t_of_Couched_Peer_Feedback_through_Face_to_Face_and_Facebook

by Marzulina Lenny

The Effect of Couched Peer Feedback through Face to Face and Facebook Interaction toward Students' Writing Ability and Engagement

Annisa Astrid
A Lecturer of State Islamic University of Raden Fatah,
Palembang, South Sumatera, Indonesia
syahidah0682@yahoo.com

Lenny Marzulina
A Lecturer of State Islamic University of Raden Fatah, Palembang,
South Sumatera, Indonesia
hj.lennymarzulina@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to find out how the implementation of couched peer feedback writing technique through direct interaction in the class and Facebook instruction influenced students' writing ability and how they engaged in learning activities viewed from student' level of writing anxiety. The research was conducted at two paragraph writing classes at one State Islamic University in Palembang. Mixed method data collection was used in this study. The quantitative data were collected by using Likert-scale questionnaire used to measure students' level of writing anxiety and paragraph writing test. Meanwhile, the qualitative data were gained by using observation and interview. Students' paragraph writing test scores were analyzed by using Two Way Anova statistical analysis. Then, observation and interview data were transcribed and coded. The findings showed that first, the difference feedback writing techniques had different effects on students' writing ability. Next, differences in students' anxiety levels in writing also had different effects on their writing performance. Then, there was no interaction between the application of feedback writing techniques, the level of writing anxiety and writing performance. Finally, students had varying engagement to the learning process in terms of behavioral, affective and cognitive aspects.

Keywords: couched peer feedback, face to face interaction, online interaction, students' engagement

Introduction

Peer feedback writing technique is one of the alternative techniques used in teaching writing. It is part of process writing approach. According to Hyland and Hyland (2006), the activity of peer feedback is a part of process writing approach, where it involves students to work actively in expressing their feedback orally in groups on their peers' writing. Peer feedback writing technique is such kind of collaborative learning activity, where learners become the center in learning process. It is a sort of activity that involves students to work actively in expressing their feedback orally in groups on their peers' writing. Peer feedback has sprang up as one alternative in writing process when there were complex issues where teachers actually have absolute power in their

class to pass or fail their students that make their students have to accept this teachers' authority (Leki, 1990; Reid, 1994). This unbalanced state of power makes the students directly accept their teacher's comments on their writing draft. Thus, peer feedback is such an alternative way for the failure of teacher feedback to students' writing.

Commonly, peer feedback is conducted in the classroom through a direct interaction. With the growth of technology and internet, peer feedback activity conducted via online has been implemented by teachers of writing in recent years. According to Shih (2011), online mediated peer feedback activity could be done through online discussion in social media. Peer Feedback through kind of online interaction is suggested to be conducted in learning process since it is proved more advantageous than peer feedback with direct interaction in the classroom. Besides, sharing feedback through online can be done everywhere and every time (Guardado & Shi, 2007; Ravand, 2001)).

Facebook is one of the social media, which is relatively familiar nowadays. As one of the online media, Facebook is beneficial to share among people all over the world and makes a lot of people connected each other. Through Facebook, we could post our personal opinion, respond to someone other's opinion, share experiences, news updates, pictures, videos and internet links to everyone connected to our Facebook. By using Facebook, we also could have new colleagues and keep communicating with them anytime we want.

Recently, many educators have used Facebook as the media in teaching and learning English. One of the English skills that could be taught through Facebook is writing. The main advantage of Facebook as an online media in teaching writing has been researched by several researchers. Yunus Salehi, and Chenzi (2012) reported their research results which focused to explore how teaching and learning writing via Facebook would affect students' writing skills. The results showed that writing activity via Facebook group could improve students' writing performance. Then, Ping, and Maniam (2015) in their study revealed that writing through Facebook was effective in teaching writing. It was considered effective for motivating the students to elaborate their ideas into writing. It is because when students frequently read their friend's writing posted on Facebook and gave comments, gradually, their vocabulary mastery was improved. Finally, Ahmed (2016) revealed that by using Facebook interaction, there was improvement of grammar and writing ability of the students. Therefore, Facebook as the online media can be utilized as the means to teaching writing.

Besides teaching techniques, affective factor also influences the learning process. One kind of the affective factors in language learning comes across with the term "anxiety". Consequently, it is known as a factor in academic performance (Brown, 2007). Students' lack of writing ability is influenced by their level of writing anxiety. Thus, it becomes such a barrier faced by the teachers in teaching writing to their students. Hence, writing anxiety as one of the individual differences is crucial to be aware of, especially in teaching writing.

Based on explanation above, we were interested in conducting research in order to know the effect of the implementation of couched peer feedback through direct interaction in the classroom and Facebook instruction, writing anxiety to students' writing ability. The aims of this research were formulated as follows: 1) to find out how the application of couched peer feedback techniques through direct interaction in the class influences students' writing skills compared to Facebook instruction 2) to describe how students' different level of writing anxiety influences their writing ability 3) to explore how the interactions between writing learning techniques, writing anxiety to students' writing skills and 4) to elaborate how students engage toward learning activities in couched peer feedback with direct interaction in the class and 5) to elaborate how

students engage toward learning activities by using couched peer feedback with online interactions.

Literature Review

Peer feedback

According to Flower and Hayes (1981), Peer feedback activity is such a modeling of writing that is already accomplished, assessing and comparing the written text to the modeled one. Some facts showed peer feedback in writing activities was valued by some researchers. Firstly, by using peer feedback, it can develop students' writing ability and their skills in giving effective feedback in terms of writing aspects; content, organization and coherence, diction and mechanics (Farrah, 2012; Lei, 2012; Wakabayashi, 2013). Next, Astrid, Rukmini, Sofwan, and Fitriati (2016) described that peer feedback could increase students' awareness on the mistakes. They explored that from the process of reading peers' essay, the students could learn from their peers' essay about new vocabulary and the way to develop ideas. Even, the students could learn from their peers' mistakes and raise their awareness for not doing the same mistakes again Similarly, Mendonça and Johnson (1994) argue that in peer feedback, The students are trained to express what they know about writing when they are asked to give feedback to their friends' writing and are able to revise their writing based on the feedback given. Thus, the students recognize that there will be other people that are going to read what they have written by experiencing peer feedback writing activities (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Hyland, 2000).

Peer feedback activity could make students become more independent and confident in learning. Hyland (2000) claims that students independently decide which feedback from their friends could be used to revise their writing and which one that could be ignored. Hyland (2000) also enhances that peer feedback boosts the students to participate actively in group work activity. In other words, students have their own power and become less dependent to their teacher. Similarly, (Yarrow & Topping 2001) confirm that students have active interactions with their peers in group when they are required to share feedback among them. They feel free to ask for anything when they think they have problems in their writing. Automatically, by modeling the writing process, their ability in writing improved.

In spite of benefits, some researchers reported the default of the implementation of peer feedback writing technique in the classroom. For example, Min (2006) claims that students only give not very important comments to their peers writing and as the results, the comments do not affect their quality of their revisions. It is supported by Bijami (2013) who reported that the students only give comments that focused on ungrammatical sentences and mechanics. They never give feedback in terms of how to develop content and ideas and how to make a coherent paragraph. This is because like Jacob (1989) says that students have lack of writing ability. Next, Carson and Nelson (as cited in Hyland & Hyland, 2006), also mention that one of the factors that cause the failure in the implementation of peer feedback is students' reluctance in giving feedback. Most of the students are reluctant because they are afraid that they would make their friends feel offended because of the feedback. Similarly, Hyland (2002) mentions cultural background of the students influences students' willingness to give feedback. Some of the students feel that giving feedback to other students' writing is regarded as being too critical to others and it is considered bad in their culture. Therefore, some students would feel uncomfortable when they have to give feedback to their peers' writing.

