SCHOLARLY TEXT WRITING WORKSHOP: THE INVESTIGATION OF COGNITIVE PROCESSES IN WRITING ARTICLE

Dina Ramadhanti[1], Diyan Permata Yanda[2]
[1]Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Universitas PGRI Sumatera Barat, Jalan Gunung Pangilun, Padang
[2]Fakultas Tarbiyah Ilmu Keguruan, Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Bukittinggi, Jalan Gurun Aua Kubang Putiah, Bukittinggi
[1]e-mail: dina.ona05@gmail.com

Abstract

The implementation of this service aims to determine the cognitive process in writing articles after being given training to write articles that are worthy of publication in international journals indexed by reputable databases. The service method is the training method. Participants were given training in writing articles and ended with an evaluation in the form of measuring the cognitive processes of workshop participants in writing articles. The results of the service showed that the participants' cognitive processes in writing articles were classified as very good with a percentage of 85.44%. This means that participants can plan their writing, write, and evaluate the writing until it is worthy of publication according to the intended journal template. Meanwhile, around 15% of participants still need intensive assistance in writing articles. The planning stage in writing still requires the attention of the workshop participants. In terms of developing ideas at the translation stage, participants understand well the systematics of article writing but are unable to present articles that meet the standards of the journal in question and are vulnerable to rejection by the journal. The weakness of participants generally lies in the presentation of coherent paragraphs. This is also caused by the participants did not carry out the review process optimally.

Keywords: scholarly text, cognitive processes; writing article

Abstrak

Pelaksanaan pengabdian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui proses kognitif dalam menulis artikel setelah diberikan pelatihan menulis artikel yang layak terbit dalam jurnal internasional terindeks database bereputasi. Metode pengabdian yaitu metode pelatihan. Peserta diberikan pelatihan menulis artikel dan diakhiri dengan evaluasi berupa pengukuran proses kognitif peserta workshop dalam menulis artikel. Hasil pengabdian menunjukkan bahwa proses kognitif peserta dalam menulis artikel tergolong sangat baik dengan persentase 85,44%. Artinya, peserta dapat merencanakan tulisan, menulis, dan mengevaluasi tulisan hingga layak diterbitkan sesuai dengan template jurnal yang dituju. Sementara itu, sekitar 15% peserta masih memerlukan pendampingan intensif dalam menulis artikel. Perencanaan yang dilakukan dalam menulis masih memerlukan perhatian oleh peserta workshop. Dalam hal mengembangkan gagasan pada tahap penerjemahan, peserta memahami dengan baik sistematika penulisan artikel tetapi tidak mampu menyajikan artikel yang memenuhi standar jurnal yang dituju dan rentan mengalami penolakan oleh jurnal tersebut. Kelemahan peserta pada umumnya terletak pada penyajian paragraf yang koheren. Hal ini juga disebabkan oleh peserta tidak melakukan proses peninjauan kembali secara maksimal.

Kata Kunci: teks ilmiah, proses kognitif; menulis artikel

INTRODUCTION

Writing of scholarly texts in the form of research articles is a must for lecturers and researchers to publish their research results. This is in accordance with Permenristekdikti Nomor 20 of 2017 concerning the obligation of lecturers to conduct scientific publications. Lecturers are seen as scientists who are obliged to develop science and technology and disseminate it to the public. This also means that apart from improving self-quality, article writing is very useful for lecturers in improving academic careers.

To meet the high demands associated with career paths, many researchers choose journals without paying attention to the quality of the journal and the reputation of the journal concerned (Kurt, 2018). In other words, as long as the article is published, the author of the article no longer pays attention to the reputation of the publication and the feasibility of an article that deserves to be published. In addition, researchers are also more likely to choose to publish research articles in the form of proceedings compared to journals because the review process is faster and easier to publish (Purnell, 2020). The number of articles published in predatory journals shows that the quality of the articles and the quality of the research carried out is also low. Supposedly, the results of the research that has been carried out must be presented in quality articles so that they can be well understood by readers. This shows that the needs of the reader need to be considered by the writer as well. The author also needs to understand that articles written from research results are more widely accepted by readers (Pagliawan, 2017).

