



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Vol. 3. Issue.4., 2016 (Oct.-Dec.)

ISSN INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA
2395-2628(Print):2349-9451(online)

LIBYAN EFL STUDENTS' RESPONSE TO AND MANAGEMENT OF FEEDBACK IN A BLOG
BASED ON A FANFICTION WRITING ENVIRONMENT

FATMA HARB^{1*}, MARDZIAH HAYATI ABDULLAH², YAP NGEE THAI³, HELEN TAN⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Department of English Language, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication,
Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM, Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

* E-mail Fatma_harb@yahoo.com



ABSTRACT

This study focuses on Libyan EFL University students' experiences in responding to and managing of reader feedback in a learner blog based on a fanfiction writing environment. It aims at exploring students' perspectives on giving, receiving, responding and incorporating reader feedback. This semester-long study adopts the mixed methods approach and has been conducted on twenty eight undergraduates in an academic writing class from the English language department at the University of Tripoli, Libya. Data has been collected via student questionnaire responses and analyzed through thematic analysis and descriptive statistics. Findings indicate that most feedback givers have enjoyed giving feedback and found it beneficial. Although many feedback receivers have been pleased with the feedback they have had and responded to it, only a small number of them have implemented since it includes more praising comments instead of constructive and critical ones. The study suggests that the success of such an online writing activity lie in offering both teacher feedback and peer feedback. It recommends that students be trained on how to provide various types of feedback as this is an effective way to enhance interaction and improve writing quality.

Keywords: fanfiction environment, Libya, literacy skills, narrative writing, peer feedback

©KY PUBLICATIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, the application of learner blogs in language classes is believed to enhance narrative writing and literacy skills (Cassell, 2004). Huffacker (2004) states that blogs are the optimal means for enhancing literacy skills that forces learners to read, write and augment their comfort with technologies at once. Cameron and Anderson (2006) report that blogs lead to positive changes in learning and develop writing and reading. With regard to reading, blogs are seen as "personal diary-like format websites enabled by easy to use tools and open for everyone to read" (Efimova & Fiedler, 2004, p.490) that stimulate learners to engage in

discussions with those sharing same interests (Yang, 2009). Concerning writing, Kennedy (2003) claims that blogs provide learners with a real audience to write to and make start writing in a careful way to avoid being criticized (Wu, 2005). Lowe & Williams (2004) conclude that frequent blog participation lessens students' apprehension about publishing online. Blackstone et al. (2007) confess that learners' motivation to take part in written communication becomes more meaningful if their audience is a combination of classmates, teachers and other bloggers from outside the classroom.

Blogs have occupied adults' free time sharing all types of asynchronous writings, especially as many of them are computer proficient (Blackstone et al., 2007) who successfully participate in social networking sites and give and receive comments with others (Duffy & Bruns, 2006). Hence, harnessing blogs in writing classrooms contributes to improving writing, reading and commenting on stories instead of wasting time chatting with friends.

Moreover, blogs enhance interaction, promote learners' collaboration and interaction which achieve effective learning in constructivist-based learning environments (McLoughlin & Lee, 2007; Thoms, 2012), help create communities (Duffy & Bruns, 2006) and make learners comfortable to express themselves (Trajtemberg & Yiakoumetti, 2011). Here, anonymity is a prominent feature that often secures privacy and enhances interaction (Tan et al. 2009). So, they choose between visual anonymity which refers to lack of visual representations through the use of fake photos or no photos at all and discursive anonymity that is about using usernames ranging from obvious anonymous nicknames to partial real names (Qian & Scott, 2007).

1.1 Statement of the Problem

This study addresses two problems pertinent to narrative writing at the university level in Libya. The first one focuses on Libyan EFL University students' unwillingness to write and their reluctance to take part in writing activities which can be ascribed to lack of interaction which Su et al. (2005) claim that although it is vital for achieving success in online learning environment, there is still a need to investigate its effectiveness in online environments. Narrative writing is generally neglected in EFL composition classes in Libya and most activities are only confined to classrooms and are disconnected from real audience engagement (Bakar & Ismail, 2009). Also, some previous research studies have evidenced the benefits of blogs on writing and peer interaction, but little research has been into how they support FL narrative writing and how their features would enhance interaction among students. Yang (2009, p.14) mentions that "While blogs are used in education, there is little research about the use of blogs for language learning and teaching in EFL contexts."

The last problem concerns Libyan EFL students' exposure to teacher feedback only. Hayes & Ge (2008) argue that learners who get feedback from instructors only often lose motivation to write that they just repeat what they have learned prior to writing tests and hence produce written work that lacks quality. Moreover, Cho & Schunn (2007) mention that privatization of writing and feedback between a student and a teacher restricts other students' access to benefit from teachers' comments on a large scale. Although there is so much literature written about peer review, studies on its efficacy on L2 writing still need to be done (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Williams & Jacobs (2004) contend that published materials on peer-reviewed journals are limited. Cho & Schunn (2007) support the inclusion of peer feedback practice in content classes where students can develop writing by acting as writers and reviewers. Wang (2009) also points out that "... there has been little research investigating student writers' editing behaviours and writing comments to support the practicality of weblogs in SL writing." Haswell (2005) claims that although peer feedback at the undergraduate level is "[T]he least studied of practices now very common in college writing classrooms... [it] appears capable of yielding outcomes at least as good as teacher assessment and sometimes better" (as cited in Cho et al., 2006, p.260-261).