Couched peer feedback

Some experts proposed that the phenomenon of students' lack of knowledge and skills for peer review could be solved by having training prior the feedback session. There are many studies that show the strength of Feedback couching. Rollinson (2005) reports that couching the students' prior feedback session is useful to avoid weak feedback from the students. Other studies also support couching process prior the feedback session (Esmaeeli, Abasi, & Soori, 2014; Lam, 2010; Min, 2006; Stanley, 1992; Zhu, 1995). The results of these studies were similar to that reported couched peer feedback could improve the quality of students' revision of their writing and automatically improve their writing capability. Besides writing quality improvement, many other researchers assert that couching peer feedback could improve the quality of feedback given to the writing (Esmaeeli et al., 2014; Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Finally, another research claims that by having couhing session, students interact more actively during the process of giving and sharing feedback together with their peers in group (Hansen & Liu, 2005)

In this research, we adapted the couching process proposed by Rolinson (2005) and Ferris (2003). There are two kinds of couching process conducted; pre-training and intervention training sessions. Rollinson (2005) mentions that there are three purposes of pre-training session. First, it is aimed at increasing students' awareness that there are readers of their writing that make them more careful on how to express their ideas in the form of written text that could be comprehensible and coherent. Second, the objective of pre-training session is to employ the students on how to work collaboratively with their friends in group and provide them with appropriate language to use to give comments. Finally, the purpose of pre-traning is to make the students practice on how to give effective comments to their students.

Besides pre-training session, there should be intervention training done by the teacher. (Ferris, 2003; Rollinson, 2005) suggested that there should be kind of "intervention training" in the middle of learning activities. The main objective of intervention training is to ensure whether peer feedback activity has run well or not. During the feedback session, the teacher monitors the process, then identifies the major mistakes done by students and tells them to not repeat the same mistakes again. In the intervention training, the teacher refreshes the students on what they have done and reminds them on how to give better feedback to their friends' writing.

Despite the usefulness of traditional Face-to-face peer feedback, however, it needs long time to conduct one peer feedback session. This limited time makes the students produce limited comments. One alternative to solve the problem is to have peer feedback session online. It is easier to have online feedback session, since the activity could be done anytime and at any place outside the class (Espasa, Guasch, & Alvares, 2013).

As online media interaction, social media is familiar for all people all over the world. According to Bartlett and Bragg (2006) social media is such kind of application that can make people interact one to another by sharing information in web-based environment. It has tools on how to make friends, and make personal account. Social media is kind of "second home" for the users, since they have their own power to control their account. As one of social media, currently Facebook is used by millions of people around the world. Many educator now frequently use Facebook in their teaching and learning activities. Facebook is also familiar to use in teaching writing. Through Facebook, the students can communicate asynchronously with their teacher without any limitation of space and time.

Writing anxiety and its relationship to students' writing ability

Every human beings have emotions (Brown, 2007). This emotion is one of the factors that could influence the learning process. Emotional factor then is called as affective domain. The affective domain influences the process of second language acquisition and language learning. The affective domain consists of some factors as follows: anxiety, empathy, imitation, attitude and self esteem. The relationship between affective factors and the process of second language acquisition and language learning is proposed in affective filter hypothesis by Krashen (1982). He asserts that everyone in the process of language acquisition and language learning is influenced by the level of affective filters. If the one has negative attitude to the process of language acquisition and language learning, he/she will have difficulty to absorb the input of the language. Meanwhile, the one who has positive attitude to the process, he/ she will open to any kinds of language input and produce best output.

One of the affective factors is anxiety. Lefrancois (1997) says that anxiety is the effect of when arousal is too high. Lefrancois (1997) defines anxiety as "a feeling characterized by varying degrees of fear and worry; also it refers to mental disorder". To give a clear description of positive and negative effect of anxiety, Brown (2007) divides anxiety into two types. They are (1) debilitative anxiety, in which anxiousness refers to the feelings of worry that are perceived as detrimental to students' self efficacy or that hinder student's performance, namely negative effect of anxiety; while (2) facilitative anxiety, refers to the "helpful anxiety, euphoric tension, or the beneficial effects of apprehension over a task to be accomplished called positive effect of anxiety.

Research over the last decade has confirmed that low anxiety has positive influence to the process of second language acquisition and learning (Krashen, 1982). In terms of writing activities, it can be inferred that students with low writing apprehension enjoys the writing activity, and automatically has better writing ability. On the other hand, students with high writing anxiety, tend to avoid writing. They have negative value about writing and automatically influence their poor writing products.

There are some studies that show how writing anxiety correlates to writing performance. First, Cheng, Horwitz and Schaller's study (1999) revealed that writing anxiety had negative correlation to writing achievement. Students with high levels of writing anxiety tended to have lower writing achievement. Meanwhile, students having low writing anxiety tend to have better writing skills. Similarly, Cheng (2002) also reports that English writing achievement was able to predict writing anxiety. Therefore, since there are facts that writing anxiety correlates to writing ability in then, it is really necessary to create learning activities that could reduce students' anxiety in writing.

Students' engagement

Engagement as students' participation and interest in learning. Engagement comprised of behavior and attitude (Abrar & Mukminin, 2016; Akey, 2006; Mukminin & McMahon, 2013). Behavior engagement is such kind of persistence in learning, exerting effort and paying attention in learning process. Meanwhile, attitude engagement refers to motivation, and enthusiasm in learning. Therefore, an engaged student is the student who actively participates in all activities in learning, shows curious in learning and have positive feeling toward learning. Another definition about engagement derives from Brophy (1983). He said that engagement refers to visible performance such as participation in all activities in learning. Finn (1989) adds emotional or

affective engagement as part of engagement in learning process. Finally Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris (2004) add aspect of cognitive in the definition of engagement.

There are some models proposed by researchers to predicts how students engaged in learning. First, the model which was proposed by Finn (1989). He developed the model of engagement that consists of behavior and emotional aspect. Second, The model which was designed by Skinner & Belmont (199 It comprised of engagement and disaffected mode of action. Finally, the model proposed by Fredricks, Blumenfeld and Paris (2004). They emphasized that students' engagement comprised of three aspects: behavioral, emotional and cognitive.

There are some researches regarded to students' engagement. First, Mukminin and McMahon (2013) reported in their qualitative study on the experience of students' engagement of Indonesian students who study in US that there werefive major academic engagement experiences, including language barriers to speaking which prevent the participants from actively participating in the oral interaction. Similarly, Abrar and Mukminin (2016) reported in their research that bariers faced in the process of discussion among students in groups were language barriers, individual matters and academic cultural differences

Method

Research design

In this research, we employed embedded design of mixed methods by collecting quantitative and qualitative data. According to Creswell (2012), the strength of embedded design is that it combines the advantages of both quantitative and qualitative data. The two data sets were analyzed separately, and they addressed different research questions. The quantitative data were obtained from writing test scores. The scores were gained from students' paragraph writing test where the students were asked to write a paragraph for free topic. The scores were used to address whether the treatments had an impact on students' writing ability. Then, the qualitative data collection was done to assess how the participants experienced the learning activities during the treatments.

