that the experimental class is more effective, with an N-Gain value of 0.52, while the control class is less effective with an N-Gain value of 0.07. Thus, it can be said that the metacognition strategy instrument is effective in learning to write French at A2 level.

The results of the N-Gain Score test showed that the experimental class which was treated with the metacognitive strategy instrument obtained better learning outcomes than the control class which was not treated with the application of the metacognitive strategy instrument. This shows that the application of the metacognition strategy instrument has a positive effect on learning outcomes. The results of this study are in line with the findings of several previous studies, namely by [15], [16], [17], and [18] which states that metacognition is effective in improving student learning outcomes, has a significant effect on critical thinking skills, and improves students' ability to solve problems.

Thus, this study strengthens the theory that metacognitive strategies have a positive role in learning achievement, including achievement in learning foreign languages, especially learning to write in French.

(2) There is a significant difference in learning achievement between synchronous and asynchronous learning in the experimental class.

The second objective of this research is to know a significant difference in learning achievement between synchronous and asynchronous learning in the experimental class". The treatment in the experimental class was carried out four times, twice synchronously and twice asynchronously. At the end of each lesson, students had to do assignments related to the material learned. The assignment was analyzed using Anova.

The homogeneity test in treatments 1 and 2 in synchronous learning in the experimental class showed that Sig. is (0.212) > 0.0, il means that the data in the experimental class in synchronous learning are homogeneous. The homogeneity test of treatments 1 and 2 of asynchronous learning shows that Sig. is 0.488 > 0.05. Thus, it means that the data in the experimental class on asynchronous learning are homogeneous. After the homogeneity test, a descriptive test was carried out and continued with Anova.

Table 8:- Descriptive test on experiment class

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Synchron	63	82,87	12,480	1,572	79,73	86,02	50	100
Asynchron	59	79,63	11,011	1,433	76,76	82,50	50	100
Total	122	81,30	11,857	1,073	79,18	83,43	50	100

Table 9:- Anova test on experiment class

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	320,998	1	320,998	2,308	,131
Within Groups	16688,781	120	139,073		
Total	17009,779	121			

The results of the One-Way ANOVA test showed that the Sig results were in the 95% significant level of 0.131 > 0.05. It means that there is no difference in learning outcomes of learning to write in French at A2 level by applying the metacognition strategy instrument either synchronously or asynchronously in the experimental class.

The assumption underlying this finding is that in the experimental class, respondents are used to managing themselves, so that when they are learning without the presence of a lecturer, they have implemented strategies that include planning, paying attention to what is being studied, managing themselves well, monitoring themselves. , accustomed to identifying the problems he encountered when learning something, as well as evaluating himself. These habits help them find solutions independently.

(3) A significant difference in learning achievement between synchronous and asynchronous learning in the control class.

The third objective in this study is to discover a significant difference in learning achievement between synchronous and asynchronous learning in the control class. Learning in the control class was carried out four times, twice synchronously and twice asynchronously. At the end of each lesson, students had assignments to do related to the material studied. The assignments and the results were analyzed using Anova.

The homogeneity test in learning 1 and 2 synchronously shows that Sig. in the control class is 0.362 > 0.05. It means that the data on learning are synchronous, homogeneous. The homogeneity test in learning 1 and 2 asynchronously shows that Sig. Is 0.433 > 0.05. Thus, it means that the data in the control class are asynchronous, homogeneous learning.

Table 10:- Descriptif test on control class

	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Synchron	61	77,30	12,761	1,634	74,03	80,56	47	100
Asynchron	60	64,97	13,872	1,791	61,38	68,55	38	100
Total	121	71,18	14,641	1,331	68,55	73,82	38	100

Table 11:- Anova test on control class

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4597,378	1	4597,378	25,898	,000
Within Groups	21124,622	119	177,518		
Total	25722,000	120			

One-Way ANOVA test in table 11, shows that the result of Sig. is 0.000 < 0.05. It means that there is a difference in learning outcomes of learning to write French at level A2 in the control class between synchronous and asynchronous learning.

The difference in learning to write in French at A2 level is shown in the average learning achievement carried out synchronously (77.30). This result is higher than the average asynchronous learning achievement, which is 64.97. This finding is in line with Narayana's research that synchronous learning is better than asynchronous learning.

IV. CONCLUSION

The conclusions from the data analysis carried out are as follows

- The instrument of metacognition strategy is effective in learning to write French at A2 level.
- In the experimental class, there is no difference in the results of learning to write French at level A2 in synchronous and asynchronous learning.
- In the control class, there is a difference in learning outcomes of writing in French at A2 level in synchronous and asynchronous learning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to express our gratitude to Faculty of languages and arts, Universitas Negeri Semarang for funding the research and publication of this article. It could enrich the repertoire of evaluation research on foreign language.

REFERENCES

[1] N. Burhan, Penilaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Berbasis Kompetensi, Yogyakarta: BPFE, 2012.

[2] C. Rodrigues, "Analyse des potentialités d'un dispositive médiatisé pour les regulations pédagogiques dans la production écrite en FLE.," *Apprentissage des Langues et Systèmes d'Information et de Communication (ALSIC),* vol. 15, no. 3, 2012.

[3] D. Sunendar, "Implementasi Metode Écriture Créative Berbasis Budaya Lokal untuk Meningkatkan Keterampilan Menulis Bahasa Prancis Level B1 DELF.," *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra,* vol. 14, 2014.

