



ISSN: 0976-3376

Available Online at <http://www.journalajst.com>

ASIAN JOURNAL OF
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Asian Journal of Science and Technology
Vol. 10, Issue, 10, pp.10352-10359, October, 2019

RESEARCH ARTICLE

IMPROVING WRITING ENGLISH PERFORMANCE THROUGH THE APPLICATION OF GOOGLE CLASSROOM FEEDBACK AT HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN BANDAR LAMPUNG

*Cucu Sutarsyah, Hery Yufrizal and Sudirman

FKIP Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 15th July, 2019
Received in revised form
29th August, 2019
Accepted 27th September, 2019
Published online 30th October, 2019

Key words:

Writing Performance,
On-Line, Google Classroom,
Feed Back.

ABSTRACT

The objectives of the research are to find out how the students' writing quality differ after being given Google Classroom-mediated feedback, how different the students' writing quality according to the predominant dimension of writing anxiety they suffer from and How do the students give feedback on their friends' writings. This study was carried out both quantitatively and qualitatively. The research design employed to find out the students' writing quality after being given Google Classroom-mediated feedback and writing anxiety differences in writing quality on the implementation of Google Classroom-mediated feedback. The results showed that the implementation of Google Classroom-mediated feedback on 'Write Art' Google Classroom Group affected student' writing quality positively. Based on the analysis of the students' feedback, it was found that the students presented positive, negative, and constructive feedback on their friends' writings.

Citation: Cucu Sutarsyah, Hery Yufrizal and Sudirman. 2019. "Improving Writing English Performance through The Application of Google Classroom Feedback at Higher Education Institutions in Bandar Lampung", *Asian Journal of Science and Technology*, 10, (10), 10352-10359.

Copyright©2019, Cucu Sutarsyah et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Feedback might come in many varieties and one of the well-known type is peer feedback. Peer feedback can be defined as students' engagement in the process of providing and receiving as well as sharing of comments and suggestions for the improvement of their peers' work (Gedera, 2012). A lot of studies have examined the value of the implementation of peer feedback in the writing process. Miao et al. (2006), for instance, claim that peer feedback is beneficial in encouraging learner autonomy. Additionally, Ion et al. (2016) argue that peer feedbacks help students to learn better, develop their competencies, get engaged with the learning process and increase their self-regulation abilities. Moreover, through peer feedback, the students can learn more about writing by reading their peers' written drafts and raise their awareness of the weaknesses in their own writings (Tsui and Ng, 2000). Peer feedback done in the class might not be well implemented due to time constraints (Rollinson, 2005). Sadat et al. (2016) mention that even though conventional peer feedback can assist students in learning language structures and expressions, there is possibility for their anxiety to be provoked. Certain students might dislike the situation in which they have to provide or receive feedback face-to-face.

Additionally, Rollinson (2005) explains that the teacher will not be able to oversee all students simultaneously through conventional peer feedback. The limited opportunity for the teachers to monitor the students' feedback might bring up the teachers' doubts and concerns in shifting responsibility to the students. In short, it can be said that the implementation of peer feedback needs to be carried out outside 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.

The present study is intended to modify the teaching writing procedure, so that the activity of providing and receiving feedback can be carried out by using the internet. A number of studies have examined the application of internet for providing and receiving feedback. Hiên (2008) conducted a study in Vietnam to compare the use of online peer feedback to teacher feedback. The findings revealed that students who received online peer feedback improved their motivation in learning to write in English and the quality of their written texts significantly, whereas motivation in writing of students that received teacher feedback remained unchanged and the quality of their written texts was slightly improved. Xing (2014) investigated the comparison between online peer feedback and teacher feedback in China. The results of the study showed that implementing online peer feedback gave more improvement to students' writing skills than teacher feedback. It also revealed that with the help of internet, the students could not feel nervous but relaxed in the process of feedback which would

*Corresponding author: Cucu Sutarsyah,
FKIP Universitas Lampung, Indonesia.