Research site and participants

The study was done at one State Islamic University in Palembang, South Sumatera, Indonesia. The students were required to take paragraph writing class. There were four classes of students. For the experimental phase, we chose two classes based on two reasons; total number of students, and the level of writing anxiety. Thus we chose two classes which consists of students with low and high anxiety in a balanced manner. Each of class comprised of twenty two students.

In order to find out how students engaged in each learning activity, we also conducted an interview of twenty two students in couched peer feedback through face-to-face interaction class, there were eight students (four students having low writing anxiety and the other four having high writing anxiety) who were willing to join the interview session. Similar to face-to-face interaction class, there were also eight students (four students having low writing anxiety and the other four having high writing anxiety) in Facebook class who were willing to join the interview session. We used pseudonyms for the participants of our study. The participants from face to face interaction class were (pseudonyms) Khoirun, Nabillah, Nur and Devi, who had low writing anxiety. Meanwhile the participants with high writing anxiety were (pseudonyms) Dora, Fitriah,

Annisa and Henas. Then, The participants from Facebook interaction class were (pseudonyms), Ade, Aisyah, Meshy and Claudia who had low writing anxiety. Meanwhile the participants with high writing anxiety were (pseudonyms) Mia, Levenia, Azza and Juniarti.

Data collection

The research was conducted in two experimental groups. We used factorial designs. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2012), factorial designs cover several relations that can be studied in an experimental approach. In this research, we would like to see the relationships among the implementation of couched peer feedback through face to face and Facebook interaction, writing anxiety and writing ability.

The first group of students was treated by using couched peer feedback with face to face interaction. First, the students were divided into groups of four. Then, the students were trained on how to give effective feedback to their peers, how to response the feedback, how to communicate among students and how to decide which feedback is appropriate to use to revise the paragraph. After that, the students were asked to brainstorm ideas, compose a paragraph based, share feedback on peers' paragraphs in group and make revision. After revising the paragraph, then the lecturer conducted such kind of intervention training, where she reviewed what the students had already done, and reminded the students for not doing the same mistakes again. Similarly, In the second group, the students were taught by using couched peer feedback with the same steps as in the first group but the implementation was conducted through Facebook.

Prior the treatments, the students were asked to fulfill each item of a Likert-scale questionnaire adapted from the questionnaire designed by Cheng (2004). During fourteen meetings, we gave treatments to the two experimental groups. After all experimental groups were taught by using writing feedback techniques (couched peer feedback through face-to-face and Facebook interaction), we gave paragraph writing composition test to gain students' writing achievement. The students were asked to write a paragraph. They were free to elaborate their own topic to become a paragraph. After that, the scores of students' paragraph writing test were rated by two independent rater based on the writing band proposed by Boardman and Frydenberg (2002)

In the qualitative phase, we collected qualitative data as the supporting data gained from experimental phase (quantitative phase). The data collections were done during and after the experimental phase in order to describe phenomena of students' engagement in each experimental group.

The first qualitative data collection was observation. Observation was chosen to gain the detailed phenomena on students' engagement during the learning activities. The observation criteria were made based on what Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris (2004). There are three aspects of engagement namely behavioral, emotional and cognitive engagement. Behavioral engagement ilustrates students' participation in learning process, and the way they interact with their teacher and their friends. Then, emotional engagement focused on the affective aspect which relates to students' emotion in experience the learning activities. Finally, cognitive engagement was defined as the students' level of independence in learning.

In order to support the data gained from field note observation to explore how the students engaged in learning activities, we interviewed eight students from face to face interaction class and the other eight ones from Facebook class who agreed to be interviewed. The interviews were recorded by using video recorder and then the results were transcribed. We interviewed the

participants around sixty to ninety minutes per participant. Guided by the interview protocol, we asked them about how they experienced all the learning activities to find out the way they engaged in the learning process in each class of treatment.

Data analysis

The quantitative data gained from the quantitative phase of data collections were analyzed by using SPSS 20 and several statistics formula. Then, the qualitative data from field notes of observation, and the results of students' interview were analyzed by using coding analysis (Creswell, 2007).

Findings

The data gained from quantitative and qualitative data collections are described as follows:

Findings of quantitative data

The data gained from the writing scores of the students after they were treated by using couched peer feedback through direct interaction and Facebook instruction are described in Table 1 below.

Tabel 1. The results of the analysis by using two way anova

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2413,909[a]	3	804,636	10,921	,000
Intercept	177419,000	1	177419,000	2408,056	,000
CPF	372,364	1	372,364	5,054	,030
Anxiety	2018,273	1	2018,273	27,393	,000
CPF * anxiety	23,273	1	23,273	,316	,577
Error	2947,091	40	73,677		
Total	182780,000	44			
Corrected Total	5361,000	43			

The result of Two Way Anova listed in Table 1 shows the effect of couched peer feedback through face-to-face interaction and Facebook with writing skills. From Table 1, it could be concluded that because the significance obtained value was 0.030 lower than 0.05, it meant there was significant difference between writing ability among groups of students in direct interaction class with students in Facebook class.

Based on the differences of the means scores of student writing who were taught using couched peer feedback through face-to-face interaction and those who were taught by using couched peer feedback through online interactions in table 2, it could be concluded that students' writing skills after being taught using couched peer feedback writing techniques through online interaction were better than those taught using couched peer feedback through face-to-face interaction.

Tabel 2. Mean scores of students taught by using couched peer feedback through face-to-face and online interactions

CPF	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Face to Face	60,591	1,830	56,892	64,290
Facebook interaction	66,409	1,830	62,710	70,108

Furthermore, the result of Two Way Anova listed in Table 4 also showed how the different levels of students' writing anxiety affected their writing ability. It could be concluded that that there was a significant difference in writing ability between low writing anxiety students and high writing anxiety ones. Then, based on the difference in average values between groups of students who had low writing anxiety and high writing anxiety in table 3, it could be inferred that groups of students who had low writing anxiety had better writing skills compared to the groups having high writing anxiety.

Table 3. Mean scores of students' writing having low and high writing anxiety

Anxiety	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Low	70,273	1,830	66,574	73,971
High	56,727	1,830	53,029	60,426

Finally, to reveal whether there was an interaction between the application of couched peer feedback writing through face-to-face and online interaction, it could be seen from significance obtained score. Because the significance obtained value was 0.577 higher than p output 0.05, it implied that there was no interaction between the different feedback writing techniques and different level of writing anxiety to students' writing skills.

Findings of qualitative data collections

From thematic analysis of qualitative data gained from observation and interview, there were three themes that showed how students engaged in the learning activities; behavior engagement, emotional engagement and cognitive engagement. Behavior engagement comprised of sub-themes; focus on each learning activity, actively participated in every learning activity and participated passively in learning activities. Emotional engagement comprised of subthemes; Feeling that the activity of giving comments to each other was fun, feeling that the activity of reading and sharing comments were useful, feeling that comments on writing were useful for revising the writing, feeling that the "pre-training" session from lecturer was useful, feeling that a review from the lecturer in the midst of a learning process was useful, feeling less trust in comments from friends on writing and feeling insecure to comments and feeling unsure whether the comments given were correct. Finally, cognitive engagement consisted of sub-themes; demonstrated the best efforts in following the learning process, and became more autonomous/ had control over their learning).