In order for the writing to be well received by the reader, the writer needs to pay attention to several things, namely: the message to be communicated, knowledge of who will read the writing, the author's familiarity with all linguistic and grammatical rules, awareness of various types of writing, digital control of writing. to avoid writing errors, and readiness to review the writing by checking the reasoning, and suitability of the writing for purpose, readership, and technical accuracy (Dombey, 2013). These are the keys to keep in mind while writing.

Grammatical ambiguity and inaccurate word selection make it difficult for readers to understand the author's intent.

Related to the writing process, article writing basically requires certain techniques. In order for the article to be reviewed and considered for publication by the intended journal, the author must also pay attention to the reasons for the rejection of the article by the editor, namely: the article does not meet the format or the intended article, the introduction of the article does not match the discussion and other parts of the article, the abstract content loses the main information, the title of the article does not match the focus of the manuscript, and the manuscript does not meet the standards of the intended journal in terms of purpose, scope, and readers. Frequently writing and reading articles that have been published in reputable journals in accordance with the field of study, is also the key to producing quality writing and overcoming rejection of articles by journal editors (Ramadhanti, Yanda, & Muhsyanur, 2021).

To produce quality research articles, a writer does not only focus on the results of the writing but also the process carried out. Writers need to realize, writing involves a complex cognitive process. Writers need to plan writing, develop ideas according to the writing material, and re-examine their writing. All that takes place naturally and is structured. The cognitive process is based on four main points, namely: (1) the writing process is understood as a set of different thought processes that are arranged and regulated by the author during the action, (2) the processes carried out are structured and interconnected with each other, (3) the act of writing is a goal-directed thought process, and that goal continues to develop during the writing process, and (4) in the writing process, writers create their own goals and sometimes experience changes as the writing progresses (Flower & Hayes, 1981). The writing process referred to in this case are planning, translation, and review.

This process needs to be investigated by the authors whether they are aware of the process they are doing and carry out the whole process in producing a research article. They are rarely investigated in scientific writing training and workshops. The workshops carried out only reported on the participants' low

motivation and knowledge in writing articles (Ismail & Elihami, 2019); (Marwa & Dinata, 2020), participants have difficulty compiling the outline of writing (Mansyur & Akidah, 2018); (Umami, 2020), articles are written do not meet the standards of scientific journals (Nuryadin, Salim, Lestary, & R, 2018), and participants gain knowledge about article writing in accordance with the journal template and participants are ready to publish articles (Nuryadin et al., 2018). However, there are no workshop results that specifically investigate the writing process carried out by participants from planning the writing to being ready to publish the article.

Therefore, the participants of the scientific writing workshop held by Rumah Publikasi Indonesia (RPI) were given workshops and assistance in writing scientific articles. During the production of scientific articles, participants were asked to report on the cognitive processes carried out during writing articles, from planning, developing writing, to evaluating writing. If the articles are written have met the scope of the intended journal, participants are assisted to submit articles to scientific journals. Based on the above, this article aims to explain the cognitive processes of workshop participants in writing research articles.

METHOD

This workshop was organized by Rumah Publikasi Indonesia (RPI) with the theme "Workshop Bersesi Menyiapkan Artikel untuk Publikasi pada Jurnal Scopus". The participants of this activity were 21 people from various universities and faculties in Indonesia. This workshop activity is a session activity starting from webinars on workshop materials, article clinics, to submitting articles to the Scopus journal. In other words, the method used is a training method, namely training in writing articles and ending with an evaluation in the form of measuring the cognitive processes of workshop participants in writing articles. In more detail, the flow of this workshop activity, namely:

First, the workshop participants attended a webinar according to the webinar theme for four days. In the first session, the workshop materials were given to participants, namely: systematics of writing Scopus-level articles,

paraphrasing techniques, grammar (error language), and finding target journals. In the second session, the workshop materials were given to participants, namely: getting to know the OJS system, the process of registering and submitting articles to the Scopus journal, understanding the article review process, and improving the h-index and SINTA account management. In the third session, the workshop materials were given to participants, namely: getting to know the manager of writing articles, paraphrasing using the Quillbot system, strengthening the Mendeley reference system, and getting to know the character of predatory journals. In the fourth session, the workshop materials were given to participants, namely: the process of writing articles, surgery and clinic of articles, directing submit/publishing in Scopus journals, and access to become members of Rumah Publikasi Indonesia (RPI).