1.2 Objectives of the Study

This study investigates how participants respond to and manage reader feedback and examines the effect of these tasks on enhancing narrative writing quality in a learner blog modelled on online fanfiction writing environments.

1.3 Research Questions

More specifically, this paper seeks to investigate the following research questions:

1. What were the participants' perspectives on giving reader feedback?
 - a- What did the participants feel about giving feedback?
 - b- Did participants think that the feedback they gave was useful?
 - c- What benefits participants gained from giving feedback?
 - d- What were the reasons that made some participants refrain from offering reader feedback?
 - e- What were the reasons that made some participants offer feedback though they received none?
2. What were the participants' perspectives on reader feedback?
 - a- What did the participants feel about receiving feedback?
 - b- What were the reasons that made them respond to, or refrain from responding to reader feedback?
 - c- Did they incorporate reader feedback in their writing?

1.4 Significance of the Study

The importance of this study lies in the fact that it documents EFL university students' experiences in Libya after an important transitional tough period after the 17th Feb revolution in 2011. It is the first study, to the best knowledge of the authors that has explored students' perspectives on the online writing activity and depicted how they have managed and responded to peer feedback in a learner blog based on a fanfiction writing environment. This study has also its contribution to the field of research on peer feedback and narrative writing in EFL contexts.

2. Literature Review

Learning in the 21st century relies on the use of technologies that allow users to create information, establish communities, share knowledge with others and post feedback on others' writing (Sahin, 2008). These technologies reflect cognitive and communal transformations in modern society (Donohoe & Beatty, 2007) and are characterized by the spread of user generated content (UGC), knowledge sharing, collaboration and participation (Sahin, 2008).

Out-of- school literacy practices have been the focus of research in the field of education literacy since they provide an understanding of adults' daily literacy practices and explain how they can assist in language teaching (Tan et al., 2009). This is done based on observation that individuals spend quality time participating in online activities in academic settings and leisure time (Black, 2009). As communication ways are changing in the Digital Age, educators' adoption and understanding of these emergent new literacies are a must (Sweeny, 2010). Black (2008) argues that the wide spread of new literacies "tranverse[s] accustomed national, cultural, linguistic, and producer-consumer boundaries" (as cited in Sweeny, 2010, p.122). Black (2005) claims that the identity issue in online fanfiction writing has shifted emphasis from writing and reading as separate subjects for learning to a new educational perspective in which language, literacy and texts are being looked upon as integral elements accounting for how adults construct, manage and maintain their identities and assume a place and value both in social and academic situations. Black (2009, p.696) writes that "Building on activities and literacy practices that many youths are accustomed to engaging with in their leisure time can help ELL students draw from prior knowledge to contextualize and develop understandings of new language forms and content."

Writing is an important skill for learners serving as a means for communication (Klein & Kirkpatrick, 2010) and has become one of the promising areas for the net-generation learners to socialize, get and share knowledge (Sweeny, 2010). However, most students approach it with fear (Mazza, n.d), particularly as the ability to write well represents a great challenge and prerequisite for achieving success and progress in many situations and professions (McNamara et al., 2009). Narrative writing is mostly practiced in language classrooms as an academic activity and outside of the classroom as a leisure time activity in personal blogs and online fanfiction sites. It continues to be the most prevalent and challenging form of writing in the world today as learners have to convince audience of their ability to recount stories through using various techniques such as description, sound images, quotations to enliven stories and coherence to make stories

understandable as well as have to get a wider audience's attention to read their stories (Mazza,n.d). Kormos (2011) asserts that narrative writing is essential for genuine communication and that it can be included in other text types such as argumentative writing contexts.

Fanfiction writing refers to "original works of fiction based on forms of popular media such as television, movies, books, music, and video games" (Black, 2005,p.118) that is regarded as a type of creative work where addition, alteration and extension to original works are allowed often with writers affiliate themselves to different writing communities and are distinguished by the depth of their engagement and close reading of original works (McWilliams et al., 2011). Black (2009) stresses that when adults gain a strong sense of acceptance and connection to a certain online writing community, they construct easy identities as writers and users of fanfiction texts. McWilliams et al.(2011) believe that the practice of fanfiction writing provides writers with a chance to explore and engage in socially motivated activities. For instance, the community of *Fanfiction.net* supports English language learners' traditional literacy through the enhancement of interaction between readers and writers in order to raise their self-confidence and aid writers to be more focused on various language aspects (Black, 2009).

