

WRITING ANXIETY DIFFERENCES IN WRITING QUALITY ON THE APPLICATION OF FACEBOOK-MEDIATED FEEDBACK

Shirtha El Rusyda, Patuan Raja, Hery Yufrizal
Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris FKIP Universitas Lampung
email: shirtha.el.rusyda@gmail.com; Telp: 08996426383

Abstract: The aims of this research are to investigate the students' writing quality after being given Facebook-mediated feedback, the differences in the students' writing quality according to the predominant dimension of writing anxiety they suffer from, and the students' feedback on their friends' writings. This research was carried out quantitatively and qualitatively and involved thirty-one Intermediate Writing students. The data were collected through writing task and SLWAI and were analyzed using Paired Samples T-Test and ANOVA. The researcher found that there was a significant difference in the students' writing quality after the implementation of Facebook-mediated feedback and there were no significant differences in the students' writing quality according to the predominant dimension of writing anxiety they suffer from. Besides, the researcher discovered that the students provided positive, negative, and constructive feedback, yet some of their feedback were still unclear, unspecific, and incorrect.

Keywords: *Facebook-mediated feedback, writing anxiety, writing quality.*

Abstrak: Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk menyelidiki kualitas menulis siswa setelah diberikan *Facebook-mediated feedback*, perbedaan kualitas menulis siswa berdasarkan dimensi kecemasan menulis yang dominan mereka alami, dan *feedback* siswa pada tulisan-tulisan teman mereka. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan secara kuantitatif dan kualitatif dan melibatkan tiga puluh satu murid *Intermediate Writing*. Data dikumpulkan melalui tugas menulis dan *SLWAI* serta dianalisis menggunakan *Paired Samples T-Test* dan *ANOVA*. Peneliti menemukan perbedaan yang signifikan pada kualitas menulis siswa setelah pelaksanaan *Facebook-mediated feedback* dan tidak ada perbedaan signifikan dalam kualitas menulis siswa berdasarkan dimensi kecemasan menulis yang dominan mereka alami. Selain itu, peneliti menemukan bahwa para murid memberikan *feedback* positif, negatif, dan konstruktif, namun beberapa *feedback* mereka masih tidak jelas, tidak spesifik, dan tidak tepat.

Kata kunci: Facebook-mediated feedback, kecemasan menulis, kualitas menulis.

INTRODUCTION

Feedback refers to information provided by an agent regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding (Hattie and Timperley, 2007). Over the years, the application of feedback on writing process has been investigated by numerous scholars. There are some scholars who oppose the use of feedback, for instance, Truscott (1996) who claims that written error feedback is ineffective and potentially harmful. Yet, there are scholars who promote the usefulness of feedback (Abadikhah and Ashoori, 2012; Tootkaboni and Khatib, 2014). Feedback comes in many varieties and one of the well-known types is peer feedback. Many previous studies have verified the value of the implementation of peer feedback in the writing process. However, Rollinson (2005) states that peer feedback that is done in the class might not be well implemented due to time constraints. Additionally, Rollinson (2005) explains that the teacher will not be able to oversee all students simultaneously through conventional peer feedback. In short, it can be said that the implementation of peer feedback needs to be carried out outside of the class and done through a medium that enables the teacher to monitor the students' feedback and lets the students provide feedback anytime and anywhere; which is none other than an internet.

It appears that a number of studies have been conducted to examine the application of internet for the activity of providing and receiving feedback (Hiền, 2008; Xing, 2014). Amidst

other kinds of online sites, Facebook has been confirmed as the world's largest social network with over 1.4 billion active users (Mehra, 2015). This social networking service is undoubtedly popular in Indonesia, especially among high school and college students as Pempek, Yermolayeva, and Calvert's study (2009) even showed that students use Facebook approximately 30 minutes throughout the day as part of their daily routine, regardless of how busy they were. Facebook also offers a tool called Facebook Group that is useful for educational activity as it enables the teacher to create a community whose members are the students. Within Facebook group, the members can share updates, photos, documents and more under specific settings of the theirs choosing (Petronzio, 2013). Since Facebook is extremely popular among students and offers useful tool for educational activity like Facebook Group, the researcher is interested in incorporating Facebook into the activity of providing and receiving feedback in the present study.