Second, during the presentation of the material, participants are asked to prepare articles according to the material that has been delivered. Especially in the presentation of the material for the first session, participants were asked to fill out questions in the form of an open questionnaire via google forms to find out the process of writing articles, starting from planning, translation, and review. These three things as stated in the introduction are the focus of the study in this article.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section describes three things related to the cognitive processes of workshop participants in writing articles, starting from planning, translating, and reviewing. From the results of the investigation through an open questionnaire using google forms, the overall percentage of participants' cognitive process scores in writing articles was classified as very good. Each percentage of cognitive processes is visualized in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Percentage of Cognitive Processes in Writing Articles

No	Cognitive Processes	%	Category
1	Planning	87,81	Very good
2	Translating	84,89	Very good
3	Reviewing	83,62	Very good
	Average	85,44	Very Good

Planning

At the planning stage, the things done by the workshop participants are visualized in Table 2 below.

Table 2.Percentage of Planning Stage in Writing Articles

No	Item	Percentage of Answers				
		Strongly angree	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
1	I read many sources, both articles and books to help me find the topic.	66,7	33,3	0	0	0
2	I analyzed several topics from the latest issues to decide which topic would be my choice.	47,6	38,1	14,3	0	0
3	I think of topics to focus ideas on.	42,9	47,6	9,5	0	0
4	I prepared an outline using a certain method that I understood.	47,6	42,9	9,5	0	0
5	I use personal notes to make it easier for me to remember topics and to help me paraphrase from reading sources.	57,1	19,0	14,3	9,5	0

Based on Table 2 above, detailed information was obtained about the planning process carried out by the workshop participants in writing articles. Overall, the workshop participants read many sources, both articles and books to help them find the topic. However, not all participants analyzed several topics from the latest issues to become topics, not all thought about topics to focus ideas, not all prepared an outline, and not all used personal notes to make it easier to remember topics and paraphrase. Theoretically, in the planning process, the writer forms an internal representation of the knowledge that will be used in writing. This process includes the process of retrieving information from long-term memory, setting goals, and organizing ideas, and forming new concepts (Flower

& Hayes, 1981). In this case, good planning will have a good impact on the quality of writing.

In writing planning, good writing materials will not be able to have any effect on the quality of writing if there is no analysis and comparison with the latest issues that attract readers. When ideas are found in writing, a writing framework is needed to map ideas. In addition, brainstorming is also carried out with colleagues who have the same topic in order to obtain additional information to increase the quality of writing. The discussion will make it easier for someone to synthesize research results into a research article (Henning, Gravett, & van Rensburg, 2010).

In addition, planning writing by preparing personal notes or journals is needed to help remember the topic and make it easier to paraphrase. Paraphrasing is important in writing to avoid plagiarism and improve the quality of writing. Paraphrasing is done by changing the synonymous vocabulary, changing the word class, and changing the word order of the original text to be different from the original text. Personal notes are needed to make it easier for writers to paraphrase written material into their own writing.

Therefore, writers need to prepare personal notes from the beginning of planning writing. This personal note is a note that contains important things from reading material that is used to make it easier to write research articles, especially paraphrases. Things that need to be considered when making personal notes, especially when planning writing in the form of research articles, are: made in your own style and words, all sources are recorded to make it easier to register reference sources, written quickly and simply instead of copying sentence by sentence, write down with a clear numbering system, use certain symbols to save time, and use abbreviations that are appropriate to the field of study (Bailey, 2006).

In planning writing, the availability of quality reference materials and sources is very necessary. The written material is read well, then important points are noted to make it easier to formulate a new topic. This is in accordance with the opinion Weinstein and Mayer (1983) that in understanding reading, various

strategies can be used, for example: (1) studying ideas, underlining important ideas, and copying the important parts, (2) paraphrasing, summarizing, taking notes, and formulating questions, (3) create an orderly and meaningful framework or organization in the form of a table or mind map. Furthermore, the topics that have been selected are mapped according to their core concepts to make it easier to develop ideas and ideas at the translation stage.

Translating

At the translation stage, the things done by the workshop participants are visualized in Table 3 below.