Students' behavior engagement

There were 3 sub-themes for the theme (students' behavior engagement). They were: 1) focused on each learning activity; 2) actively participated in every learning activity, and 3) participated passively in learning activity. The descriptions of each sub-theme were as follows:

Focus on each learning activity

Based on the data obtained from observations, most of low and high writing anxiety students either in direct interaction or online interaction always showed a serious attitude in doing all their tasks during learning activities. From observation, we found that in face-to-face interaction class, students stayed focused during the assignment. They carried out tasks with full concentration. Students always stayed focused as long as the lecturer explained to them. Students showed body posture that showed they paid attention to lecturers and focused on learning activities. Most students never talked or continued to work themselves. The students were seen to understand all the lecturers' instructions and were able to do all the steps of the learning activities. It happened too in online class. The students were disciplined in following the schedule of activity that had to be conducted via Facebook. They stayed on their task and they did exactly what the lecturer told them to do.

Actively participate in every learning activity

We explored that most students in face-to-face interaction class who had low writing anxiety had participated actively in learning activities. Most students with low anxiety were active to participate in group discussions by contributing their opinions. Meanwhile, in Facebook class, based on the results of data analysis obtained from observations, it was found that in the feedback sharing process, all students who had low and high anxiety actively gave their comments on their friends' posts in the comments column available on Facebook based on the schedule decided by their lecturer. They paid attention to all aspects of writing listed in the guidelines. They tried to provide feedback on the contents of the paragraph, especially for coherence even though they frequently provided comments in terms of language features; grammar, spelling, and punctuation. In the next feedback sharing session, all students were much more active. Most students were accustomed to using expressions that must be used in commenting and discussing together in groups. The comments given were also more varied and included all aspects of writing listed in the guidelines.

Participate passively in learning activities

After analyzing the data gained from observation, we got the information that most of the high anxiety students in face-to-face interaction class were not too active, they often stayed quiet, and seemed embarrassed to be involved in activities.

Students' emotional engagement

There were seven sub-themes for the theme (students' emotional engagement). They were: 1) feeling that the activity of giving comments to each other was fun; 2) feeling insecure to give feedback made the peers hurt; 3) feeling unsure whether the comments given by friends were correct; 4) feeling that the activity of reading and sharing comments was useful; 5) feeling that the"pre-training" session from lecturer was useful; 6) feeling that the "lecturer's review" in the middle of learning process was useful; 7) feeling that comments on writing were useful for revising the writing for the better. The descriptions of each sub-theme were as follows

Feeling that the activity of giving comments to each other is a fun activity

Only students who had low anxiety felt that the activity of giving comments to friends' writing in group was fun because, for them, the activity of giving and sharing feedback on each other and revising the writings of friends in group was a new activity for them. By having active discussion and sharing comments with their friends, peer feedback could foster their confidence and get useful information to improve their writing. In connection with this, one of the students named Khoirun said "I felt when reading my friend's writing, I found a lot of new information from it and afterwards by having those activities I could foster my self-confidence". Other students having low writing anxiety also had similar opinions as Khoirun.

Meanwhile, most students either having low and high writing anxiety felt that the activity of giving and sharing feedback to friends' writings in groups through Facebook was fun. This was because for them the activity of commenting on each other and revising the writings of friends in groups through Facebook was enjoyable. Low or high anxiety students argued that the activities carried out through Facebook could make them feel relaxed because these activities could be done anywhere not only limited in the classroom. It was in accordance with what was said by Ade, one of the students who has low writing anxiety. She said "I feel that reading and commenting on Facebook is more comfortable than in the classroom because the time given was quite long and I could think broader than when I had to do everything inside the class that has minimal time". Regarding to this, all students with low writing anxiety had similar opinion to Ade.

Similar to students having low writing anxiety, most students with high anxiety stated that they felt more confident when commenting on their friends' writing posted on Facebook. This was because they basically felt the tense and embarrassed when they had to discuss face to face with their friends, so that when the activity was done through Facebook they felt more relaxed. Like Levenia, one of the students who had high anxiety, said that "when on Facebook I could feel more relaxed because there was time given by the lecturer, but when I was in the class I felt nervous". The other students having high writing anxiety had similar opinion as Levenia.

Feel insecure to give feedback

This feeling was only expressed by students having high writing anxiety. Most students having high writing anxiety felt discomfort in the process of sharing comments on writing and discussing in groups. Almost all students who had high writing anxiety felt less confident in commenting directly on their friends' writing and discussing in groups because they felt their abilities were lacking. For example, Dora argued, "What I felt, when I had to read the writing of my friends, it was initially a little uncomfortable, but then I felt quite cool and interesting." And

some had mix feelings in commenting on the writings of friends like Fitriah who mentioned that "In my opinion, when I read and commented on my friend's writing, I felt very nervous, and embarrassed. When I commented on my friend's writing, I was afraid of being wrong in commenting on my friends' posts. But I tried hard by reading books again and more often opening dictionaries.

Feeling unsure whether the comments given by friends are correct

After analyzing the data gained from interview , we found out that the majority of students who had low anxiety either in face to face interaction and online interaction through Facebook class felt unsure whether the comments given were correct. Like Nur argued "The comments given were quite clear, although there were things that were difficult to understand because my friends did not explain more clearly" then Devi said "Not everything I believed from my friends, because I was sure there was a part of my paragraph that was correct but blamed". Students from Facebook interaction class expressed similar opinions. For example Mia stated "I did not believe all comments given from my friends because there are some friends whom I doubted their ability to make a paragraph" then Meshy also said "Not fully, because we were still in the process of learning so there must be errors in commenting".

Feeling that the activity of reading and sharing comments were useful

All students who had low and high writing anxiety either from face to face interaction or online interaction through Facebook class considered the activities of reading and sharing comments useful. By reading their friends' writing, they could learn how to structure the correct paragraph. This was in accordance with Annisa, who had high writing anxiety, said that "the benefit of the two activities is that I could learn how to write well from the mistakes in my friend's writing". The other student named Nabilah having low writing anxiety said that "There are benefits when we were required to read our friends' writing in group. In addition to gaining insight and gaining knowledge in terms of writing, when commenting on the writing of our friends, it can make our writing better". The other students having low and high writing anxiety also had similar ideas as Annisa and Nabilah.

From Facebook class, Meshi, one of the students having low writing anxiety also argued "there are benefits that I got when I read and gave comments on my friends' paragraphs posted on Facebook. I could better understand the structure of the paragraph and other components in making a good paragraph, I also got a lot of new vocabulary, got a lot of knowledge by reading while discussing, and made me confident by commenting on my friend's writing. "Similar to students having low writing anxiety, Azza, the one having high writing anxiety also admitted that reading and sharing feedback on their friends' writing posted on Facebook is useful. She stated that "Of course there are benefits, by reading through Facebook I could learn from the mistakes of my friends because by looking at the mistakes of others, I was easier to remember mistakes that my friends have done so I will not repeat them"

Thus, the opinions of the students showed that they inferred the activities of giving and sharing feedback are useful especially to get much information related the way to write, learn the mistakes made by their friends so that they indirectly learn from these mistakes and avoid making the same mistakes when writing.