Many previous studies have demonstrated the advisability of Facebook for educational activity like online peer feedback. However, those studies were conducted to examine the effect of online peer feedback on students' writings in general. To researcher's knowledge, there is no study which examines writing anxiety differences in writing quality on the implementation of Facebook-mediated feedback. Typically, EFL students who attend writing course feel anxious and under pressure since they have an obligation to produce a composition

in non-native language and they might experience three dimensions of writing anxiety, namely somatic anxiety, avoidance behavior, and cognitive anxiety (Cheng, 2004). Each student is likely to have a certain dimension of writing anxiety that predominates the other dimensions and the researcher is interested in investigating the differences in the students' writing quality based on the predominant dimension of writing anxiety they suffer from. The researcher believes that it is essential to conduct this study since Ellis (2010, as cited in Zhang and Rahimi, 2014) states that the effectiveness of corrective feedback can be determined by taking into consideration individual attribute such as anxiety. Moreover, thus far, studies regarding feedback and anxiety have only been done in the context of teacher feedback and face-to-face peer feedback (Hua, 2016; Kurt and Atay, 2007; Yastibas and Yastibas, 2015) and none has been done in the context of Facebook-mediated feedback. Therefore, a study related to anxiety should be done in the context of Facebook-mediated feedback as well.

Furthermore, the researcher believes that it is necessary to investigate the feedback that are provided by the students on their friends' writings. For the implementation of Facebook-mediated feedback, the researcher will instruct the students to contribute feedback which cover three things, namely positive feedback (value), negative feedback (concerns), and constructive feedback (suggestions). Since Cole (2006) mentions that most writers are dependent on feedback providers, it

is apparent that the student writers will be reliant on those three feedback. With regard to this matter, the students' feedback should be examined to discover whether the students present the positive, negative, and constructive feedback on their friends' writings. In line with the background, the researcher would like to seek answers to research questions presented as follows.

1. How do the students' writing quality differ after being given Facebook-mediated feedback?
2. How different are the students' writing quality according to the predominant dimension of writing anxiety they suffer from?
3. How do the students give feedback on their friends' writings?

METHODS

This research was carried out quantitatively and qualitatively. A Facebook Group called 'Write Art' was specifically created for this research. Thirty-one students who took Intermediate Writing as a compulsory subject at English Language Teaching Study Program in Lampung University participated in this research. There are two kinds of instrument employed by the researcher, they are writing task and Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI). For writing task, each student was required to compose an essay. The students' essays submitted before the treatment began were considered as their first drafts. Meanwhile, the essays that had been revised and edited after the treatment were considered as the students' final drafts.

Moreover, Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) developed by Cheng (2004) was distributed to determine the dimension of writing anxiety. SLWAI is a 22-items questionnaire that is formatted in five-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (uncertain), 4 (agree), 5 (strongly agree). There are seven items (1, 4, 7, 17, 18, 21, and 22) negatively worded in this questionnaire, thus reversed score was used in analyzing these items. After scoring the responses of each item of the questionnaire, the researcher calculated the mean of each dimension of writing anxiety. Afterwards, the researcher examined the predominant dimension of writing anxiety that was experienced by each student through comparing the mean of each dimension of writing anxiety and identifying the highest mean among the dimensions.

To answer the first research question, the researcher analyzed the mean score of the students' first and final drafts through *Paired Samples T-Test*. Moreover, the researcher analyzed the data through *ANOVA* to

figure out the answer to the second research question. In addition, the researcher categorized the students' feedback that were posted on 'Write Art' Facebook group into positive, negative, and constructive feedback by following the models which have been exemplified by Lanley (2010), Brookhart (2008), and Eaglescliffe (2017) to discover the answer to the third research question.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

The scores of the students' first and final drafts were analyzed to answer the first research question. The results showed that the mean score of first drafts was 74.08 points and the mean score of final drafts was 82.12 points. Hence, the students' mean score increased 8.04 points, from 74.08 points to 82.12 points. Based on these results, it can be acknowledged that the students' writing quality were different after the implementation of Facebook-mediated feedback.