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Design

This study employed the mixed methods approach. Research questions guided the choice of this design. This method combines both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Social scientists believe that this approach offers better information and understanding to the phenomenon being investigated and it minimizes the weaknesses of either method or thus strengthening the study (Ary et al., 2006). Glymph (2012) reports that the use of qualitative measures is imperative for understanding the phenomenon studied fully and correctly, while the use of quantitative measures will eliminate bias and subjectivity of sampling. Gedera (2012,p.22) says that, " Through the multiple voices of participants qualitative research methods allow the researcher to make detailed descriptions of what is happening in natural settings."

3.2 Sampling

The study was based on volunteer participation. The population of the study consisted of sixty one undergraduates. The study sample comprised only twenty-eight undergraduates at the English Language department, Faculty of Languages, University of Tripoli, during the spring semester, 2013. Twelve weeks were designated for writing and interacting in the blog. During this period, participants posted stories, read other readers' stories and commented on them and responded to reader feedback.

3.4 Data Collection

Data was collected through a post-questionnaire which was administered to explore participants' perspectives on giving and receiving feedback. The questionnaire consisted of both close-ended and open-ended questions (See Appendix A). Additionally, participants had to write stories of original fiction or fanfiction based on a TV show, cartoon, movie, or other media sources.

3.5 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics was used to answer multiple choice questions. Thematic analysis developed by Braun and Clarke (2006, p.35) was used to thematically analyze participants' responses to open ended questionnaire questions (See appendix B).

4. Results

4.1 Response to Feedback Giving

Thematic analysis of participants' responses to the feedback giving task was carried out and descriptive statistics was used when necessary.

Satisfaction with Feedback Giving: Feedback givers expressed their feelings about the feedback giving task. (95%) of them confirmed that they liked offering reader.

Usefulness of the Feedback that Participants Offered: When asked about their perceived usefulness of the feedback they offered,(50%) of the participants hoped that the feedback they offered would be useful to

writers. (40%) of the participants thought it was useful.(5%) of the participants were not sure if the feedback they gave was useful.

Benefits of Giving Feedback: (70%) of the participants confirmed that giving feedback had a positive impact on them as writers. Three areas of influence were identified as a result of the thematic analysis of the participants' responses. The first area focused on writing. Giving feedback was effective in developing writing. Participants were also happy that offering feedback helped them to become confident writers, improved their writing skills, English language, increased their vocabulary and made them write good paragraphs with confidence. A few participants acknowledged that offering feedback assisted them in improving their fanfiction writing and enhanced their creativity. They argued that:

"It made me a confident writer."

"It encouraged me to write and improve my writing."

"The benefits [were] learning how to write well, how to write good paragraphs and get new words."

"It helped me to let out the ideas about fanfiction and become creative."

Reading was the second highlighted area. Giving feedback enhanced participants' reading and made them read more and have an insight and understanding of other readers' needs. They became more confident readers and editors and learned more about fanfiction. They mentioned that:

"It made me read more."

It gave me an insight on what readers may expect from a piece of writing and how they would react to it."

"It is a good feeling to read other students' stories and comment on them.It makes you more experts in finding mistakes and correcting them."

"It gave me more confidence to read other stories and comment on them."

"It also helped me learn that people are more than what we see. All the stories posted told me little stories about their writers. So, I learned more about the heart of fanfiction."

The third influenced area was participants' motivation, especially as **some** participants pointed out that offering feedback made them to more responsible and active.

(30%) of participants claimed that offering feedback was not beneficial mainly due to blog-mates who either refused to offer and exchange feedback or who provided positive feedback. They reported that:

"Because most of the blog-mates did not give me feedback."

"Because most feedback was just positive feedback."

Reasons behind Refraining from Offering Feedback: (28.6%) of participants did not send feedback (see Appendix C). A large number of these participants (87.5%) reported that they did not send reader feedback because of their preference to teacher feedback which they think it would have a positive effect on the improvement of the content and language of stories posted. Also, a relatively high percentage of responses (75%) accounted for trusting teacher feedback more than reader feedback.(38%) of participants gave other reasons which included statements like "I was busy in my study", "I liked publishing stories more than commenting on other students' stories", "The Internet is usually weak" and "Teacher feedback would be better for me than student feedback".(25%) of participants argued that they did not send feedback for they did not receive any.(12%) of participants said that all the mentioned reasons made them refrain from sending reader feedback.

Reasons Making Some Offer Feedback Though They received none: (15%) participants offered feedback though they did not receive any. They were asked about the reasons that made do so. They seemed to be eager about using the blog and started offering feedback and liked their blog –mates to do the same. Unfortunately, they got no feedback in return. This made them very upset. Some participants blamed themselves for not posting stories in the blog ensuring that they are the type who liked and enjoyed commenting on others' writing rather than posting stories. However, they were sad because they expected other participants to begin communicating with them as readers. Some participants also said that they offered feedback in order to interact with other blog users and gain and exchange ideas. Therefore, it appears that

some participants were brave enough to initiate interaction to get and exchange thoughts, but they got no feedback.