Feeling that the "pre-training" session from lecturer is useful

From this research, all students having low and high writing anxiety either from face to face or Facebook interaction class considered the pre-training session was useful. This is in accordance with the opinion of students like Henas, one student having high writing anxiety in face-to-face interaction class said "in my opinion pretraining session is useful. Because with this training, before we did sharing feedback activities, we understood what had to be corrected in our friends' paragraphs". In addition, Nabilah, the one having low writing anxiety said that "the pre-training session was truly effective; we were given guidance on how to comment, and what aspects of writing that should be considered. The lecturers then asked us in groups to give feedback to the wrong paragraph samples, so that it made us able to provide effective feedback for the writing of our colleagues ". As well as Henas and Nabilah other students having low and high writing anxiety also have similar opinions.

Moreover, all students who had low or high writing anxiety in Facebook class also considered the pre-training session useful to train them in how to write well and comment on their friends' writing correctly. This was in accordance with the opinions of students like Aisah, the one having low writing anxiety argued "pre-training session was useful for me because with pre-training session I knew what steps to take in giving feedback". Similar to Aisah, Mia, the one having high writing anxiety said "Very useful, the pre-training session gave us guidelines to do feedback. Everything that should be commented on was explained in pre-training."

Thus, it could be inferred that pre-training session given by the lecturer prior sharing feedback session was very useful to train the students on how to write a good paragraph and to employ the students with the guideline of how to give feedback appropriately to their friends' paragraph.

Feeling that the "lecturer's review" in the middle of learning process is useful

All students with low and high writing anxiety either from direct interaction with face to face communication or Facebook class regarded feedback from their lecturers in the middle of learning activities was useful. According to Khoirun, the one having low writing anxiety in face to face interaction stated "The review session provided by the teacher could help correct mistakes that occurred while writing", just like Khoirun, Fitriah, the one having high writing anxiety also said "From the review from my lecturer, I could refresh my mind about mistakes in my writing and try not to do it again. "

Similar to face to face interaction class, all students who had low or high writing anxiety in Facebook class also considered feedback from their lecturers in the middle of learning activities useful. This was in accordance with the opinion of students such as Meshy who has low writing anxiety stated "With the review session given by the teacher, I could find out where my mistakes were in writing a paragraph, so I could improve it and improve my writing skills" just like Meshy, Mia the one having high writing anxiety also said that "The review process improves our writing skills because with the review we could find out our mistakes in making a paragraph.

Thus, all students commonly had the same opinion that their lecturers' feedback in the midst of learning activities was useful to refresh their minds about what they should do during peer feedback activities. The lecturer also provided an explanation of some of the mistakes that have generally been made by students that made students aware of not making the same mistakes again.

Feeling that comments on writing are useful for revising the writing for the better

The students both having low and high writing anxiety either in face to face interaction or Facebook interaction class argued that the comments given by friends in their writing were useful for revising their writing and making their writing better. According to the students, comments from their friends variedly could make them revise their writing both from the aspects of content, organization, grammar, diction and mechanics. For example according to Devi, the one from direct interaction class stated

> "At first I used content and ideas that were too general or not specific which could cause the reader not to feel curious about my writing. With the comments about this, then I could make content or ideas that are more specific or not too general. In terms of "paragraph organization" I became more aware in making a topic sentence which should not be too general nor too specific, supporting sentence which follows the topic sentence, major or minor in supporting sentence, unity and coherence in my writing, conclusion, etc. With comments, I could become more aware of all parts of the paragraph organization. In terms of "grammar" with comments from my friends, I became more attentive to my grammar. From the aspect of "word choice", sometimes I used words that were quite ordinary so readers could understand the content of my writing. However, I also often used abbreviated words that should not be there in paragraph. So, I was more careful in selecting words. Finally in terms of mechanics, I usually also paid less attention to mechanics in writing. So with the correction from my friends, I was more careful in spelling and punctuation."

Next, students felt aware that somehow they could not identify their own mistakes even though they had read their paragraph more than once until they received feedback from their friends. This was in accordance with Annisa's opinion saying "Yes, the comments my friends gave were very useful, because even though I felt that I had written very carefully, I had examined my own writing by reading it several times, but in reality, there were some errors identified by my friends, so my friends' feedback helped me greatly to improve the quality of my writing ." Similar to face to face interaction class, in Facebook interaction class, almost all students both have low anxiety and those who have high anxiety argued that the comments given by friends in their writing were useful for revising their writing. For example according to Azza,

> My friends' comments in writing were very influential and beneficial for me because they could make my mindset wider. In terms of the "paragraph organization" comments from my friends make me more careful in writing the paragraphs. In terms of "grammar", comments from my friends encouraged me to study harder, so that the order of my sentence in writing sentences in my paragraph was even better than before and. In terms of word choice "From the comments I received from my friends, I had to know more about the vocabulary so that it was better in writing. Lastly in terms of mechanics, I realized that I had to be more careful when writing a paragraph.

Cognitive engagement

There were two sub-themes for the theme (students' behavior engagement). They were: 1) students demonstrated the best effort in the learning process; 2) students became more

autonomous (have control over their learning). The descriptions of each sub-theme were as follows:

Demonstrate the best effort in the learning process

Students' willingness to exert their best effort in each stage of learning was shown in the results of interviews of some students having low and high writing anxiety. It was reflected from Nabillah's statement, the one having low writing anxiety in face to face interaction class. She mentioned "When I was told to comment on [18] friend's writing, I felt challenged and got new responsibility. Furthermore, although basically students with high anxiety had lack of confidence in their abilities but they still provided comments that made them become accustomed to it. This was said by Dora "First of all, I was feeling depressed because I was afraid my friends would be angry and unhappy, but because I tried to feel like I was able to improve the writing of my friends".

Furthermore, the students had done such a hard work when they were required to give comments. When they were required to give feedbacks to their friends' paragraphs, they showed their sense of responsibility by providing the best comments by reading books, ensuring more comments regarding vocabulary by opening the dictionary and others. This was in accordance with what Devi, low writing anxiety student said. "I believed in this technique, because by repeating constantly reading and commenting, my writing skills increased and we shared feedback together in our group and discussed it". In addition, most students with high and low writing anxiety showed learning persistence. "Furthermore, despite having limited ability, Henas, the one having high writing anxiety in his statement showed his persistence to remain active in the learning process" Yes, at first I was a bit stressed, because I felt insecure about my writing skills, but I had to give feedback to my friend's paragraph, but as time passed I enjoyed it, I just tried hard to give the best feedback I could, then actually, we always shared our feedback together in our group and discussed". Likewise, Fitriah has similar opinions. she said, "To be honest, I felt scared, but it made me more careful, I read the guidelines given by the lecturer before I commented, I read their writings more than once to ensure that my responses were correct, and tried hard by reading several sources to ensure providing correct feedback. "

Similar to face to face interaction class, most students having high and low writing anxiety in Facebook interaction class also showed their best effort to give and share feedback. Students' responses that showed that they wanted to exert as much effort as possible were shown by Azza's statement, the one having high writing anxiety. "When I started reading the writing of my friend, I felt I had to be really careful in reading my friends' paragraphs and I had to understand the content of the paragraph, so that I would give comment on what I captured from the content of the paragraphs". Just like Azza, Mia also said "I felt very careful when reading and commenting on my friends' writing". Meanwhile, the other students commonly had the same opinions.

Thus, despite all the difficulties faced by students, they always tried hard to follow all stages in learning activities. Especially for students who had high writing anxiety although the process of reading their colleague's writing was a big burden because of their lack of writing skills. They were willing to force themselves to keep trying, reading more books, or asking questions to their friends in groups.