Table 1. Results of First and Final Drafts Analysis

	First Drafts	Final Drafts	Gain
Mean Score	74.08	82.12	8.04

To find out whether the difference is significant or not, the researcher

analyzed the data through *Paired Samples T-Test* and the results were as follows.

Table 2. Results of Paired Samples T-Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Avg2 - Avg1	8.04839	4.57048	.82088	6.37192	9.72485	9.805	30	.000

It was shown that the two-tailed significance was .000 and the t-value was 9.805. It appeared that the t-value was higher than the t-table ($9.805 > 2.042$) and the two-tailed significance was lower than .05 ($.00 < .05$). In this case, it can be argued that the difference in the students' writing quality after the treatment was significant.

To answer the second research question, the researcher firstly determined the predominant dimension of writing anxiety that the students suffer from. It was discovered that twenty-one students

experienced somatic anxiety as the predominant dimension of writing anxiety, none had avoidance behavior as the predominant dimension of writing anxiety, and ten students experienced cognitive anxiety as the predominant dimension of writing anxiety. Moreover, the score of somatic-anxiety and cognitive-anxiety students' first and final drafts were examined to find out the differences in the students' writing quality according to the predominant dimension of writing anxiety they suffer from. The results were presented as follows.

Table 3. Writing Score of Somatic-anxiety and Cognitive-anxiety Students

	N	Mean Score (First Drafts)	Mean Score (Final Drafts)	Gain
Somatic-anxiety	21	74.4762	83.0238	8.54
Cognitive-anxiety	10	73.2500	80.2500	7.00

It can be seen that the mean score of somatic-anxiety students increased by 8.54 points, from 74.47 points to 83.02 points. In contrast, the improvement of the mean score of cognitive-anxiety students was 7.00 points, from 73.25 points to 80.25 points. Thus, it can be inferred that the writings of both groups were affected positively, however somatic-

anxiety students achieved greater gain score than cognitive-anxiety students. To discover whether there are significant differences in the students' writing quality according to the predominant dimension of writing anxiety they suffer from, the researcher analyzed the data through ANOVA. The table of ANOVA calculation can be seen below.

Table 4. Results of ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	52.121	1	52.121	.676	.418
Within Groups	2235.363	29	77.081		
Total	2287.484	30			

The results of ANOVA calculation showed that the F-value was .676 and the two-tailed significance was .418. It appeared that the F-value was lower than the F-table (.676<4.18) and the the two-tailed significance was higher than .05 (.418>.05). These results suggested that there were no significant differences in the students' writing quality according to the predominant dimension of writing anxiety they suffer from.

Furthermore, for the third research question, it was found that the

students presented positive, negative, and constructive feedback on their friends' writings. Nevertheless, it was revealed that some students presented unspecific feedback to their friends' writings, for instance '*some incorrect spelling*' and '*be careful with your punctuation*'. The researcher found few unclear feedback and incorrect feedback as well, for example '*on your introduction you should write the sentences about mom that is public word*' and '*second paragraph, first line, "it can give" should be "it can gives"*'.

Table 5. Examples of Students' Feedback

Feedback	Illustrations
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>You use simple words, so that your essay is easy to understand.</i> • <i>Your final message is relevant with the thesis statement, it is good enough.</i>
Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Your first and second topic sentence on your essay are underdeveloped.</i> • <i>I did not see the thesis statement in your introduction of the essay.</i>
Constructive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>You can add moral value of your essay because it is very important.</i> • <i>In the first sentence of the conclusion paragraph, I think you do not need to use word "of course", because it is spoken style.</i>

DISCUSSION

Since it was revealed that the difference in the students' writing quality after the implementation of Facebook-mediated feedback was significant, it can be confirmed that the implementation of Facebook-mediated feedback affected student' writing quality positively. In other words, the quality of students'

writings become better after the implementation of Facebook-mediated feedback. These results are in accordance with the findings of previous research conducted by Hièn (2008). His study revealed that online peer feedback could contribute to the improvement of students' writing quality since its implementation boosted up students' motivation in learning to write. Additionally, the findings of this present reseach are comparable with

the findings of the study conducted by Wichadee (2013) which showed that the feedback that was given on Facebook had an effect on improving students' revised drafts.

