

**STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN PEER REVIEWS  
IN ONLINE WRITING LEARNING****Joko Priyana<sup>1</sup>, Basikin<sup>2</sup>, Suciati<sup>3</sup>**<sup>1,2</sup> Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, <sup>3</sup> Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta<sup>1</sup>joko.priyana@uny.ac.id, <sup>2</sup>basikin@uny.ac.id, <sup>3</sup>suciati@uny.ac.id**Abstract**

Student involvement in a learning process is a very important factor in achieving optimal student learning outcomes. However, there are still issues related to effective strategies and patterns to improve student involvement in learning. This study aims to identify patterns of peer review that can be applied, explore their effectiveness in online learning, and identify the learner aspiration about the application of peer review in online writing classes. This is a qualitative research study with students enrolled in English writing classes in Bachelor and Master in English Language Education study programs as the data sources. Data were collected through peer review task sheets, peer corrective feedback sheets, and questionnaires or reflection sheets. Data collected through peer review task sheets and corrective feedback sheets were analyzed using data analysis techniques proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2013) which include data collection, data presentation, data condensation, and conclusion drawing. Findings show that the involvement of students in providing descriptive and corrective feedbacks on online writing classes could occur well with a peer review pattern accompanied with lecturer guides. Feedback given by peers with lecturer guides is also effective, which is indicated by the feasibility of most of the given feedbacks. Based on the aspirations of students, peer review patterns that work well and result in quality peer feedbacks require detailed instructions from lecturers, a good command of English, and good motivation among the students.

**Keywords:** *student involvement, feedback, peer review, online learning*

**1. Introduction**

A lot of research has been done regarding the involvement of students in the learning process, especially about the factors that encourage student involvement in learning and its contribution to student learning outcomes. Some research results state that learner involvement is influenced by motivational factors such as autonomy, interest and independence (Skinner et al., 2009); learning-community participation (Pike et al., 2011); schools and classrooms (Gilboy et al., 2015); technology used by teachers in teaching (Cronk, 2012); teacher support (Klem & Connell, 2004); interaction with peers, class structure, task characteristics and personal needs of learners (Fredricks et al., 2004). Some studies state that the involvement of

learners in teaching and learning activities has a positive effect on the achievement of learning outcomes (Steele & Fullagar, 2009; Fredricks et al., 2004); learner satisfaction (Wefald & Downey, 2009); problem solving skills (Eseryel et al., 2014); and persistence in learning (Kuh et al., 2008).

The involvement of learners not only involves the active participation of learners, but also the feelings and meaning of a learning activity (Harper & Quayle, 2009). It also involves the willingness, motivation, desire, and success of students in learning (Bomia et al., 1997). Student involvement is also related to how students assess the achievement of learning objectives and participate in achieving these goals (Hu & Kuh, 2001; Kuh, 2009). Stovall (2003) also states that student involvement in learning is not only in the form of the amount of time

they spend in learning, but also their willingness to participate actively in all learning activities. Gunuc and Guzu (2014) underline the importance of involving the psychological aspects of learning in defining learner engagement. They state that learner involvement is related to the quality and quantity of students' psychological, cognitive, emotional, and behavioral reactions to activities inside and outside the classroom, or to school programs in general.

In online writing learning in universities, certain strategies are needed that are able to make learners to be actively involved in learning. To plan and implement learning activities that can actively involve students requires certain strategies and is very challenging. In this regard, it is necessary to explore how to involve students in learning to write.

A number of globally used writing teaching materials designed by well-known authors (eg Zemach and Rumisek, 2005; Oshima and Hogue, 2007; Jordan, 1999), show that the process of learning to write involves a series of activities undertaken by learners in order to acquire attitudes, knowledge, and writing skills. In general, the learning process that can be concluded from some of these teaching materials is as follows. First, learners are involved in the activity of understanding the text models. In this activity, students learn the structure of texts and paragraphs (including organization, coherence, and cohesion), text functions, grammar, and vocabulary. Second, learners are given the opportunity to engage in guided writing activities. In this activity, students apply their knowledge of the text they have just learned to compose a text with support from the teacher. Third, learners are involved in writing activities independently to express their ideas. This activity may involve students seeking ideas from various sources, organizing ideas, writing draft 1, writing draft 2, editing drafts, and producing a final draft.