give more confidence and inspiration to speak out freely. The students regarded online feedback as a convenient and quick way to communicate with peers and comment their writings without the embarrassment made by facing meeting. They also stated that online feedback really benefited them in improving English writing, such as pointing out the weakness in their compositions and getting more information to enrich their minds. There are other scholars who conducted studies to investigate the application of online sites like blog, wikis, email, WeChat, and Google Classroom for providing feedback, for instance Elola and Oskoz, 2010; Huang, 2016; Motallebzadeh and Amirabadi, 2011; Putra, 2016; Shukor and Noordin, 2014; Wichadee, 2013; Wu, 2006; Yoke et al., 2013; Yusof et al., 2012; and Zhang et al., 2014. Amidst other kinds of online sites, Google Classroom or on-line media 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 et al.'s study (2009) even showed that students use Google Classroom approximately 30 minutes throughout the day as part of their daily routine, regardless of how busy they are.

On-line media also offers a tool called Google Classroom Group that is useful for educational activity as it enables the teacher to create a community whose members are the students. The members can share updates, photos, documents and more under specific settings of their choosing (Petronzio, 2013) and they can engage in more in-depth discussions (Sherman, 2010). In addition, the teacher is able to be the administrator of the group and can monitor the discussions held by the students.

Review of Literature: Hale (2013) states that editing involves the close-up view of individual sentences and words and it needs to be done after the writers have made revisions on a big scale. Based on this definition, it can be noted that editing is different from revising. Revising allows us to check the whole arrangement of our text, whereas editing lets us make sure the small part of the text such as sentence, word, or punctuation is in the right form and position. Editing usually couples with feedback given by an editor or writers' colleagues. Ur (1991) defines feedback as information that is given to the learner about his or her performance of a learning task, usually with the objective of improving this performance. Correspondingly, Hattie and Timperley (2007) describe feedback as information provided by an agent regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding. Therefore, it can be inferred that feedback is a response (i.e. comments and suggestions) given to work or task done by the learner so as to make her or his performance better.

Three things that can be given by feedback providers to writers are: positive, negative, and constructive feedbacks. Positive feedback refers to feedback which motivates the researchers to keep writing (Cole, 2006), while negative feedback is defined as feedback which is designed to 'fix' your 'mistakes' as a writer (Edel, 2010), and constructive feedback is feedback which highlights how a writer could do better next time (Landsberg, 2003). Positive, negative, and constructive feedback serve different purposes. Positive feedback might boost up writers' self-confidence and encourage them to continue writing. Negative feedback, on the other hand, is given to make writers aware of writing mistakes. Constructive feedback is provided to help writers correct their writing

mistakes so that they are able to improve the quality of their writings. According to Lanley (2010), there are some models of positive feedback which can be used by feedback providers. The models are presented as follows.

- *This thesis statement is very clear. When I read it, I know exactly what your essay will be about.*
- *This paragraph is full of details. This one even made me laugh. This one gave me a clear image in my mind.*
- *Your introduction really grabbed my attention. I wanted to keep reading.*
- *This transition word is perfect for shifting to the next main idea.*
- *I love how you wrapped up all the main points at the end. Your clincher was very strong.*
- *Great use of comma and a conjunction to join to independent clauses!*
- *This is a superb word choice.*
- *Wow, there are no run-on sentences in this entire essay.*
- *You didn't get tricked by the its/it's thing. Good job!*

Furthermore, Brookhart (2008) provides some examples of negative feedback which can be used by feedback providers as follows.

- *This report probably wouldn't convince a reader who didn't already agree we should recycle. What else could you do to make a more convincing argument?*
- *You didn't answer the second part of the question. How would you know if you had all possible combinations?*
- *Did you check your spelling? See if you can find two misspelled words.*

Moreover, the following are examples of constructive feedback suggested by Eaglescliffe (2017).