The researcher presumed that the application of asynchronous learning and the placement of three to four students in a group for the implementation of Facebook-mediated feedback are the factors which support the improvement of students' writing quality. Asynchronous learning provides the opportunity for the students to read each other's writing intensively since the providers and the recipient of the feedback do not have to be online at the same time (Hrastinski, 2008). Feedback providers can present more feedback to their friends' writings since they are able to analyze their friends' writings without being in a hurry. Furthermore, by placing the students in groups, each student will have the opportunity to receive more comments and suggestions to be considered before they began editing their writings. Peer feedback helps students to better learn and develop their competencies (Ion, Barrera-Corominas, and Tomàs-Folch, 2016). The students can enlarge their knowledge or refine any concepts related to writing which have been misunderstood and subsequently, they are able to edit and turn their compositions into better ones. Moreover, it was believed that the improvement of students' writing quality occurred because they could easily download the writings that were uploaded on 'Write Art' Facebook Group, read them, and learn from them as stated by Tsui and Ng (2000) that the students can

learn more about writing by reading their peers' written drafts and raise their awareness of the weaknesses in their own writings.

Based on the results of the research, it was discovered that there were no significant differences in the students' writing quality according to the predominant dimension of writing anxiety they suffer from. In other words, it can be stated that the quality of writings between somatic-anxiety and cognitive-anxiety students were relatively the same. According to Morris, Davis, and Hutchings (1981 as cited in Cheng, 2004), somatic anxiety is one's perception of the physiological effects of the anxiety experience, as reflected in increased autonomic arousal of unpleasant feelings, such as nervousness and tension. Meanwhile, cognitive anxiety refers to the mental aspect of anxiety experience, including negative expectations, preoccupation with performance and concern about others' perception (Morris, Davis, and Hutchings, 1981 as cited in Cheng, 2004). It can be implied that, theoretically, somatic-anxiety and cognitive-anxiety students show different symptoms when they experience writing anxiety. However, in relation to the results of the research, the dissimilar symptoms did not cause the differences between somatic-anxiety and cognitive-anxiety students' writing quality.

The researcher firstly assumed that the statistically insignificant differences between somatic-anxiety and cognitive anxiety students' writing quality happened due to the

number of the sample. The present research involved thirty-one students, which means that the sample size of the research was not large. There is a possibility for the results of the data analysis to be statistically insignificant when the sample size of the research is not large. Besides, it was assumed that both somatic-anxiety and cognitive-anxiety students already have sufficient knowledge about writing. At the time of the research, the students who participated in this research attended an Intermediate Writing class. Intermediate Writing is a compulsory subject which can be taken only if the students pass the other compulsory subjects, which are Basic and Pre-Intermediate Writing. Since the students already passed those two compulsory subjects and attended Intermediate Writing class, it was believed that both somatic-anxiety and cognitive-anxiety students must already have sufficient knowledge about how to produce a good composition, how to develop their essays, and how to write grammatically correct sentences. Therefore, it is no wonder if the differences between somatic-anxiety and cognitive-anxiety students' writing quality were not statistically significant.

Additionally, it was discovered that the students gave positive, negative, and constructive feedback on their friends' essays. Cole (2006) mentions that positive feedback is awarded to motivate the writer to keep writing. In line with this theory, the students gave positive feedback to indicate that they want to give each other confidence and encourage one another to never stop writing.

Meanwhile, the students pointed out the weaknesses of each other's essay through negative feedback. It was done in order that they can 'fix' their 'mistakes' as writers (Edel, 2010). Besides, constructive feedback were given by the students so that they are able to enhance the quality of each other's essay because constructive feedback highlights how a writer could do better next time (Landsberg, 2003). The findings also revealed that not all students gave specific feedback as instructed by the researcher. Before conducting Facebook-mediated feedback, the researcher commanded the students to present specific feedback, for instance, by mentioning the word or sentence structure that should be edited by their friends. Unfortunately, some students still presented unspecific feedback.