This general process is in line with the steps of learning to write as mentioned by Richards (2015) who reviewed the genre or text-based approach written by Burns (2010) and Feez and Joyce (1998). These steps

include modeling of text, joint construction of text, and independent construction of text. In the modeling of text step, teachers and students discuss and analyze the text model in terms of objectives, organization, and linguistic elements. In the joint construction of text stage, the teacher and students compose a new text by following the text features in the text model that they have just discussed and analyzed. Then, in the independent construction of text, students compose their own text by drafting, revising, and reviewing their writing.

Paying attention to the steps of learning to write from a number of writing textbooks (Zemach and Rumisek, 2005; Oshima and Hogue, 2007; Jordan, 1999) and expert opinion as reviewed by Richards (2015), it can be stated that in general learning to write involves analyzing the text model to find out the features of the text (especially the structure of the text, the function of the text, and the linguistic elements that are typical of the text), and composing the text both guided (with support) and independently. At the final stage, students review their draft to revise it to produce a final draft.

Reviewing a number of works, Yin (2016) concludes that the process of learning to write involves students in the process of composing texts as real writers in the real world. However, the process of writing a text is not always linear. The process of writing a text can be an iterative process.

In the literature it is found a number of definitions of involvement in the learning process. Stovall (2003), for example, defines involvement in the learning process as the length of time spent by learners in the learning process and their willingness to participate in the learning activities. Meanwhile, Krause and Coates (2008) state that involvement in the learning process is a variety of efforts made by learners in learning activities to achieve learning objectives. In line with this definition, Bomia et al. (1997) wrote that involvement in the learning process is the willingness, need, desire, and drive to participate and succeed in the learning process. From the three definitions, it can be said that involvement in the learning process is the intensity and

length of time for active participation of learners in learning activities to achieve learning objectives driven by the willingness of the learner.

The activeness and involvement of learners in the online learning process is a must for increased learning outcomes and retention (Gray & DiLoreto, 2016). A study by Williams, Birch, and Hancock (2012) found that the level of learner engagement in online quizzes is positively correlated with academic achievement. They found that students who took more online quizzes had higher learning outcomes than those who did less. The results of this study are in line with the findings of Wong (2013) which show that there is a positive correlation between the level of learner involvement and their academic achievement.

Pittaway (2012 in Tomas, 2015) identifies five engagements in the learning process. The first is personal involvement. This involvement includes self-confidence to be able to achieve goals, intentions, motivation and perseverance. The next is academic involvement. Students who are academically involved will, among other things, plan, monitor and evaluate learning outcomes, take notes, read, listen, and solve problems effectively, and will understand academic culture and have ICT literacy. The third is intellectual involvement. This involvement is shown by the learner by focusing himself on the ideas and concepts he is learning. Then, social involvement. Learners who are socially engaged will establish positive relationships with teachers and are proactive in making themselves part of the learning community. The last is professional involvement, that is the activeness of learners in their participation in class in every learning activity.

In online learning, Kennedy (2015) identifies three perspectives on learner engagement, namely interaction perspective, interactivity perspective, and learning design perspective. The interaction perspective includes the interaction of learners with teachers, learners with learners, and learners with learning materials. Meanwhile, the interactivity perspective distinguishes engagement into two, namely behavioral

involvement (such as clicking, navigating, handing over, and scrolling the monitor screen) and cognitive engagement (such as thinking deeply about the learning material). And, the learning design perspective includes inquiry-based learning models, simulation-based learning models, and peer-based learning models.