- *I found the first chapter very difficult to follow as there were so many new characters being introduced every few lines.*
- *The action in the opening chapter needs to be made more focused and easier to follow.*
- *Perhaps you could concentrate on the action of a few key characters and introduce others in the next chapter?*
- *This would result in a much clearer narrative and I would be more engaged in the story.*

Positive, negative, and constructive feedback given by feedback providers should be specific because they will help writers improve by addressing their strengths and weaknesses directly (Hockett, 2017). The examples also illustrate that feedback should be clear and concise (Chando, 2015). Additionally, feedback providers should deliver feedback carefully through language which is not offensive and upsetting so that writers will not get annoyed or distressed. Apparently, there is a chance for Google Classroom-mediated feedback to be employed in two different kinds of learning environment: synchronous and asynchronous. Higley (2013) explains that synchronous learning offers students and teachers with multiple ways of interacting, sharing, and the ability to collaborate and ask questions in real-time through synchronous learning technologies. The examples of synchronous media include video conferencing, webcasts, interactive learning models, and telephone conferences (Er et al., 2009 and

eLearners.com, 2012 as cited in Higley, 2013). Meanwhile, Hrastinski (2008) notes that asynchronous learning supports work relations among learners and with teachers even when participants cannot be online at the same time. The media that can facilitate asynchronous learning include email and discussion board. In short, it can be said that asynchronous learning offers more flexibility than synchronous learning. When the students are required to provide feedback, time flexibility might be something that is badly needed by them. Therefore, the teacher can put into practice asynchronous learning over synchronous learning.

Other than email and discussion board, Google Classroom can facilitate asynchronous learning as well. Google Classroom is a well-known social networking service and has been confirmed as the world's largest social network with over 1.4 billion active users (Mehra, 2015). Anyone can register themselves to the site and communicate with people from different country since it is accessible worldwide, including in Indonesia. Google Classroom is incredibly popular among students. A research conducted by Pempek et al. (2009) even showed that students use Google Classroom approximately 30 minutes throughout the day as part of their daily routine, regardless of how busy they were. Google Classroom is useful for educational activity as well since it enables the teacher to create a group whose members are the students. The teacher may utilize Google Classroom group as an online classroom. Within Google Classroom group, the members can share updates, photos, documents and more under specific settings of the theirs choosing (Petronzio, 2013) and they can engage in more in-depth discussions (Sherman, 2010). Moreover, the teacher is able to be the administrator of a group and can monitor the discussions held by the students. Thus, the researcher assumes that Google Classroom might be a great site for the application of online peer feedback since it is well-liked and allows the teacher to build an online community as a place for discussions for the students.

Research Design: This study was carried out both quantitatively and qualitatively. The research design employed to find out the students' writing quality after being given Google Classroom-mediated feedback and writing anxiety differences in writing quality on the implementation of Google Classroom-mediated feedback. There are three kinds of variable presented in this research: independent, dependent, and intervening variable. Independent variable is defined as a variable the experimenter manipulates (i.e. changes) assumed to have a direct effect on the dependent variable (McLeod, 2008). The independent variable of this research was Google Classroom-mediated feedback. Meanwhile, dependent variable is a variable the experimenter measures, after making changes to the independent variable that are assumed to affect the dependent variable (McLeod, 2008). Students' writing quality was the dependent variable of this research. Intervening variable is a variabel which affects the relation between the dependant variable and independent variable. The intervening variable of this research was students' writing anxiety. This research was carried out at two English Language Teaching institutions in Lampung involving the students who took Writing Course as compulsory subject.. There are two kinds of instrument used in the present study. The instruments are presented as follows:

A writing task was used to investigate the difference in the students' writing quality after the implementation of Google

Classroom-mediated feedback. For this 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. Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) developed by Cheng (2004) was distributed by the researcher to find out the dimension of writing anxiety. SLWAI is a 22-items questionnaire that has been used widely by scholars to identify both ESL and EFL students' writing anxiety. It 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.

RESULTS

It was hypothesized that there was a difference in the students' writing quality after the treatment. The hypothesis testing was done by *Paired Samples T-Test* resulting as follows. The results showed 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. Before analyzing the differences in students' writing quality according to the predominant dimension of writing anxiety, the researchers calculated the mean score of each dimension of writing anxiety included in Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI). SLWAI was administered to discover dimension of writing anxiety. The results of the analysis can be seen in Table 4.2.