4.2 Response to Feedback Receiving

Satisfaction with Receiving Feedback: More than half feedback receivers (68.1%) of participants enjoyed getting reader feedback.

Reasons behind Responding to Reader Feedback : (72.7%) of participants responded to reader feedback (see Appendix D). (73.3%) of them argued that they liked reader feedback so they responded to it. More than half of the participants(53.3%) said that they liked the way their readers commented on their stories.(40%) of the participants listed others reasons like, "Appreciation to those sending me feedback", "I think it was ethical to respond to those sending me feedback", "I liked to give moral support to my readers and say Thank You", "I felt responsible to respond to others who gave me feedback at least thanking them for reading my stories and encouraging me to write", "Reader feedback was motivating, but frankly was not what I wanted. Good reader feedback should involve criticism of content and structure of stories posted" and "Out of politeness and respect". (20%) of the participants responded to reader feedback due to its helpfulness. (13%) of the participants stated they benefited from reader feedback.

Reasons behind Choosing not to Respond to Reader Feedback: (27.2%) of participants did not respond to reader feedback (see Appendix E). The majority of them (85.5%) argued that they trusted teacher feedback more than reader feedback. Many participants (71.4%) favored teacher feedback as it would lead to the enhancement of the content and language of their stories. (14.2%) of the participants chose all the given reasons.

Reasons for Incorporating Reader Feedback : (13.6%) of participants incorporated reader feedback (see Appendix F).(67%) of them contended that they considered reader feedback because they liked it and found it to be helpful.(66.6%) of them stressed that reader feedback helped them to enhance the content and language of their stories.(33.3%) of the participants reported that they benefited from reader feedback and that the way that their readers gave them written comments was appealing to them.(33.3%) of them listed another reason in which they clarified that they liked all their readers' comments.

Reasons for Ignoring Reader Feedback : (86.3%) of participants did not incorporate reader feedback (see Appendix G). (58%) of them preferred teacher feedback to reader feedback. (58%) of them stressed that teacher feedback would help them to enhance the content of their stories more than reader feedback.(47%) of them said that teacher feedback would promote the language of their stories.(37%) of them reported that they trusted teacher feedback more than reader feedback.(21%) of them considered reader feedback to be useless.(16%) of them said they were better than other blog users in English.(11%) of the participants chose all the mentioned reasons.(21%) of them mentioned other reasons in which they expressed that they did not like reader feedback all the time and that they wanted to receive critical and serious comments instead of praising ones.

DISCUSSION

Like any other study conducted, this study yielded both positive and negative points. Regarding Participants' engagement in feedback giving , benefits of the feedback giving task are in line with Cho et al. (2006,p.161) claim that , "...the possibility that writers gain nothing from reading their peers' comments seems remote." The task of giving feedback was beneficial to many participants and influenced their writing and reading, English language and personality. As for writing, satisfaction was expressed over feedback offering as it enabled participants to write paragraphs with confidence, served as an outlet for ideas and thoughts and increased their creativity.

The participants were enthusiastic about offering feedback, particularly it enhanced their desire to read more and gave them a chance to explore and understand what readers' needs. Moreover, it enhanced their confidence to read posted stories, comment on them and make corrections. Some participants confessed that offering feedback made them learn more little things about other participants from the stories they

posted and made them more knowledgeable about fanfiction. Participants' English language also improved, especially in the areas of grammar (spotting mistakes and correction them) and vocabulary acquisition.

Offering feedback affected participants' personality as well where some became more responsible and active. This finding confirms with earlier studies that emphasize the gains of feedback giving on part of students. The first one is the study of Yusof et al. (2012.,p.224) that concludes that feedback giving improves students' "... pre-writing skills ... self- editing skills..." and that it is also beneficial to reviewers as it makes them "... learn to be more effective in self-editing their own work" (Ibid.p. 227).The other one is the study of Lundstrom & Baker (2009) that argues that feedback givers and reviewers show significant enhancement in their own writing compared to feedback receivers who wait for and rely on feedback from feedback givers to improve their writing. Some participants' disapproval of feedback giving stemmed from blog users' refraining from giving feedback and giving praising comments instead of constructive ones. Although this is a negative point, it reflected participants' awareness of the importance of constructive critical feedback on writing improvement.

Hesitation to offer feedback is due to participants' preference of teacher feedback, lack of expertise, training and guidelines on how to produce effective types of feedback (Dippold, 2009). The nature of some participants also played a role for their unwillingness to engage in the feedback giving task due to their perception that their peers are incapable of providing feedback and have a low linguistic level. This tendency led them to either refrain from giving feedback or provide praising comments only. Some participants considered the task of feedback in the blog as a give and take relationship and once they did not receive feedback from blog-mates to whom they provided feedback, their motivation to interact lessened. Also, lack of peer- initiated revisions was a concern to some participants. Some participants gave feedback though they did not have any. They were upset and disappointed from their blog-mates' attitude. Looking at these participants' responses, it was evident that commencement of interaction and continuation of communication with blog users were a desirable quest among participants.