Overall, by considering the research results, and various types of learner involvement in the learning process, it can be concluded that effective engagement has several characteristics, which include: (1) driven by a strong will and intention of the learner, (2) carried out intensively over a long period of time, (3) being physically and mentally (cognitive) involved, (4) using multiple strategies such as listening, reading, taking notes in studying the material, (5) establishing good relationships with teachers and fellow learners, (6) proactively make the learner a part of the learning community in his class, and (7) aim to achieve high learning outcomes.

Kennedy (2015) suggests several ways to get students actively involved in the online learning process. The first way is to design learning so that there is a good interaction between the teacher and the learner, between one learner and another, and between the learner and the content of the lesson. The second way is done by seeking the involvement of learners with activities that make behavioral and cognitive involvement. The next way is to implement learner-centered learning. In addition, to ensure engagement, monitoring of learner activity needs to be done.

Through their experimental research, Tai, Lin and Yang (2015) found that peer reviews combined with teacher feedback made a significant positive contribution to students' writing development. The results of this study are supported by Nguyen (2016) who states that peer feedback has been widely applied because it is an effective strategy to support teacher feedback and improve students' writing skills. Peer reviews naturally make learners intensively involved in the learning process that facilitates learner-centred learning. Furthermore, through more recent research,

Husna (2017) shows that learners who are involved in peer review are motivated to write more and enjoy writing.

Based on the results of a study of a number of articles, Nguyen (2016) defines peer review, which is also called peer feedback or peer response as a collaborative activity with students reading, criticizing, and giving each other feedback on their friends' compositions to improve writing competence through the support they give to one another.

Feedback can cover several aspects of the text. Richards (2015) mentions that the scope can include content, organization, vocabulary (word choice and spelling), grammar, style, use of punctuation, ideas, and originality. Other aspects that can be covered are cohesion, coherence, and unity. Meanwhile, Zahida, Farrah & Zaru (2014) distinguish feedback into three, namely meaning-focused feedback, positive feedback, and form-focused feedback.

One of the principles that need to be applied is that feedback from both teachers and peers is constructive and encouraging. Richards (2015) states that the aspects covered in the review or feedback depend on the level and needs of the learner. Feedback can be provided either orally or in writing or both. Using feedback differentiation into two (Ferris 2006 in Zahida, Farrah & Zaru 2014), written feedback on online learning can be in the form of direct feedback or indirect feedback. Direct feedback is in the form of explicit corrections written next to the wrong part (eg grammar), while indirect feedback is a sign or hint that a certain part has an error without the correction.

There are several things that can make peer review less successful. First, as indicated by the research results of Tai, Lin, and Yang (2015), learners lack confidence in their ability to provide feedback. Second, a number of learners do not trust the feedback given by their peers. As stated by Richards (2015), learners may lack trust in peer feedback because it may be inaccurate or incorrect. Third, learners do not know the aspects that need feedback and how to provide it.

In this regard, before peer review is implemented, several things need to be done. Moore (2013) suggests that teachers prepare detailed instructions on the process and how to provide feedback. Each learner is given written instructions containing what aspects they need to provide feedback on, when, how long, and whether direct or indirect feedback. They were given an explanation both orally and in writing at the beginning of the semester with examples. Learners are invited to practice giving feedback together with the guidance of the teacher. It is also necessary to provide a forum to share problems or difficulties or questions for the teacher to immediately provide support to each learner in providing feedback for their peers.

To reduce the learning burden, Zahida, et al. (2014) suggest that the feedback requested to be given could be limited to certain aspects, on meaning-focused feedback because this type of feedback is more motivating and useful than other types of feedback. Furthermore, addressing the problem that there are learners who lack confidence in peer feedback, Richards (2015) suggests that peer feedback should be supplemented by teacher feedback.

This study aims to explore: 1) patterns of peer review that can be applied in online English writing classes; 2) the effectiveness of peer review in online English writing classes with different levels of learner maturity; and 3) learner aspirations related to the application of peer review in online writing learning.

## 2. Method

This research is a descriptive study that involves two writing classes, namely one writing class (Writing for Social and Intercultural Communication) in the English education department (Bachelor) and one writing class (Academic Writing) for MA students in the same department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Yogyakarta State University.