Table 3 Percentage of Translation Stages in Writing Articles

No	Item	Percentage of Answers				
		Strongly Agree	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
1	I present the thesis (according to the topic) in the introduction and reaffirm it in the conclusion.	33,3	47,6	14,3	4,8	0
2	I present an introduction to guide the reader in understanding the structure and/or scope of my article.	38,1	52,4	9,5	0	0
3	I put forward the topic I chose and that topic is visible throughout my article.	38,1	47,6	14,3	0	0
4	I present an article that can reveal the development of my argument.	42,9	47,6	4,8	4,8	0
5	I present a thesis (according to the topic) that is supported by several sub-theses.	28,6	47,6	19,0	4,8	0
6	I present relevant evidence from various sources to support my topic.	52,4	33,3	14,3	0	0
7	I present my writing seriously so that readers can understand	47,6	42,9	4,8	4,8	0

No	Item	Percentage of Answers				
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	the meaning of the topic I write.					
8	I use grammar succinctly and economically and choose words that contribute directly to the meaning I convey.	38,1	47,6	14,3	0	0
9	I present the paragraph well, the paragraph has the main idea and several sentences containing the explanatory idea to explain the main idea.	33,3	47,6	19,0	0	0
10	I present each paragraph in relation to one another in order to create coherence.	42,9	42,9	14,3	0	0
11	I am aware of all the sources I used in preparing my article and all of them are listed in the reference list.	52,4	28,6	19,0	0	0
12	I use methods that are relevant to my topic and research question.	47,6	38,1	14,3	0	0
13	I present the research results according to the research questions in the introduction.	42,9	47,6	9,5	0	0
14	I present the discussion in accordance with the research question and research objectives.	42,9	47,6	9,5	0	0
15	I present conclusions that serve as the culmination of the research argument and give the impression of completion.	28,6	47,6	23,8	0	0

In theory, the translation process means the process of entering ideas into written language. Information obtained from reading sources in the planning

process is represented in the form of written language symbols by taking into account certain syntactic rules. Based on Table 3 above, information about the translation process carried out by workshop participants in writing articles is explained below.

First, the workshop participants presented an introductory section to guide the reader in understanding the structure and scope of the article. In the introduction, there is also a thesis. In addition to the thesis, there is also a sub-thesis and it is supported by relevant evidence according to the topic. Participants also tried to put forward the main topics and topics referred to by the author in all parts of the article. In addition, participants also seek presentations that reveal the development of their arguments. Despite the fact, there are still participants who do not do this. Participants need to understand that the thesis in the introduction is very important because it is the main key field of study in an article. As conveyed by Henning, Gravett, and van Rensburg (2010) that the thesis in the introduction has five functions, namely: helping the author focus on the topic and guiding its development, as a unifier of ideas that builds coherence, being a link between sub-theses, guiding the reader with respect to the scope and development of the writing, and helping to build problem-solving mechanisms.

Second, the workshop participants tried to present the writing seriously so that the readers could understand the topic well. To that end, participants also tried to use grammar in a concise and economical way and choose words that contributed directly to the meaning they wanted to convey. Participants also pay attention to the presentation of paragraphs and the coherence relationship between paragraphs. Although there are still participants who pay less attention to this in presenting their articles. Articles presented in non-standard language will be susceptible to rejection from the journal. Therefore, participants need to present paragraphs that can guide readers to have an understanding of the topic. A good paragraph should provide unity of ideas, encourage coherence, and show the development of the author's thinking.

Third, some workshop participants paid attention to the presentation of research methods in written articles and some did not. Participants who pay

attention to it use methods that are relevant to the topic and research question. *Fourth*, the workshop participants presented the research results in accordance with the research questions in the introduction and some did not. The presentation of research results needs to be considered by participants because in this section all answers to research questions are presented. The answers given in this section should be relevant to the research question. *Fifth*, workshop participants present discussions in accordance with research questions and research objectives. In this discussion section, participants can compare the research results obtained with the results of previous studies. This section will clarify the uniqueness of the findings of the research conducted.

Sixth, participants present conclusions as to the culmination point of the arguments presented. In this section, participants should also understand that the conclusion should provide clear answers to each question posed in the title and summarize the main points (Bailey, 2006). *Seventh,* workshop participants generally present all the sources used in the reference list section in the articles written but not all that use applications such as Mendeley and Zotero. Because they do not use the application, not all the reference sources used are listed in the reference list section. In fact, presenting the source of the article on the reference list is one way that the author needs to pay attention to avoid allegations of plagiarism.