The researcher assumed that some students gave unspecific feedback due to two factors. The first factor is that some students might not think that giving specific feedback is necessary since they did not get the instruction from their lecturer. The second factor is that when the students read their friends' writings, they might notice that there are too many errors or mistakes on particular aspect of writing, thus they decided to provide general feedback to their friends' writings. Nevertheless, further research is needed to verify these assumptions. In addition, there were few students who provided unclear feedback on their friends' essays. Certainly, this is not in accordance with Chando's recommendation (2015) which tells that feedback should be clear and concise. There were also some

students who gave incorrect feedback. The incorrect feedback that were discovered in this present research confirmed Truscott's claim (1996) which says that written error feedback can be ineffective and potentially harmful. It was presumed that the incorrect feedback existed due to inadequate knowledge and misconceptions about English grammar. Therefore, the students who received the feedback should be careful in choosing the right feedback for their writings and must not accept all feedback given by their friends without question.

Apparently, those are the shortcomings which occurred in the implementation of Facebook-mediated feedback on the present research. The researcher can notice the shortcomings because the comments and suggestions provided by the students can be viewed by the administrator and all members of 'Write Art' Facebook Group. In other words, the researcher can monitor the feedback given by the students since she served as the administrator of 'Write Art' Facebook Group at the time of the treatment. It would be more difficult to identify the shortcomings if the researcher applies conventional peer feedback because Rollinson (2005) explains that it is difficult to oversee all students simultaneously through conventional peer feedback.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In relation to the results of the research, it can be concluded that the implementation of Facebook-

mediated feedback can facilitate foreign language students to make some positive development in their writing quality. In other words, the students can refine the quality of their writings and become better writers than before. Besides, the researcher concludes that the students' writing quality are not affected by the dissimilar predominant dimension of writing anxiety that they suffer from. Their writing quality are somewhat the same, even though they experience different predominant dimension of writing anxiety. Furthermore, it can be concluded that the students express willingness to help their friends improve the quality of their writings by providing beneficial feedback. Nevertheless, the students lack awareness about the importance of giving clear and specific feedback as they still presented unclear and unspecific feedback on their friends' writings and their incorrect feedback might ruin their friends' writings if they are accepted without question.

With regard to the results of the research, the researcher provides several suggestions for English teachers. Firstly, the researcher suggests the English teachers to implement Facebook-mediated feedback in teaching writing since its implementation influences students' writing quality positively. Secondly, this research was conducted on college students. Therefore, it is suggested that educators who teach English in junior or senior high school make an attempt to implement Facebook-mediated feedback. Thirdly, the researcher recommends the English teachers to inform the students regularly that providing

clear and specific feedback to each other's writing is more helpful than providing unclear and unspecific feedback. Furthermore, in the post-activity, the teachers are suggested to explain about clear and specific feedback based on the actual feedback given by the students. The researcher also suggests that the English teacher and the students review the incorrect feedback and put them right together in the post-activity.

Additionally, the researcher provides some suggestions for other researchers who are interested in conducting relevant research. First of all, the limitation of the present research is the number of the sample. For that reason, it is suggested that further research involve more participants than the present research. It is also recommended that further research investigate the effect of Facebook-mediated feedback on students' level of anxiety. It appears that the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI), a questionnaire which was employed to determine the dimension of writing anxiety in the present study, can be used to figure out students' level of writing anxiety as well. Therefore, the researcher suggests that further research explore students' level of anxiety before and after being given Facebook-mediated feedback. Moreover, the researcher recommends that further research explore and discover the factors which trigger the students to give unclear, unspecific, and incorrect feedback since the factors which cause the students to provide unclear, unspecific, and incorrect feedback

was not investigated in the present research.