Students become more autonomous (have control over their learning)

After analyzing the data gained from interview, we found that students with low and high writing anxiety either in face to face or Facebook class became more autonomous in learning. In other words, they had control over their learning, where actually students who had low or high writing anxiety would consider all types of feedback before using it to revise their essays. Along with this, Henas, the one having high writing anxiety said "My friends' comments were not always correct, so before revising, we would crosscheck the feedback in group and discuss the reasons, why the paragraph was wrong". Students who had low anxiety also shared a relatively similar opinion as said by Devi "Sometimes I believe sometimes I did not, if I believed on the comments given by my friends, I would immediately revise my writing based on those comments, but when I did not believe on the comments I would clarified to my friends."

Just like in direct interaction with face to face communication class, students who had low and high writing anxiety in Facebook class became more autonomous in learning. In other words, they had control over their learning. Students who had low or high writing anxiety would consider all types of comments their friends give to their writing before using it to revise their paragraphs. Along with this, Juniarti, the one having high writing anxiety said "I did not immediately trust the comments of my friends. I would check it again and when it was necessary, I would ask my lecturer whether the comments were true or false. Students who have low anxiety also have relatively the same opinion as what is said by Juniarti. For example, Aisyah mentioned "after reading my friend's comments, I read my writing again to find out if their comments were correct because there are some comments of my friends that I still need to analyze before I used the comments to revise my paragraph."

Discussion

From the results of quantitative data analysis, it was found that differences in the implementation of feedback writing techniques in writing class had different effects on students' writing ability, where students in couched peer feedback class through Facebook showed better performance in writing than couched peer feedback through face to face interaction. The result of this study was in accordance with the research conducted by Sullivan and Pratt (1996) who found that students who experienced the learning process by interacting through social media networks showed an increase in the quality of their learning rather than students studying in traditional class. Next Cha (2007) also revealed that with the use of peer feedback through mixed modes provide each other's effectiveness in the writing process. Furthermore Cha (2014) reported from research that by using mixed modes, both asynchronous and synchronous modes with feedback from peers and the teacher in the writing process for students in the EFL context showed an increase in writing skills in mechanics, content, structure and organization in students 'writing.

Referring to the results obtained from this research that the better performance of students in writing in classes taught using couched peer feedback through Facebook compared to direct interaction basically because of the weaknesses in the application of writing feedback technique through face-to-face communication as stated by Rollinson (2005), such as a) time limitations; (b) student characteristics and cultural background; c) the inability of the teacher to monitor each group simultaneously and d) unbalanced student participation in the learning process. This weakness in face-to-face process can be covered by the learning process through online interaction.

Furthermore, in terms of students' anxiety levels, differences in students' anxiety levels in writing also had different effects on their writing performance. Students who had low writing anxiety showed better writing performance than students who had high writing anxiety. The fact of this study was supported by Brown (2007) who stated that students' inability to write is mostly due to anxiety factors. Then, this research was also supported by research conducted by Cheng, Horwitz & Schallert (1999) which showed writing anxiety determined writing achievement, where writing anxiety was negatively correlated to writing performance. Other study which also showed similar findings to this research as done by Cheng et al. (1999) and which was conducted by Hassan (2001) who reported that low writing anxiety students showed better writing performance than high writing anxiety ones.

Moreover, we found that there was no interaction between differences in learning techniques applied and differences in students 'anxiety levels in writing with students' ability in writing. In this case, the ability of students who had low or high writing anxiety to write was equally better with the application of couched peer feedback technique through Facebook rather than the application of couched peer feedback technique through face-to-face interaction.

Better writing performance of students who had low or high anxiety through the application of couched peer feedback techniques through online interaction compared to peer feedback with face-to-face interaction is also supported by their behavior in the learning process. Basically in terms of behavior, students showed that they were focused and actively participated in the learning process. However, most students who had high anxiety tended to be passive in the process of discussion and sharing comments in groups in couched peer feedback with face-to-face interaction class. They felt afraid that they would give wrong comments and felt afraid that their friends would be angry with them. Meanwhile, in the learning process through Facebook interaction, both students who had low and high anxiety were actively participated in commenting on their friends' posts in the Facebook comment column. This was because they could concentrate more on reading each of their friends' paragraphs and preparing comments given to their friends.

Apart from the behavioral aspects, affectively, almost all students who had low or high anxiety felt comfortable with learning process by using couched peer feedback through Facebook. This could be seen from their response of interview. Both students who had low and high anxiety argued that the activities carried out through Facebook could make them feel relaxed because these activities could be done everywhere not only limited in the classroom. Most students who had high anxiety stated that they felt more confident when commenting on their friends' posts on Facebook. This was because they basically felt stressful and embarrassed when they had to discuss face to face with their friends, so that when the activity was carried out through Facebook they felt more relaxed. Besides, because writing and commenting done via Facebook could be done in a non-narrow time, it made the students calmer and focused in writing and commenting on their friends paragraphs. Students were encouraged to comment on others' paragraphs that automatically make the students exert their best efforts to give comment. They read more and more to ensure they have provided useful feedback to their friends in group.

Moreover, some students who had low anxiety felt uncomfortable in commenting directly, they felt afraid that their friends would feel offended. Likewise with students who had high anxiety, they felt afraid that they would give a wrong comment. Most of the students having high writing anxiety felt their ability was weak in commenting on their friends' paragraphs in group. This was in accordance to with previous study done by Nelson and Murphy (1993) who reported that students who were native speakers of Chinese as mother tongue, felt that their friends who were not native speakers of English had no rights to criticize their paragraphs. This implied that

the process of commenting in groups of students did not run well because of the unwillingness to give comments to others' paragraphs.

The phenomenon mentioned earlier corresponds to the affective filter hypothesis proposed by Krashen (1982) who revealed that affective variables showed strong relationships with language acquisition. He proposed that language acquisition processes vary and relate to their affective filter levels. If the student's attitude is not optimal in the language acquisition process, students will not seek more input, but students will have high affective filter while inputs will not reach the part of the brain that plays a role in the language acquisition process. As an affective factor, anxiety has been shown to influence the writing process. With the learning process through Facebook, both students who had low or high anxiety express their sense of comfort in following the learning activities, this would indirectly reduce their tension in the learning process. Thus, the affective filter became low so that the incoming input would be more easily absorbed in the brain, and the final performance of students would become more optimal. In other words, every time the application of writing teaching techniques could create a conducive learning situation that made the affective filter low, it would automatically have a better effect on student performance. It was applied to students either having low or high writing anxiety.

Although students in peer feedback class through Facebook instruction showed better performance in writing than students in peer feedback class with direct interaction, basically both students who were in the couched peer feedback class with direct interaction and Facebook instruction felt that sharing comments on their friend's paragraphs is useful to improve their paragraphs. Indeed, the process of reading and commenting on their friends' writing indirectly made students aware that someone would read their writing. Awareness of the existence of writing audience was emphasized by Rolinson (2005). He stated that by reading someone's writing, it would automatically create critical students that critically revise their own writing. Along with Rollinson (2005), Keh (1990) also argues that the writer from a given commentary can learn whether or not he has confused his readers or not by not providing sufficient information, compiling ideas that are not systematic, and presenting inappropriate choices of words or write in an inappropriate grammar. Therefore, when students participated in reading and commenting on their friends' writing, they automatically realized that there were readers from their writing and this activity would increase students' awareness of the audience from their writing.