The results presented in Table 4.2 revealed that the lowest mean score of somatic anxiety was 2.00 points, while the highest mean score of somatic anxiety was 4.14 points. There was one student who got the lowest mean score of somatic anxiety and there were two students who achieved the highest mean score of somatic anxiety. Table 4.3 showed that the lowest mean score of avoidance behavior was 1.14 points, whilst the highest mean score of avoidance behavior was 3.43 points. It was found that one student got the lowest mean score of avoidance behavior and one student attained the highest mean score of avoidance behavior. Table 4.4 showed that the lowest mean score of cognitive anxiety was 2.13 points, whilst the highest mean score of cognitive anxiety was 3.75 points.

Apparently, there was one student who obtained the lowest mean score of cognitive anxiety and there were two stu. Table 4.4 showed 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. To discover the differences in the students' writing quality according to the predominant dimension of writing anxiety they suffer from, the score of somatic-anxiety and cognitive-anxiety students' first and final drafts were examined.

The results were presented as follows. In line with Table 4.6 above, it can be seen that the mean score of somatic-anxiety students' first draft was 74.47 points, whereas the mean score of cognitive-anxiety students' first drafts was 73.25 points. Moreover, the somatic-anxiety students achieved 83.02 points for the mean score of their final drafts, whilst the cognitive-anxiety students got 80.25 points for the mean score of their final drafts. Based on these results, it reveals that somatic-anxiety and cognitive-anxiety students achieved different score on the first and the final draft. Additionally, the researcher made an attempt to calculate the gain score of somatic-anxiety and cognitive anxiety students.

The table of ANOVA calculation can be seen below. 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 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. Based on the analysis of the students' feedback, it was found that the students presented positive, negative, and constructive feedback on their friends' writings. The researcher categorized the students' feedback into positive, negative, and constructive feedback by following the models which have been exemplified by Lanley (2010), Brookhart (2008), and Eaglescliffe (2017). The following are several illustrations of the feedback that were provided by the students.

Positive Feedback

- *Your paragraph is good, because it contains introduction, developmental paragraphs, and also conclusion.*
- *Your essay is interesting because it gives me new information about your city which has many tourism spots.*
- *You use simple words, so that your essay is easy to understand.*
- *Your final message is relevant with the thesis statement, it is good enough.*
- *Each of your paragraph is well developed.*

Negative Feedback

- *I did not see the thesis statement in your introduction of the essay.*
- *Your thesis statement does not match with your essay.*
- *In the first paragraph, your explanation is just in one sentence.*
- *You make some mistakes in placing the punctuation, so it makes run-on sentence.*
- *Your first and second topic sentence on your essay are underdeveloped.*

Constructive Feedback

- *In the first sentence of the conclusion paragraph, I think you do not need to use word "of course", because it is spoken style.*
- *There are some difficult words. For example 'boundaries'. Better for you to write common words.*

- *I think it is better if you can add some sentences or something like that in your moral value, so the readers understand clearly about your moral value.*
- *I think that you do not have to repeat the word like "try new foods, try new drinks, try new snacks" you can change with the sentences " try new foods, drinks, or snacks"*
- *You can add moral value of your essay because it is very important.*

Furthermore, the researcher tried to examine whether the students' feedback are clear and specific like what have been demonstrated by Lanley (2010), Brookhart (2008), and Eaglescliffe (2017). However, it was found that some students presented unspecific feedback to their friends' writings. Some examples of unspecific feedback which could be found by the researcher were as follows.

- *Be careful with the word which you used*
- *You made so much typo in your essay*
- *Be careful with your punctuation*
- *Some Incorrect grammar*
- *Some Incorrect spelling*
- *Something wrong with your introduction*

DISCUSSION

The implementation of Google Classroom-mediated feedback on 'Write Art' Google Classroom Group had been proved to affect student' writing quality positively. The quality of students' writings become better after the implementation of Google Classroom-mediated feedback. These results are similar to the findings of previous research conducted by Hiên (2008) that online peer feedback could contributed positively to the improvement of students' writing quality since its implementation boosted up students' motivation in learning to write. This result is comparable to the study conducted of Wichadee (2013) who showed that the feedback that was given on Google Classroom had an effect on improving students' revised drafts. The activity of giving and receiving written feedback can be extremely helpful for foreign language students who enroll in writing class.