Qualitative research data were collected using peer review sheets. Peer reviews were carried out on writing assignments given by the lecturer. The review sheet consists of a descriptive review sheet and a corrective



review sheet. The data collected through this review activity include data related to the language, content, and organization of student writing.

In addition to the data generated through the peer review process, this study also collected data on student aspirations for the peer review process which was carried out using a questionnaire (Likert scale 1-4) and open-ended questions filled out online.

Descriptive and corrective feedback data were analyzed using a qualitative data analysis framework following the stages of 1) data collection, 2) data display, 3) data condensation, and 4) conclusion drawing/verifying (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2013). Meanwhile, quantitative data collected by questionnaires were analyzed by descriptive statistics.

### 3. Findings and Discussion

#### a. Peer review patterns

In this study, several patterns of peer feedback were applied, namely giving descriptive peer feedback without instructions, giving peer descriptive feedback with instructions, and giving peer corrective feedback with instructions.

#### 1) Giving descriptive peer feedback without instructions

In relation to the time spent by undergraduate students providing peer descriptive feedback without guidance from the lecturer, 47% of students spent 20 minutes or more providing feedback on each draft and 53% of students spent less than 20 minutes. Meanwhile, 70.6% of undergraduate students do not know the aspects of writing that need feedback and as many as 29.4% of students do. The data also show that 58.8% of undergraduate students are not confident, 5.9% are fairly confident and 35.3% of students are confident in giving feedback.

Regarding the level of confidence of undergraduate students in the appropriateness of peer feedback, the data show that 52.9% of them feel unsure and 47.1% of them feel confident.

In this pattern of giving feedback, the WA forum is available for consultation. Based on the data, there are 94.1% of undergraduate students who feel that chat forums via WA are very helpful in providing feedback and 5.9% of them feel that chat forums via WA are not helpful. The data regarding the comparison of the peer reviewing process without lecturer instructions for undergraduate and postgraduate students can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. Data on peer reviewing without lecturer's instruction

No.	Statement	Mean	
		S1	S2
1.	I know the aspects of the feedback I need to provide WITHOUT detailed instructions from the lecturer.	2,33	2,00
2.	I feel confident giving feedback WITHOUT detailed instructions from the lecturer.	2,28	2,00
3.	I believe in the appropriateness of the feedback I give WITHOUT detailed instructions from the lecturer.	2,44	2,17
4.	I spent 20 minutes or more providing feedback on each draft WITHOUT detailed instructions from the lecturer.	2,50	3,17

The data in the table above show that the average scores of almost all indicators of peer reviews without lecturer guidance are in the range of fairly good for undergraduate and postgraduate students with the average score of masters students being lower for most of the items, except for item 4 which has an average score in the good category. This means that both undergraduate and postgraduate students are poorly aware of aspects of feedback, lack of confidence in giving feedback, and lack of trust in the feedback given to their peers without detailed instructions from the lecturer. Taking into account that the mean score of MA students is lower than that of Bachelor students for almost all indicators, peer

review without lecturer guidance works less with MA students.

**2) Giving descriptive and corrective peer feedback with detailed instructions**

Data regarding the time spent by undergraduate students providing descriptive and corrective peer feedback with detailed instructions provided by the lecturer show that 88.2% of undergraduate students spent 20 minutes or more providing feedback on each draft and 11.8% of them spent less than 20 minutes for one draft. Meanwhile, 100% of undergraduate students claimed to know the aspects of feedback with detailed instructions from the lecturer.

Based on the data obtained, as many as 94.1% of undergraduate students feel confident in giving feedback and only 5.9% of students feel insecure. In addition, as the data collected show that 100% of undergraduate students feel confident about the appropriateness of the feedback they receive from their peers when detailed feedback instructions from the lecturer are provided. The data on the process of peer reviews with the instructions of lecturers for undergraduate and postgraduate students can be seen in the following table.