Many feedback receivers were happy with the feedback they received as it improved their next stories and encouraged them to write. Some found the received feedback ineffective and ascribed that to its scarcity, inclusion of more praising comments on content and form.

Many participants responded to reader feedback because they liked blog users' comments on their stories, felt appreciative and ethically accountable to respond to feedback givers and because they sensed that the feedback was beneficial. However, the implementation of feedback was too small owing to trusting teacher feedback, self-esteem and feeling that they have a good command of English better than other blog-mates, disapproval to have reader feedback all the time and preference for constructive critical comments from teachers.

Reluctance to use peer review in the online activity is justified. Mahfoodh & Pandian (2011) explain that the quality of feedback relates to the feedback source. Similarly, in the current study, the majority of feedback receivers did not implement reader feedback due to their trust in teacher feedback. Yang et al.(2006) found that all students in the peer feedback group accepted peer feedback with certain reservations, that some of them were doubtful about the linguistic knowledge of their peers and said that they only could accept peer feedback after consulting grammar books or asking the teacher. A closer look at posted feedback segments revealed that dissatisfaction was also caused by failing to get constructive feedback. The students were not happy to receive praising feedback only. Min (2006) equates lack of feedback production to lack of training on how to produce useful types of feedback. In this study, those who incorporated reader feedback liked it and found it to be helpful to the content and language of their stories. Yang et al.(2006) confess that the act of reading peers' writing and offering feedback assist students to know their strong and weak points and find solutions to writing difficulties. Cho et al.(2006,p.261) argue that, "Anecdotal evidence suggests that students actually find the task of reading and commenting on peers' papers to be more helpful for revising than attempting to address their peers' suggestions."

Conclusion

The study indicates that the feedback tasks in the blog did not improve participants' writing due to lack of constructive and critical feedback and shows that it is very difficult, if not impossible, for EFL undergraduates in Libya to effectively participate in an online activity without teacher feedback for they are being brought up with the fear of making mistakes in language production and that the teacher is authoritative. The study agrees to some extent with the conclusion of Lundstrom & Baker (2009) about the rewards of effective peer feedback activities in enhancing lower proficiency students' writing though they are time-consuming.

Some pedagogical implications are made from the findings of this study. For instance, teacher feedback vital in online courses, but more as facilitators (Mahfoodh & Pandian, 2011) through different technologies in online activities where free exchange of thoughts and mutual learning can coincide. This, in turn, may create a level of emotional relief, leverage students' learning and grow seeds of collaboration and competition among students. The study has appeared to lead to useful, though tentative implications for practicing outside of writing activities in academic settings and contributed to understanding their effects on the performance of lower-achieving university students. Moreover, there is one theoretical implication that can be highlighted as the blog caused the emergence of some notions like content –generation and active participation that succeeded in functioning together and in creating an ideal environment for learners to interact with a real audience that are all in perfect alignment with the perspectives of a combination of e-learning theories involving constructivism, sociocultural theory, communities of practice and connectivism.

Some limitations that has made this study's findings tentative. The study thus needs a control group so that results can be compared. The study findings may not be generalized due to the small sample size of the participants. Another threat to generalizability relates to the lack of teacher feedback which results in no improvement in writing quality and reduces participants' unwillingness to interact. Despite these limitations, the study recommends other related follow-up future research which involves looking into more vivid depiction of student perceptions and finding solutions to achieve sustainable learning outcomes in future online studies.

References

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., Sorensen, C., & Walker, D. (2006). *Introduction to research in education*. Cengage Learning.
- Bakar, N. A., & Ismail, K. (2009). Using blogs to encourage ESL students to write constructively in English. *AJTLHE: ASEAN Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 1(1), 45-57.
- Black, R. W. (2005). Access and affiliation: the literacy and composition practices of English-language learners in an online fanfiction community. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(2), 118-128.
- Black, R.W. (2008). Just don't call them cartoons: The new literacy spaces of animé, manga, and fan fiction. In S. Sweeny, (ed.), *Writing for the instant messaging and text messaging generation: Using new literacies to support writing instruction* (54(2), p. 121-130.) *JOURNAL OF ADOLESCENT & ADULT LITERACY*.
- Black, R. W. (2009). English-Language Learners, Fan Communities, and 21st-Century Skills. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(8), 688-697.
- Blackstone, B., Spiri, J., & Naganuma, N. (2007). Pedagogical uses and student responses. *Reflection on English Language Teaching*, 6(2), 1-20.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Cassell, J. (2004). Towards a model of technology and literacy development: Story listening systems. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 25(1), 75-105.
- Cho, K., Schunn, C. D., & Charney, D. (2006). Commenting on writing typology and perceived helpfulness of comments from novice peer reviewers and subject matter experts. *Written Communication*, 23(3), 260-294.
- Cho, K., & Schunn, C. D. (2007). Scaffolded writing and rewriting in the discipline: A web-based reciprocal peer review system. *Computers & Education*, 48(3), 409-426.