REFERENCES

- Abadikhah, S. and Ashoori, A. 2012. The Effect of Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Learners' Performance after Collaborative Output. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 118-125.
- Brookhart, S. M. 2008. *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Chando, J. 2015. *How To Give Students Specific Feedback That Actually Helps Them Learn*. (Online), (<https://www.teachthought.com/pedagogy/how-to-give-students-specific-feedback-that-actually-helps-them-learn/>, viewed on October 31st, 2017).
- Cheng, Y. -S. 2004. A Measure of Second Language Writing Anxiety: Scale Development and Preliminary Validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 313-335.
- Cole, J. B. 2006. *Toxic Feedback: Helping Writers Survive and Thrive*. Lebanon: University Press of New England.
- Eaglescliffe, B. 2017. *Giving and Receiving Feedback in Writing Groups*. (Online), (<https://letterpile.com/writing/Giving-and-Receiving-Feedback-in-Writers-Groups>, viewed on October 31st, 2017).
- Edel, R. 2010. *Writing Workshop Feedback - Positive, Negative, and Progressive*. (Online),

- (<http://www.12writing.com/2010/03/writing-workshop-feedback-positive.html>, viewed on October 31st, 2017).
- Hattie, J. and Timperley, H. 2007. The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Hiền, H. M. 2008. *The Impact of Online Peer Feedback on EFL Learners' Motivation in Writing and Writing Performance: A Case Study at Can Tho University*. Published M.A. Thesis. Can Tho: Can Tho University.
- Hrastinski, S. 2008. Asynchronous and Synchronous e-Learning. *Educause Quarterly*, 31(4), 51-55.
- Hua, M. 2016. An Investigation on the Influence of Teachers' Feedback on Learners' Anxiety in English Classroom. *Atlantis Press*, 1169-1172.
- Ion, G., Barrera-Corominas, A., and Tomàs-Folch, M. 2016. Written Peer-Feedback to Enhance Students' Current and Future Learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 13(15), 1-11.
- Kurt, G. and Atay, D. 2007. The Effect of Peer Feedback on the Writing Anxiety of Prospective Turkish Teachers on EFL. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 3(1), 12-23.
- Landsberg, M. 2003. *The Tao of Coaching: Boost Your Effectiveness at Work by Inspiring and Developing Those Around You*. London: Profile Books.
- Lanley, J. 2010. *Giving Positive Feedback in Writing*. (Online), (<https://jimmiescollage.com/positive-feedback-writing/>, viewed on October 31st, 2017).
- Mehra, G. 2015. *91 Leading Social Networks Worldwide*. (Online), (<http://www.practicalecommerce.com/articles/86264-91-Leading-Social-Networks-Worldwide>, viewed on September 14th, 2017).
- Pempek, T. A., Yermolayeva, Y. A., and Calvert, S. A. 2009. College Students' Social Networking Experiences on Facebook. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 30, 227-238.
- Petronzio, M. 2013. *Everything You Wanted to Know About Facebook Groups*. (Online), (<http://mashable.com/2013/01/28/facebook-groups-101/#OnUTtogSukqz>, viewed on September 16th, 2017).
- Rollinson, P. 2005. Using Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class. *ELT Journal*, 59, 23-30.
- Tootkaboni, A. A. and Khatib, M. 2014. The Efficacy of Various Kinds of Error Feedback on Improving Writing Accuracy of EFL Learners. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 7(3), 30-46.
- Truscott, J. 1996. The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369.
- Tsui, A. B. M. and Ng, M. 2000. Do Secondary L2 Writers Benefit from Peer Comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147-170.
- Wichadee, S. 2013. Peer Feedback on Facebook: The Use of

- Social Networking Websites to Develop Writing Ability of Undergraduate Students. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 14(4), 260-270.
- Xing, S. 2014. Application of Online Peer Feedback in the Teaching of College English Writing. *International Conference on Education, Language, Art and Intercultural Communication*, 373-376.
- Yastibas, G. C. and Yastibas, A. E. 2015. The Effect of Peer Feedback on Writing Anxiety in Turkish EFL (English as a Foreign Language) Students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 530 – 538.
- Zhang, L. J. and Rahimi, M. 2014. EFL Learners' Anxiety Level and Their Beliefs About Corrective Feedback in Oral Communication Classes. *System*, 42, 429-439.