Furthermore, both students who were in the couched peer feedback class with direct interaction and Facebook instruction acknowledged that pre-training session, the couching session for students was beneficial to employ the students information on what aspects of the language to comment on, and what language to use in giving comments on their friends' writing. All students also argued that the intervention session from the teacher in the middle of the learning process in the form of a review from their lecturer was also useful to ascertain whether what they had done was appropriate or not and improve the quality of the way of commenting that automatically improved the quality of their paragraph revisions. Hyland (2003) emphasizes that because English language students as a second language generally have lack of language mastery, training on peer session activity is most effective when it is demonstrated, and organized. Thus, the intervention session from the lecturer in the middle of the learning process in the form of a review from their lecturer was useful to ascertain whether what the students have done is appropriate or not and improve the quality of the way of giving comments that automatically improve the quality of the revisions.

Finally, from the cognitive aspect, almost all students who had low or high anxiety both in couched peer feedback classes with face-to-face interaction and Facebook interaction showed that

They became independent and did not always depend on the guidance of their lecturers at any time. The students had the confidence to decide which comments from friends they used to revise their writing. This was consistent with what was concluded by Tsu and Ng (2000) who concluded that because students felt that they were at the same level of ability, they felt they were not obliged to always obey what their friends commented on to revise their writing. In other words, they had their own control over their writing. This would automatically make students independent.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The conclusions of our study were formulated as follows: 1) the difference feedback writing techniques had different effects on students' writing ability, where students who were in couched peer feedback through Facebook interaction showed better performance in writing than couched peer feedback through face-to-face interaction; 2) differences in students' anxiety levels in writing also had different effects on their writing performance, where students with low writing anxiety showed higher writing achievement than those with high writing anxiety; 3) there was no interaction between the application of feedback writing techniques, different level of anxiety in writing and students' writing performance and 4) students had varying engagement to the learning process both in terms of behavioral, affective and cognitive aspects.

There are some suggestions that we would like to propose as follows: 1) because the scope of the research is quite limited, it is recommended that further research be carried out for the influence of the comments given to each student's revision of their writing; 2) additional study is needed to determine the influence of commenting to each aspect of writing, namely content, coherence, grammar, choice of words and mechanical aspects such as punctuation, and spelling of words and 3) affective factor examined in this study is only anxiety in writing. Thus, It is indispensable to conduct more research that focuses on other affective factors that affect students' writing ability.

References

Abrar, M., & Mukminin, A. (2016). International graduate classroom discussion engagement, challenges and solving-strategies. *Asia Pacific Collaborative Education Journal*, *12*(1), 5-19.

Akey, T. M. (2006). School context, student attitudes and behavior, and academic achievement: An exploratory analysis. 1-52.

Astrid, A., Rukmini, D., Sofwan, A., & Fitriati, S.W. (2016). The analysis of students' engagement to writing feedback activities viewed from students' writing anxiety. *International Journal of English and Education, 6*(2), 86-107.

Bijami, M. (2013). Peer feedback in learning English writing: advantages and disadvantages. *Journal of Studies in Education*, *3*(4), 1-7.

Boardman & Frydenberg. (2002). *Writing to communicate: Paragraphs and essays*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Brophy, J. (1983). Conceptualizing student motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 18*, 200-215.

Brown, H.D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York, NY: Pearson Education.

Cha, Y. (2014). Effects of blended peer feedback modes on learner's writing performance and perspectives. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning, 17*(2), 11-42.

Cha, Y. (2007). A study of peer feedback patterns in CMC modes on Korean EFL students. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning, 10*(1), 9-35.

Cheng, Y.S, Horwitz, E.K., & Schallert, D.L., (1999). Language writing anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning*, *49*, 417-446.

Cheng, Y.S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(4), 313-335.

Cheng, Y.S, Horwitz, E.K. & Schallert, D.L., (1999). Language writing anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning*, *49*, 417-446.

Cheng, Y. S. (2002). Factors associated with foreign language writing anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*(5), 647-656.

Creswell. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Creswell. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. (2Eds.)*. London, UK: Sage Publication Ltd.

Esmaeeli, H., Abasi, M., & Soori, A. (2014). Is peer review training effective in Iranian EFL students' revision? *Advances in Language and Literacy Studies*, *5*(4), 151-154.

Espasa, A., Guasch, T., & Alvarez, I. M. (2013). Analysis of feedback processes in online group interaction: A methodological model. *Digital Education Review*, *23*, 59-73.

Farrah, M. (2012). The impact of peer feedback on improving the writing skills among Hebron University students. *An-Najah Univ. J.Res.(Humanities)*, *26*(1), 180-210.

Ferris, D. (2003). Responding to writing. In B.Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 119-140). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Finn, J.D. (1989). Withdrawing from school. *Review of Educational Research*, *59*, 117-142.

Flower & Hayes (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, *32*(4), 365-387.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. San Fransisco: McGraw Hill.

Fredricks, J.A., Blumenfeld, P.C., & Paris, A. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept: state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*, 59-119.

Guardado, M., & Shi, L. (2007). ESL students' experiences of online peer feedback. *Computer and Composition*, *24*(4), 443-461.

Hassan, B. (2001).The relationship of writing apprehension and self-esteem to the writing quality and quantity of EFL University students. *Mansoura Faculty of Education Journal, 39*, 1-36.

Hansen & Liu. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. *ELT Journal*, *59*(1), 31-38.

Hyland, F .(2000). ESL writers and Feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research*, *4*(1), 33-54.

Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and researching writing*. Essex, England: Pearson Education.

Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(1), 17–29.

Hyland, K & Fiona Hyland. (2006). *Feedback on second language students' writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Jacobs, G. (1989). Miscorrection in peer feedback in writing class. *RELC Journal*, *20*(1), 68-76.

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

Krashen. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. California: Pergamon Press Inc.

Lam. 2010. A peer review training workshop: Couching students to give and evaluate peer feedback. *TESL Canada Journal*, *27*(2), 1-14.

Lee, S. Y. (2005). Facilitating and inhibiting factors in English as a foreign language writing performance: A model testing with structural equation modeling. *Language Learning, 55*(2), 335-374.

Lefrancois, G.R. (1997). *Psychology for teaching*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Lei, C. (2012). Relations among peer feedback, writing performance and writing improvement: Evidence from a writing class in China. *Reflecting Education*, *8*(1), 10-22.

Leki, I. (1990). Potential problems with peer responding in ESL writing classes. *CATESOL Journal, 3*, 5-19.

Liu, J., & Sadler, R.W. (2003). The effect and affect of peer review in electronic versus traditional modes on L2 writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 2*, 193-227.

Mendoca, C., & Johnson, K. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(4), 745–768.

Min, H. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*(2006), 118-141.

Mukminin, A., & McMahon, B.J. (2013). International graduate students' cross cultural academic engagement: stories on Indonesian doctoral students on American campus. *The Qualitative Report, 18*(35), 1-19.

Nelson,G., & Murphy, J.(1993). Peer response groups: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts? *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 135–142.

Ping, N.S., & Maniam, M. (2015). The effectiveness of Facebook group discussions on writing performance: A study in matriculation college. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *4*(1), 30-37.

Reid, J. (1994). Responding to ESL students' texts: The myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(2), 273–294.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, *59*(1), 23-30.