Based on the results above, workshop participants need a review process to evaluate articles that have been written before being sent or submitted to the target journal.

Reviewing

At the review stage, the things done by the workshop participants are visualized in Table 4 below.

Table 4 Percentage of Review Stage in Writing Articles

No	Item	Percentage of Answers				
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Agree
1	I make sure my writing has answered the question according to	52,4	38,1	9,5	0	0

No	Item	Percentage of Answers				
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Agree
	the title and reflects the topic.					
2	I make sure that the presentation of each of my paragraphs is balanced from the introduction to the conclusion.	33,3	47,6	19,0	0	0
3	I make sure that the presentation of my arguments progresses clearly and logically.	33,3	42,9	19,0	4,8	0
4	I make sure that no elements are forgotten in my writing, both in terms of systematic writing and language use.	38,1	38,1	19,0	4,8	0
5	I carefully check my writing to avoid spelling, punctuation, and grammar mistakes.	38,1	52,4	4,8	4,8	0

Table 4 above provides information on the review process carried out by the workshop participants. In essence, writing will not be done immediately without an editing or revision process. After the writing is completed, the writer needs to reread it to check the accuracy of the writing in terms of content and grammar. Based on the table above, it is evident that not all workshop participants review their writing articles. After the article is finished, the author should make sure that his writing has answered the questions according to the title and topic, his writing has been built by balanced paragraphs from the introduction to the conclusion, the presentation of the argument has shown the development of ideas, no elements are forgotten both in terms of systematics and used of language and there are no spelling, punctuation, and grammar mistakes. If all of that has been considered, then the article can be submitted to the reviewer for review.

The findings of this study confirm that writing is a complex process and requires complex thinking. To produce quality writings or articles as a result of these complex thoughts, signs are needed that can be used as guidelines during the

writing process. Cognitive processes in this case can be a guide for writers to produce writings that are not only focused on the goal but also on the process. The cognitive process in writing is an iterative process until quality writing results are obtained (Ramadhanti, Yanda, Ghazali, Hasanah, & Harsiati, 2019).

To get quality writing, writers can use a checklist that can be used as a tool to measure the progress of writing articles. This checklist can also function as a writing journal because through this checklist it can be measured to what extent the development of writing and the author can overcome the weaknesses encountered in the process of developing ideas (Ramadhanti, Ghazali, Hasanah, & Harsiati, 2019; Ramadhanti, Ghazali, Hasanah, Harsiati, & Yanda, 2020). The checklist is visualized in the form of Table 5 below.

Table 5 Article Writing Progress Assessment Checklist

No	Item	Writing Progress*	
		already achieved	not reached
1	I read many sources, both articles and books to help me find the topic.		
2	I analyzed several topics from the latest issues to decide which topic would be my choice.		
3	I think of topics to focus ideas on.		
4	I prepared an outline using a certain method that I understood.		
5	I use personal notes to make it easier for me to remember topics and to help me paraphrase my reading sources.		
6	I present the thesis (according to the topic) in the introduction and reaffirm it in the conclusion.		
7	I present an introduction to guide the reader in understanding the structure and/or scope of my article.		
8	I put forward the topic I chose and that topic is visible throughout my article.		
9	I write each argument well so that each section shows the progress of my argument.		
10	I present a thesis (according to the topic) that is supported by several sub-theses.		
11	I present relevant evidence from various sources to support my topic.		
12	I present my writing seriously so that readers can understand the meaning of the topic I write.		
13	I use grammar succinctly and economically and choose words that contribute directly to the meaning		

No	Item	Writing Progress*	
		already achieved	not reached
	I convey.		
14	I present the paragraph well, the paragraph has the main idea and several sentences containing the explanatory idea to explain the main idea.		
15	I present each paragraph in relation to one another in order to create coherence.		
16	I am aware of all the sources I used in preparing my article and all of them are listed in the references.		
17	I use methods that are relevant to my topic and research question.		
18	I present the research results according to the research questions in the introduction.		
19	I present a discussion that is in accordance with the research question and research objectives.		
20	I present conclusions that serve as the culmination of the research argument and give the impression of completion.		
21	I make sure my writing has answered the question according to the title and reflects the topic.		
22	I make sure that the presentation of each of my paragraphs is balanced from the introduction to the conclusion.		
23	I make sure that the presentation of my arguments progresses clearly and logically.		
24	I make sure that no elements are forgotten in my writing, both in terms of systematic writing and language use.		
25	I carefully check my writing to avoid spelling, punctuation, and grammar mistakes.		