- Dippold, D. (2009). Peer feedback through blogs: Student and teacher perceptions in an advanced German class. *ReCALL*, 21(01), 18-36.
- Donohoe, J., & Beatty, B. (2007). Web 2.0 and online learning—a response to a new type of learner.
- Duffy, P. D., & Bruns, A. (2006). The use of blogs, wikis and RSS in education: A conversation of possibilities.
- Efimova, L., & Fiedler, S. (2004). Learning webs: Learning in weblog networks.
- Fanfiction.net. (2008). Beta readers. In R. Black, (ed.), *English-Language Learners, Fan Communities, and 21st-Century Skills*, (52(8), 688-697). JOURNAL OF ADOLESCENT & ADULT LITERACY.
- Gedera, D. (2012). The dynamics of blog peer feedback in ESL classroom. *Teaching English with technology*, (4), 16-30.
- Glymph, O. G. (2012). *The Effect of the Private Classroom Blog on the Acquisition of Formal Writing Proficiency with Spanish III High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, Liberty University).
- Haswell, R. H. (2005). NCTE/CCCC's recent war on scholarship. In K. Cho, D. Shunn & D. Charney (Eds.), *Commenting on writing typology and perceived helpfulness of comments from novice peer reviewers and subject matter experts*, (23(3), p.260-294). *Written Communication*.
- Hayes, T., & Ge, X. (2008, June). The effects of computer-supported collaborative learning on students' writing performance. In *Proceedings of the 8th international conference on International conference for the learning sciences—Volume 1* (pp. 335-341). International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Huffaker, D. (2004). The educated blogger: Using weblogs to promote literacy in the classroom. *First Monday*, 9(6).
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing: An introduction. *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*, 1-19.
- Kennedy, K. (2003). Writing with web logs. *Technology and Learning Magazine*, 23.
- Klein, P. D., & Kirkpatrick, L. C. (2010). A framework for content area writing: Mediators and moderators. *Journal of Writing Research*, 2(1), 1-46.
- Kormos, J. (2011). Task complexity and linguistic and discourse features of narrative writing performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(2), 148-161.
- Littleton, C. E. (2011). *The Role of Feedback in Two Fanfiction Writing Groups* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania).
- Lowe, C., & Williams, T. (2004). Moving to the public: Weblogs in the writing classroom. *Into the blogosphere: Rhetoric, community, and culture of weblogs*, 19, 2007.
- Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 30-43.
- Mahfoodh, O., & Pandian, A. (2011). A qualitative case study of EFL students' affective reactions to and perceptions of their teachers' written feedback. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), p14.
- Mazza, A. (Undated). *Writing the Non-Fiction Narrative as Feature Story*.
- McLoughlin, C., & Lee, M. J. (2007, December). Social software and participatory learning: Pedagogical choices with technology affordances in the Web 2.0 era. In *ICT: Providing choices for learners and learning. Proceedings ascilite Singapore 2007* (pp. 664-675).
- McNamara, D. S., Crossley, S. A., & McCarthy, P. M. (2009). Linguistic features of writing quality. *Written Communication*, 27(57), 24.
- McWilliams, J., Hickey, D. T., Hines, M. B., Conner, J. M., & Bishop, S. C. (2011). Using collaborative writing tools for literary analysis: Twitter, fan fiction and the crucible in the secondary English classroom. *The Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 2(3).
- Min, H. T. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(2), 118-141.
- Qian, H., & Scott, C. R. (2007). Anonymity and self-disclosure on weblogs. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4), 1428-1451.
- Sahin, M. C. (2008). *Constructivism, Participation and Web 2.0*.