The written feedback received by the students on 'Write Art' Google Classroom Group was effective in helping the students refine the quality of their essays. This indicates that the purpose of feedback has been achieved, as stated by Ur (1991) that feedback is information that is given to the learner about his or her performance of a learning task, usually with the objective of improving this performance. Asynchronous learning and peer feedback were applied during the implementation of Google Classroom-mediated feedback. The application of asynchronous learning and the placement of three to four students in a group for the implementation of Google Classroom-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.

Table 4.1 Results of Paired Samples 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

Table 4.2. Mean Score of Somatic Anxiety

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.00	1	3.2	3.2	3.2
	2.29	1	3.2	3.2	6.5
	2.43	1	3.2	3.2	9.7
	2.57	1	3.2	3.2	12.9
	2.86	4	12.9	12.9	25.8
	3.00	6	19.4	19.4	45.2
	3.14	5	16.1	16.1	61.3
	3.29	4	12.9	12.9	74.2
	3.43	3	9.7	9.7	83.9
	3.57	1	3.2	3.2	87.1
	3.71	1	3.2	3.2	90.3
	3.86	1	3.2	3.2	93.5
	4.14	2	6.5	6.5	100.0
Total		31	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.3 Mean Score of Avoidance Behavior

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.14	1	3.2	3.2	3.2
	1.43	1	3.2	3.2	6.5
	1.71	1	3.2	3.2	9.7
	1.86	1	3.2	3.2	12.9
	2.00	3	9.7	9.7	22.6
	2.14	1	3.2	3.2	25.8
	2.29	7	22.6	22.6	48.4
	2.43	6	19.4	19.4	67.7
	2.57	4	12.9	12.9	80.6
	2.86	3	9.7	9.7	90.3
	3.00	2	6.5	6.5	96.8
	3.43	1	3.2	3.2	100.0
	Total		31	100.0	100.0

Table 4.4 Mean Score of Cognitive Anxiety

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.13	1	3.2	3.2	3.2
	2.25	3	9.7	9.7	12.9
	2.38	3	9.7	9.7	22.6
	2.50	1	3.2	3.2	25.8
	2.63	2	6.5	6.5	32.3
	2.88	3	9.7	9.7	41.9
	3.00	4	12.9	12.9	54.8
	3.13	5	16.1	16.1	71.0
	3.25	2	6.5	6.5	77.4
	3.38	1	3.2	3.2	80.6
	3.50	3	9.7	9.7	90.3
	3.63	1	3.2	3.2	93.5
	3.75	2	6.5	6.5	100.0
Total		31	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.5. Predominant Dimension of Writing Anxiety

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	21	67.7	67.7	67.7
	3.00	10	32.3	32.3	100.0
	Total	31	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.6. Writing Score of Somatic-anxiety and Cognitive-anxiety Students

	anxtype	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score1	1.00	21	74.4762	12.03378	2.62599
	3.00	10	73.2500	9.90300	3.13160
Score2	1.00	21	83.0238	9.01038	1.96623
	3.00	10	80.2500	8.24368	2.60688

4.8. 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			

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 et al., 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. In addition, it was assumed that the students were able to improve the quality of their writings because they observed and studied the feedback provided by the members of other groups. The whole students who join as the members of 'Write Art' Google Classroom Group can easily access that group and view each other's comments and suggestions displayed on the main page of 'Write Art' Google Classroom Group. Subsequently, it is possible for any students to check out the feedback given by other groups, reflect on them, and edit their writings based on them. Moreover, it was believed that the improvement of students' writing quality occurred because the students could easily download the writings that were uploaded on 'Write Art' Google Classroom 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.