Shih, R. (2011). Can Web 2.0 technology assist college students in learning English writing? Integrating facebook and peer assessment with blended learning. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 27*(5), 829-845.

Skinner, E., & Belmont, M.J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *85*, 571-581.

Stanley, J. (1992). Couching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *1*(3), 217-233.

Statista. (2015). Leading social networks worldwide as of August 2015, ranked by number of active users (in milions). *The Statistics Portal*. Retrieved from www.statista.com/global-social-networks-ranked.

Sullivan, N., & Pratt, E. (1996). A comparative study of two ESL writing environment: A computer assisted classroom and traditional oral classroom. *System*, *29*(4), 491-501.

Tsui, A. B. M., & Maria, N. G. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(2), 147-170.

Wakabayashi, R. (2013). The effectsof the peer feedback process on reviewers' own writing. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(9), 177-192

Yarrow, F., & Topping, K. J. (2001). Collaborative learning: The effects of metacognitive prompting and structured peer interaction. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *71*, 261–282.

Yunus, M., Salehi, H., & Chenzi, C. (2012). Integrating social networking tools into ESL writing classroom: strength and weaknesses. *English Language Teaching*, 5(8), 42-48.

Zu, W. (1995). Effects of training for peer response on students' comments and interaction. *Written Communication*, 1(4), 492-528.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

13% SIMILARITY INDEX

8% INTERNET SOURCES

6% PUBLICATIONS

9% STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	**Submitted to Universitas Ibn Khaldun** Student Paper	**3**%
2	**repository.radenfatah.ac.id** Internet Source	**1**%
3	**Neng Eva Agustuna, Rina Herlina, Didih Faridah. "Corrective Feedback on Pronunciation Errors: Teacher's Perception and EFL High School Students' Self-Reflection", Journal of English Education and Teaching, 2019** Publication	**1**%
4	**eprints.unm.ac.id** Internet Source	**<1**%
5	**repository.unikama.ac.id** Internet Source	**<1**%
6	**scholarcommons.usf.edu** Internet Source	**<1**%
7	**media.neliti.com** Internet Source	**<1**%

docplayer.net

8	Internet Source	<1%
9	**Submitted to University of Sheffield** Student Paper	<1%
10	www.iafor.org Internet Source	<1%
11	eltlt.org Internet Source	<1%
12	**Submitted to University of Edinburgh** Student Paper	<1%
13	**Submitted to Higher Ed Holdings** Student Paper	<1%
14	**Submitted to University of South Florida** Student Paper	<1%
15	**Submitted to Victoria University** Student Paper	<1%
16	**Submitted to International Black Sea University** Student Paper	<1%
17	mafiadoc.com Internet Source	<1%
18	Ahmed Abdulateef Sabti, Sabariah Md Rashid, Vahid Nimehchisalem, Ramiza Darmi. "The Impact of Writing Anxiety, Writing Achievement Motivation, and Writing Self-Efficacy on Writing	<1%

Performance: A Correlational Study of Iraqi
Tertiary EFL Learners", SAGE Open, 2019
Publication

19 citeseerx.ist.psu.edu
Internet Source   <1%

20 Submitted to Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi
Student Paper   <1%

21 Submitted to University of York
Student Paper   <1%

22 Mary Ainley. "Connecting with Learning:
Motivation, Affect and Cognition in Interest
Processes", Educational Psychology Review,
2006
Publication   <1%

23 Submitted to University of Warwick
Student Paper   <1%

24 Submitted to Universitas Jambi
Student Paper   <1%

25 Submitted to University of Leicester
Student Paper   <1%

26 repository.iainkerinci.ac.id
Internet Source   <1%

27 jeda-uniport.com
Internet Source   <1%

28 files.eric.ed.gov
    Internet Source
                                                                <1%

29 Submitted to Massey University
    Student Paper
                                                                <1%

30 journal.kate.or.kr
    Internet Source
                                                                <1%

31 Submitted to Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
    Student Paper
                                                                <1%

32 www.tojet.net
    Internet Source
                                                                <1%

33 Ledis Saryono Putro, Dedik Budianta, Dedi
    Rohendi, Amin Rejo. "Biomethane Emissions:
    Measurement in Wastewater Pond at Palm Oil
    Mill by Using TGS2611 Methane Gas Sensor",
    Journal of Ecological Engineering, 2019
    Publication
                                                                <1%

34 Submitted to University of Newcastle upon Tyne
    Student Paper
                                                                <1%

35 Submitted to University of Reading
    Student Paper
                                                                <1%

36 Submitted to Argosy University
    Student Paper
                                                                <1%

37 ojs.fkip.ummmetro.ac.id
    Internet Source
                                                                <1%

38 **Submitted to Sriwijaya University**
Student Paper
<1%

39 **academypublication.com**
Internet Source
<1%

40 **Submitted to Universiti Sains Malaysia**
Student Paper
<1%

41 **zombiedoc.com**
Internet Source
<1%

42 **Submitted to Hoa Sen University**
Student Paper
<1%

43 **teslcanadajournal.ca**
Internet Source
<1%

44 **Submitted to University College London**
Student Paper
<1%

45 **Submitted to Eastern Mediterranean University**
Student Paper
<1%

46 **journal.unika.ac.id**
Internet Source
<1%

47 **hdl.handle.net**
Internet Source
<1%

48 **Elif Emine Balta. "The Relationships Among Writing Skills, Writing Anxiety and Metacognitive Awareness", Journal of Education and Learning, 2018**
<1%

Publication

49	www.tandfonline.com Internet Source	<1%
50	asian-efl-journal.com Internet Source	<1%
51	Hanoi University Publication	<1%
52	www.scribd.com Internet Source	<1%
53	waikato.researchgateway.ac.nz Internet Source	<1%
54	Submitted to University of Birmingham Student Paper	<1%
55	clok.uclan.ac.uk Internet Source	<1%
56	blogs.ubc.ca Internet Source	<1%
57	www.academypublication.com Internet Source	<1%
58	propertibazar.com Internet Source	<1%
59	Submitted to Sheffield Hallam University Student Paper	<1%

60 llt.msu.edu
Internet Source   <1%

61 Submitted to Universiti Putra Malaysia
Student Paper   <1%

62 arizona.openrepository.com
Internet Source   <1%

63 Submitted to Hankuk University of Foreign
Studies
Student Paper   <1%

64 Submitted to University of Portsmouth
Student Paper   <1%

65 "Pattern Analysis, Intelligent Security and the
Internet of Things", Springer Science and
Business Media LLC, 2015
Publication   <1%

66 eprints.umm.ac.id
Internet Source   <1%

67 fltal.ibu.edu.ba
Internet Source   <1%

68 Submitted to University of Durham
Student Paper   <1%

69 Elena Cotos. "Genre-Based Automated Writing
Evaluation for L2 Research Writing", Springer
Science and Business Media LLC, 2014
Publication   <1%

70 Andianto - -. "THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PEER FEEDBACK TECHNIQUE TO TEACH WRITING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' CREATIVITY", PREMISE JOURNAL:ISSN online: 2442-482x, ISSN printed: 2089-3345, 2017
Publication

<1%

71 Lan Vu. "chapter 9 A Case Study of Peer Assessment in a Composition MOOC", IGI Global, 2017
Publication

<1%

72 Submitted to American University of Beirut
Student Paper

<1%

73 Submitted to University of Hong Kong
Student Paper

<1%

74 Submitted to The University of Manchester
Student Paper

<1%