- Su, B., Bonk, C. J., Magjuka, R. J., Liu, X., & Lee, S. H. (2005). The importance of interaction in web-based education: A program-level case study of online MBA courses. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 4(1), 1-19.
- Sweeny, S. M. (2010). Writing for the instant messaging and text messaging generation: Using new literacies to support writing instruction. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 54(2), 121-130.
- Tan, K., Mohammed, A., & Saw, K. (2009). Improving school English in Malaysia through participation in online threaded discussion groups. *Asian EFL Journal*, 11(2), 147-162.
- Thoms, B. (2012). Student perceptions of microblogging: Integrating Twitter with blogging to support learning and interaction. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Innovations in Practice*, 11(1), 179-197.
- Trajtemberg, C., & Yiakoumetti, A. (2011). Weblogs: a tool for EFL interaction, expression, and self-evaluation. *ELT journal*, ccr015.
- Tsui, A. B., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments?. *Journal of second language writing*, 9(2), 147-170.
- Wang, H. C. (2009). Weblog-mediated peer editing and some pedagogical recommendations: A case study. *The Jalt Call Journal*, 5(2), 29-44.
- Williams, J. B., & Jacobs, J. (2004). Exploring the use of blogs as learning spaces in the higher education sector. *Australasian journal of educational technology*, 20(2).
- Wu, W. S. (2005, March). Using blogs in an EFL writing class. In *2005 Conference and Workshop on TEFL and Applied Linguistics, Department of Applied English, Ming Chuan University, Taiwan* (pp. 426-432).
- Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of second language writing*, 15(3), 179-200.
- Yang, S. H. (2009). Using blogs to enhance critical reflection and community of practice. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 12(2), 11-21.
- Yusof, J., Ab Manan, N. A., & Alias, A. A. (2012). Guided Peer Feedback on Academic Writing Tasks using Facebook Notes: An Exploratory Study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 67, 216-228.
-

Appendix A

Post-Survey Questionnaire

Dear student,

This questionnaire is part of a doctoral research in English Language at the UPM University. Information you provide in this survey will remain confidential and anonymous. Your participation will contribute to the success of the study and will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you

Part I. Demographic information

1. Please select your gender

Gender: a) Male b) Female

2. Please specify your age: -----

3. Please specify your nationality: -----

Part II. Questions about the Blog Task Engagement

Feedback Giving	<p>1. What did you feel about giving feedback?</p> <p>2. Did you think the feedback you gave was helpful to the writer?</p> <p>3. Did you benefit from offering feedback to your readers? If so, what were the benefits? If not, why not?</p> <p>(Adapted from Tsui and Ng,2000).</p> <p>4. Why did not you send feedback on other readers' stories? You can tick more than one reason.</p> <p>(a). I trusted teacher feedback more than reader feedback.</p> <p>(b). I did not receive reader feedback.</p>
-----------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>(c). I was better than my readers in English.</p> <p>(d). I would prefer teacher feedback to reader feedback.</p> <p>(e). Teacher feedback would help me improve the content of my narratives than reader feedback.</p> <p>(f). Teacher feedback would help me improve the language of my narratives than reader feedback.</p> <p>(g). All the above reasons.</p> <p>(h). Others. Please write them down. (You can use Arabic if you want).</p> <p>-----</p> <p>(Adapted from Tsui and Ng, 2000).</p> <p>5. Why did you offer feedback though you received none?</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Feedback Receiving	<p>1. What did you feel about receiving feedback? (Adapted from Littleton,2011,p.133).</p> <p>2. What were the reasons that made you respond to reader feedback? You can tick more than one reason.</p> <p>(a). I liked reader feedback.</p> <p>(b). I found reader feedback helpful.</p> <p>(c). Reader feedback helped me to enrich the content of my subsequent narratives.</p> <p>(d). Reader feedback helped me to improve the language of my subsequent narratives.</p> <p>(e). Reader feedback helped me to improve the language (grammar and vocabulary) of my subsequent narratives.</p> <p>(f). I benefited from reader feedback.</p> <p>(g). I liked the way my readers gave me written feedback on my narratives.</p> <p>(h). All the above reasons.</p> <p>(i). Others. Please write them down. (You can use Arabic if you want).</p> <p>-----</p> <p>(Adapted from Tsui and Ng, 2000).</p> <p>3. What were the reasons that made you ignore reader feedback? You can tick more than one reason.</p> <p>(a). I liked reader feedback.</p> <p>(b). I found reader feedback helpful.</p> <p>(c). Reader feedback helped me to enrich the content of my subsequent narratives.</p> <p>(d). Reader feedback helped me to improve the language of my subsequent narratives.</p> <p>(e). Reader feedback helped me to improve the language (grammar and vocabulary) of my subsequent narratives.</p> <p>(f). I benefited from reader feedback.</p> <p>(g). I liked the way my readers gave me written feedback on my narratives.</p> <p>(h). All the above reasons.</p> <p>(i). Others. Please write them down. (You can use Arabic if you want).</p> <p>-----</p> <p>(Adapted from Tsui and Ng, 2000)</p> <p>4. What were the reasons that made you incorporate reader feedback in your subsequent narratives? You can tick more than one reason.</p> <p>(a). I liked reader feedback.</p> <p>(b). I found reader feedback helpful.</p> <p>(c). Reader feedback helped me to enrich the content of my subsequent narratives.</p>
--------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>(d). Reader feedback helped me to improve the language of my subsequent narratives.</p> <p>(e). Reader feedback helped me to improve the language (grammar and vocabulary) of my subsequent narratives.</p> <p>(f). I benefited from reader feedback.</p> <p>(g). I liked the way my readers gave me written feedback on my narratives.</p> <p>(h). All the above reasons.</p> <p>(i). Others. Please write them down. (You can use Arabic if you want).</p> <p>-----</p> <p>(Adapted from Tsui and Ng,2000).</p> <p>5. Why did not you incorporate reader feedback in your subsequent narratives? You can tick more than one reason.</p> <p>(a). I did not find reader feedback useful.</p> <p>(b). I trusted teacher feedback more than reader feedback.</p> <p>(c). I did not read reader feedback because reading reader feedback was a waste of time.</p> <p>(d). I was better than my readers in English.</p> <p>(e). I would prefer teacher feedback to reader feedback.</p> <p>(f). Teacher feedback would help me improve the content of my subsequent narratives than reader feedback.</p> <p>(g). Teacher feedback would help me improve the language of my subsequent narratives than reader feedback.</p> <p>(h). All the above reasons.</p> <p>(i). Others. Please write them down. (You can use Arabic if you want).</p> <p>-----</p> <p>(Adapted from Tsui and Ng, 2000).</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Appendix B