After analyzing the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory through SPSS, it was found that there were 21 somatic-anxiety students and 10 cognitive-anxiety students participated in this research. The results proved that every student experiences anxiety in the teaching-learning process, especially in a writing course. These results support what has been claimed by Hoffman (2015) that anxiety has always played a role in the developmental drama of a student's life. Basically, anxiety is not only experienced by students, but also experienced by all human beings. However, each human's anxiety might not be triggered by the same factor. The researcher assumed that students' anxiety emerged because the students have to deal with things that are demanding, challenging, and score-oriented. The students are required to learn many subjects diligently and achieve good learning results, therefore it is reasonable if they experience anxiety. Furthermore, the anxiety which was investigated in this research is writing anxiety. It was believed that students' writing anxiety emerged because the process of writing is extremely complex (Hamp-Lyons and Heasley, 1987 as cited in Nunan, 1991). Some people might even consider writing as a tough and time-consuming activity. Even Harmer (1998) states that students have to go through a mental activity in order to construct proper written texts. Student writers must collect ideas for their writings and write them down in English, a language that is neither their first nor second language. After writing down their ideas, students writers still have to go through revising and editing stage for several times until their writings deserve to be published. Since writing is a complicated activity, it is no wonder that it could trigger students' writing anxiety. 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, & 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, & 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 assumed that the insignificant differences between somatic-anxiety and cognitive anxiety students' writing quality happened because the 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. The results of this research showed that all students participated in providing feedback on each other's essay during the treatment. They were willing to contribute information regarding aspects of their friends' performance or understanding (Hattie and Timperley, 2007). Apparently, the whole students have been conditioned to read each other's writing and provide feedback before the researcher conducted this present research. They are already familiar with feedback and quite understand how it works. Furthermore, 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 researchers to keep writing. In line with this theory, the students gave positive feedback, such as *'Your essay is interesting because it gives me new information about your city which has many tourism spots'* or *'Your final message is relevant with the thesis statement, it is good enough'*, 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, for instance *'Your first and second topic sentence on your essay are underdeveloped'* or *'In the first paragraph, your explanation is just in one sentence.'* It was done in order that they can 'fix' their 'mistakes' as writers

(Edel, 2010). Besides, constructive feedback, for example 'There are some difficult words. For example 'boundaries'. Better for you to write common words' or 'I think that you do not have to repeat the word like "try new foods, try new drinks, try new snacks" you can change with the sentences " try new foods, drinks, or snacks"' 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 Google Classroom-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, such as 'Some incorrect grammar' or 'Some incorrect spelling' even after being instructed to give specific feedback by the researcher. 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.

Conclusion

This research investigated three points, namely the difference in the students' writing quality after the implementation of Google Classroom-mediated feedback, the differences in the students' writing quality according to the predominant type of writing anxiety they suffer from, and students' feedback on their friends' writings. The conclusion of each point will be elaborated as follows. The researcher modified the face-to-face peer feedback into Google Classroom-mediated feedback and was interested in examining whether there is any differences in the students' writing quality after the implementation of Google Classroom-mediated feedback. The results of the research revealed that there was a significant difference in the students' writing quality after the implementation of Google Classroom-mediated feedback. In relation to the results, it can be concluded that the implementation of Google Classroom-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.

Moreover, writing in foreign language makes the students experience different dimensions of writing anxiety, such as somatic anxiety, avoidance behavior, and cognitive anxiety. Hence, the researcher desired to find out the differences in the students' writing quality according to the predominant dimension of writing anxiety they suffer from. 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. It can be concluded 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. It was found that the students provided

positive, negative, and constructive feedback on their friends' writings. The students express willingness to help their friends improve the quality of their writings by providing beneficial feedback. However, the students lack of 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.