[4] Y. Mutiarsih, "Aplikasi Metode Reciprocal Teaching dalam Pembelajaran Menulis Teks Jurnalistik Bahasa Prancis Berbasis Kearifan Lokal," *Barista,* vol. Vol 3, 2016.

[5] A. Rizqina, "L'efficacité de la publicité imprimée comme un média de l'écriture," *Didacticofrancia,* vol. 5, 2016.

[6] D. M. H. Ahmed, "Les stratégies d'apprentissage de l'écrit en français langue étrangère d'étudiants égyptiens," *Multilinguales* , 2016.

[7] H. Wang, "Les apports de l'apprentissage coopératif en production écrite. Une experimentation pédagogique avec un public chinois.," *Synergies France,* vol. 11, pp. 103-117, 2017.

[8] R. Sokawati, " Étude comparative sur la compétence des étudiants de troisième semestre dans le test d'expression écrite basé sur la stimulation d'image et le thème particulier," *Didacticofrancia,* vol. 7, pp. 1-6, 2018.

[9] D. Faticha, "The Effectiveness of Write-Pair-Square and Group Investigation to Teach Writing Descriptive Text for Students with High and Low Participation," *English Education Journal,* vol. 9, pp. 307-315, 2019.

[10] R. K. Rahmadani and N. Purwani, "Étude comparative: sur la competence des étudiants de deuxieme semestre de l'Unnes à écrire le texte narratif en utilisant la serie d'images et le schéma conceptuel.," *Didacticofrancia,* vol. 10, 2021.

[11] H. G. Tarigan, Menulis sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa, Bandung: Angkasa, 2008.

[12] Zaenurrahman, Menulis dari Teori Hingga Praktik (Penawar Racun Plagiarisme)., Bandung: Alfabeta, 2011.

[13] M. S. Bosson, "Le développement de strategies cognitives et métacognitives chez des élèves en difficulté d'apprentissage," *Développements,* vol. 1, no. June, pp. 14-20, 2009.

[14] D. Escorcia, "Quel rapport entre la metacognition et la performance à l'écrit?," *Education et didactique,* vol. 4, no. December, pp. 63-82., 2010.

[15] C. Magno, "The role of metacognitive skills in developing critical thinking.," *Metacognition Learning,* vol. 5, p. 137–156 , 2010.

[16] Z. B. Namira, "Keefektifan Strategi Metakognisi Berbantu Advance Organizer untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Kimia Siswa.," *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Kimia,* vol. 8, pp. 1271-1280, 2014.

[17] T. Khoiriah, "Pengaruh Strategi Pembelajaran Metakognisi terhadap Hasil Belajar Siswa pada Konsep Sistem Pencernakan pada Manusia.," *Jurnal Pengajaran MIPA,* vol. 20, pp. 177-180, 2015.

[18] A. Maulana, ". Pengaruh Strategi Metakognisi terhadap Kemampuan Pemecahan Masalah Matematika.," *Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan Matematika,* vol. 02, no. June, pp. 193-200, 2017.

[19] L. Mihalca, C. Mengelkamp and W. Schnotz, "Accuracy of metacognitive judgments as a moderator of learner control effectiveness in problem-solving tasks.," *Metacognition Learning,* vol. 12, p. 357–379, 2017.

[20] K. Ohtani and T. Hisasaka, "Beyond intelligence: a meta-analytic review of the relationship among metacognition, intelligence, and academic performance.," *Metacognition Learning* , vol. 13, p. 179–212, 2018.

[21] N. Suardana and N. Devi, "Pengaruh Strategi Belajar Metakognisi dan Sosial Afektif terhadap hasil Belajar IPA.," *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Sains Indonesia.,* vol. 2, no. October, pp. 151-160, 2019.

[22] S. U. Putri, "Pengembangan Desain Blended Learning untuk Program Pelatihan Pendalaman Materi IPA Berbasis Kebutuhan Mahasisa PGSD.," *Mimbar Sekolah Dasar.,* vol. 1, pp. 153-160., 2014.

[23] Z. S. S. Hussin, G. Darusalam and N. Salleh, " Kajian Model Blended Learning dalam Jurnal Terpilih: Satu Analisa Kandungan.," *Jurnal Kurikulum & Pengajaran Asia Pasifik,* vol. 3, no. January, 2015.

[24] A. K. Amin, "Kajian Konseptual Model Pembelajaran Blended Learning Berbasis Web untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar dan Motivasi Belajar," *Jurnal Pendidikan Edutama.,* vol. 4 No.2, 2017.

[25] D. Astuti, "Pengembangan Instrumen Metakognisi untuk Keterampilan Menulis Bahasa Prancis Tingkat A2," BSA, Semarang, 2020.

[26] M. Gredler, Learning and Instruction: Teori dan Aplikasi., Jakarta: Kencana, 2011.

[27] C. Bégin, "Les strategies d'apprentissage: un cadre de reference simplifié," *Revue des sciences de l'éducation.,* Vols. 34, No 1., 2008.

[28] M. Syaefudin and A. Yulianto, Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa Asing., Semarang: Unnes Semarang Press, 2012.

[29] C. Tagliante, L'Évaluation et le Cadre européen Commun., Paris: CLE International, 2005.

[30] G. Vigner, Pratique d'criture: apprendre à rédiger en langue étrangère., Paris: Hachette, 2013.

[31] U. d. S. M. Chaeruman, "Quadrant of Blended Learning: a Proposed Conseptual Model for Designing Effective Blended Learning.," *Jurnal Pembelajaran Inovatif* , vol. 1, pp. 1-5, 2018.