* given a tick (√) if it has been achieved

CONCLUSIONS

The cognitive process in writing is something that a writer needs to be aware of. Writing is done through an iterative process, starting from planning (planning), developing ideas (translation), and evaluating the results of writing (review). This process is carried out continuously until quality writing is obtained. In general, workshop participants have a plan in writing and developing ideas but are not optimal in carrying out the process of reviewing writing. Therefore, keep in mind that writing is formed through a complex process and requires complex thinking as well.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Bailey, S. (2006). *Academic writing: a handbook for international students, third edition* (2nd ed.). UK: Routledge.

Dombey, H. (2013). What we know about teaching writing. *Preschool & Primary Education*, 1(1), 22–40. https://doi.org/10.12681/PPEJ.40

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365. https://doi.org/10.2307/356600

Henning, E., Gravett, S., & van Rensburg, W. (2010). *Finding your way in academic writing*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Ismail, & Elihami. (2019). Pelatihan penyusunan artikel publikasi ilmiah bagi mahasiswa perguruan tinggi stkip muhammadiyah enrekang. *Maspul Journal of Community Empowerment*, 1(1), 12–20. https://doi.org/10.3348

Kurt, S. (2018). Why do authors publish in predatory journals? *Learned Publishing*, *31*(2), 141–147.

Mansyur, U., & Akidah, I. (2018). Peningkatan kompetensi profesional guru mts ddi padanglampe kabupaten pangkep melalui pelatihan penulisan karya tulis ilmiah. *JPPM (Jurnal Pengabdian dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat)*, 2(2), 273–278. https://doi.org/10.30595/jppm.v2i2.2589

Marwa, & Dinata, M. (2020). Pelatihan penulisan artikel ilmiah dan publikasi di jurnal bagi guru sman 4 tualang, kabupaten siak. *Jurnal Pengabdian Pada Masyarakat*, 5(1), 71–82. https://doi.org/10.30653/002.202051.256

Nuryadin, C., Salim, A., Lestary, A., & R, A. L. A. (2018). Penulisan artikel ilmiah mahasiswa semester enam fakultas keguruan dan ilmu pendidikan universitas muhammadiyah buton. *Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 2(1), 120–127.

Pagliawan, D. L. (2017). Feature style for academic and scholarly writing. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 6(2), 35–41. https://doi.org/10.1515/ajis-2017-0004

Purnell, P. J. (2020). Conference proceedings publications in bibliographic databases: a case study of countries in southeast asia. *Scientometrics*, 126(1), 355–387. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03773-2

Ramadhanti, D., Ghazali, A. S., Hasanah, M., & Harsiati, T. (2019). Students' metacognitive weaknesses in academic writing: a preliminary research. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET)*, 14(11),

41–57. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v14i11.10213

Ramadhanti, D., Ghazali, A. S., Hasanah, M., Harsiati, T., & Yanda, D. P. (2020). the use of reflective journal as a tool for monitoring of metacognition growth in writing. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET)*, 15(11), 162–187. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i11.11939

Ramadhanti, D., Yanda, D. P., Ghazali, A. S., Hasanah, M., & Harsiati, T. (2019). Development of explanatory text writing evaluation tools based on a process approach (pengembangan alat evaluasi menulis teks eksplanasi berbasis pendekatan proses). *Jurnal Gramatika: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 5(2), 194-210. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22202/JG.2019.V5i2.3445

Ramadhanti, D., Yanda, D. P., & Muhsyanur. (2021). Scholarly text writing workshop: uncloking weaknesses in article writing. *Rangkiang: Jurnal Pengabdian Pada Masyarakat*, 3(1), 55-64. https://doi.org/10.22202/JR.2020.V1i2.3929

Umami, S. S. (2020). Pelatihan dasar menulis bagi guru madrasah aliyah at-tamimy praya di lombok tengah. *Transformasi: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 16(2), 203-212. https://doi.org/10.20414/transformasi.v16i2.2714

Weinstein, C. E., & Mayer, R. E. (1983). The teaching of learning strategies. *innovation abstract*, 5(32). (Online), tersedia di https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED237180.pdf