REFERENCES

- Beuningen et al. 2008. The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on L2 Learners' Written Accuracy. *ITL-Review of Applied Linguistics*, 156, 279-296.
- 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*. Retrieved from <https://www.teachthought.com/pedagogy/how-to-give-students-specific-feedback-that-actually-helps-them-learn/>.
- 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*. Retrieved from <https://letterpile.com/writing/Giving-and-Receiving-Feedback-in-Writers-Groups>.
- Edel, R. 2010. *Writing Workshop Feedback - Positive, Negative, and Progressive*. Retrieved from <http://www.12writing.com/2010/03/writing-workshop-feedback-positive.html>.
- Elola, I. & Oskoz, A. 2010. Collaborative Writing: Fostering Foreign Language and Writing Conventions Development. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14(3), 51-71.
- Gedera, D. S. P. 2012. The Dynamics of Blog Peer Feedback in ESL Classroom. *Teaching English with Technology*, 12(4), 16-30.
- Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. 2007. The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Hiên, 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.
- Higley, M. 2013. *Benefits of Synchronous and Asynchronous e-Learning*. Retrieved from <https://elearningindustry.com/benefits-of-synchronous-and-asynchronous-e-learning>
- Hockett, C. 2017. *Why Specific Feedback is so Important*. Retrieved from <https://www.youseeu.com/2017/09/why-specific-feedback-is-so-important/>.
- Hrastinski, S. 2008. Asynchronous and Synchronous e-Learning. *Educause Quarterly*, 31(4), 51-55.
- Huang, J. 2016. Contribution of Online Peer Review to Effectiveness of EFL Writing. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 4(11), 811-816.
- Ion, J. 2016. Written Peer-Feedback to Enhance Students' Current and Future Learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 13(15), 1-11.

- 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*. Retrieved from <https://jimmiescollage.com/positive-feedback-writing/>
- Mehra, G. 2015. *91 Leading Social Networks Worldwide*. Retrieved from <http://www.practicalecommerce.com/articles/86264-91-Leading-Social-Networks-Worldwide>
- Motalebzadeh, K. & Amirabadi, S. 2011. Online Interactional Feedback in Second Language Writing: Through Peer or Tutor? *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(5), 534-540.
- Miao et al. 2006. A Comparative Study of Peer and Teacher Feedback in a Chinese EFL Writing Class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 179-200.
- Pempek et al. 2009. College Students' Social Networking Experiences on Google Classroom. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 30, 227-238.
- Petronzio, M. 2013. *Everything You Wanted to Know About Google Classroom Groups*. Retrieved from <http://mashable.com/2013/01/28/Google-Classroom-groups-101/#0nUTtogSukqz>.
- Putra, W. H. 2016. *The Utilization of Google Classroom Closed Group Peer Correction in Teaching Writing*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Bandar Lampung: University of Lampung.
- Rollinson, P. 2005. Using Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class. *ELT Journal*, 59, 23-30.
- Sadat et al. 2016. Internet-Mediated Corrective Feedback for Digital Natives. *TESOL Journal*, 7(1), 233-245.
- Sherman, A. 2010. Google Classroom Pages, Groups and Profiles Explained. Retrieved from <https://gigaom.com/2010/01/19/Google-Classroom-pages-groups-and-profiles-explained/>
- Shukor, S. S. & Noordin, N. 2014. Effects of Google Classroom Collaborative Writing Groups on ESL Undergraduates' Writing Performance. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 2(2), 89-99.
- Truscott, J. 1996. The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369.
- Tsui, A. B. M. & Ng, M. 2000. Do Secondary L2 Writers Benefit from Peer Comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147-170.
- Ur, P. 1991. A Course in Language Teaching. In Williams, M., Wright, T. (Eds.), *Cambridge Teacher Training and Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wichadee, S. 2013. Peer Feedback on Google Classroom: The Use of Social Networking Websites to Develop Writing Ability of Undergraduate Students. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 14(4), 260-270.
- Wu, W. S. 2006. The Effect of Blog Peer Review and Teacher Feedback on the Revisions of EFL Writers. *Journal of Education and Foreign Languages and Literature*, 3, 125-139.
- Yoke, et al. 2013. The Use of Online Corrective Feedback in Academic Writing by L1 Malay Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 6(12), 175-180.
- Yusof, et al. 2012. Guided Peer Feedback via Google Classroom Notes for Mixed-Ability ESL Learners in the Process Writing Classroom: An Exploratory Study. *Voice of Academia*, 7(1), 14-33.
- Zhang, et al. 2014. The Effects of Blog-Mediated Peer Feedback on Learners' Motivation, Collaboration, and Course Satisfaction in A Second Language Writing Course. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 30(6), 670-685.