Phases of Thematic Analysis outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006, p.35)

Phases	Description of the process
1. Familiarizing yourself with data	Reading and rereading the data, noting down initial ideas.
2. Generating initial codes	Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code.
3. Searching for themes	Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.
4. Reviewing themes	Checking in the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic “map” of the analysis.
5. Defining and naming themes	Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells; generating clear definitions and names for each theme.
6. Producing the report	The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.

Appendix C

Reasons for Refraining from Offering Feedback

Reasons	Percentage
(a) I trusted teacher feedback more than reader feedback.	75%
(b) I did not receive reader feedback.	25%
(c) I was better than my readers in English.	0%
(d) I would prefer teacher feedback to reader feedback.	87.5%
(e) Teacher feedback would help me improve the content of my narratives than reader feedback.	87.5%
(f) Teacher feedback would help me improve the language of my narratives than reader feedback.	87.5%
(g) All the above reasons.	12.5%
(h) Others.	38. %

Appendix D

Reasons behind Responding to Reader Feedback

Reasons	Percentage
(a) I liked reader feedback.	73.3%
(b) I found reader feedback helpful.	20%
(c) Reader feedback helped me to enrich the content of my subsequent narratives.	0%
(d) Reader feedback helped me to improve the language of my subsequent narratives.	0%
(e) I benefited from reader feedback.	13.3%
(f) I liked the way my readers gave me written feedback on my narratives.	53.3%
(g) All the above reasons.	0%
(h) Others.	40%

Appendix E

Reasons Behind Choosing not to Respond to Reader Feedback

Reasons	Percentage
(a) I trusted teacher feedback more than reader feedback.	85.7%
(b) I was better than my readers in English.	0%
(c) I would prefer teacher feedback to reader feedback.	71.4%
(d) Teacher feedback would help me improve the content of my narratives more than reader feedback.	71.4%
(e) Teacher feedback would help me improve the language of my narratives more than reader feedback.	71.4%
(f) All the above reasons.	14.2%
(g) Others.	0%

Appendix F

Reasons for Incorporating Reader Feedback

Reasons	percentage
(a) I liked reader feedback.	67. %
(b) I found reader feedback helpful.	76%
(c) Reader feedback helped me to enrich the content of my subsequent narratives.	76%
(d) Reader feedback helped me to improve the language of my subsequent narratives.	76%
(e) I benefited from reader feedback.	33.3%
(f) I liked the way my readers gave me written feedback on my narratives.	33.3%
(g) All the above reasons.	0%
(h). Others	33.3%

Appendix G

Reasons for Ignoring Reader Feedback

Reasons	Percentage
(a) I did not find reader feedback useful.	21%
(b) I trusted teacher feedback more than reader feedback.	37%
(c) I did not read reader feedback because reading reader feedback was a waste of time.	0%
(d) I was better than my readers in English.	16%
(e) I would prefer teacher feedback to reader feedback.	58%
(f) Teacher feedback would help me improve the content of my narratives more than reader feedback.	58%
(g) Teacher feedback would help me improve the language of my narratives more than reader feedback.	47%
(h) All the above reasons.	11%
(i) Others.	21%

A Brief Bio of Authors

Fatma Harb received her master’s degree in applied linguistics from the University of Tripoli in 2006. Her research interests focus on understanding the nature of peer collaboration in online writing environments and developing computer-supported writing programs to facilitate EFL learning. She is currently in Malaysia pursuing her PhD program in English language studies.

Mardziah Hayati Abdullah is an Associate Professor in the Department of English, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia. Her research interests focus on English language education at various levels of learning, discourse in the media and ICT environments, semiotic analysis and qualitative inquiry.

Yap Ngee Thai is an Associate Professor at the English Language Department, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia. Her current research interests include speech perception and production, second language acquisition, experimental psycholinguistics and the neuroscience of language.

Dr. Helen Tan is an academic staff from the Department of English, University Putra Malaysia. She has many years of teaching experience, having taught in both the secondary and tertiary levels of education. Her research interests are writing and discourse studies.