Table 2. Data on peer reviewing with lecturer's instructions

No.	Statement	Mean	
		S1	S2
1.	I know the aspects of feedback I need to give WITH detailed instructions from the lecturer.	3,50	3,83
2.	I feel confident giving feedback WITH detailed instructions from the lecturer.	3,39	3,83
3.	I am confident with the appropriateness of the feedback I provide WITH detailed instructions from the lecturer.	3,33	3,83

4.	I spend 20 minutes or more providing feedback on each draft WITH detailed instructions from the lecturer.	3,22	3,83
----	---	------	------

The data in the table above show that both undergraduate and postgraduate students are very knowledgeable about the aspects of feedback, very confident in giving feedback, very confident about the feedback given to their peers, and spend sufficient time reviewing their peers' writings with detailed instructions from the lecturer. Taking into account the average score of MA students which is higher than the average score of Bachelor students for the three indicators, peer review with teacher instructions work better with MA students.

In relation to the benefits of chat forums via WA for consultation while students are providing feedback, the data indicate that the forum is very helpful. Meanwhile, the data also indicate that both undergraduate and postgraduate students learn more about writing through their involvement in giving feedback to peers.

Overall, the data show that peer reviews without lecturer's instructions did not work well. Peer review without the guidance of the lecturer did not work well even though 94.1% of students stated that the WA chat forum which gave students the opportunity to give feedback to consult when giving feedback was very helpful for them.

The data on the of peer reviews without teacher guidance as shown by the results of this study are in line with Tai et al. (2015) who also found that learners lack confidence in their ability to provide feedback and lack confidence in the feedback given by their peers. In addition, the findings of this study are in line with Richards' (2015) statement that learners do not trust peer feedback because it may be inaccurate or incorrect and the feedback providers do not know the aspects or areas of feedback.

Meanwhile, the data indicate that the mean of peer reviewing with guidance worked very well. This finding is in line with Moore's (2013) suggestion that teachers

should prepare detailed instructions on the process and how to provide feedback. Each learner is given written instructions containing what aspects they need to provide feedback on, when, how long, and whether direct or indirect feedback.

Almost all of the respondents in this study (94.1%) stated that the consultation forum (WA chat) helped them provide feedback when they encountered problems. However, only 29.4% of the students who know the area of feedback, 35.3% feel confident in giving feedback, and 47.1% trust the appropriateness of the feedback they receive. Reflecting on the learning process that has passed, this may be due to the small number of students who use the WA forum. Although they believe in the potential of WA consulting forums in helping them to provide feedback when faced with difficulties, they do not take advantage of it even though they do not know the aspect or area of feedback to provide and are unsure of their capabilities.

The results of this study indicate that peer review without teacher guidance as a whole does not work well for undergraduate and postgraduate students. In addition, the data show that peer review without lecturer's guidance work less with MA students.

That peer review without guidance of the lecturer work less with MA students is something that needs to be discussed. Judging from the ability to speak English and learning experience, MA students can be assumed to be higher. Thus, they are expected to be able to provide better feedback to their peers.

The factor that may cause the peer review to work less with MA students is the level of complexity of the text being reviewed. While undergraduate students review non-academic texts with a length of about 250 words, postgraduate students review academic texts, namely research proposals that are much longer. In general, research proposals have a higher level of content, organization, and language complexity than non-academic texts. Thus, although postgraduate students may have a higher level of maturity in terms of language

and learning experiences, more complex and lengthy texts are not an easy challenge.

The results of this study indicate that peer review with teacher instructions can work very well for undergraduate and postgraduate students. Even though they both work very well, this review pattern is more effective for MA students.

The finding that peer review with teacher guidance is more effective for MA students may be related to the maturity level of MA students as learners. With a higher level of maturity, when master's students are given instructions by the lecturer, they can give peer feedback better.

#### **b. Effectiveness of peer reviews in online English writing classes**

The effectiveness of peer review, among others, can be assessed in terms of the feasibility of feedback, both descriptive and corrective feedback.

##### **1) Effectiveness of descriptive peer reviews with lecturer's instructions**

From 24 drafts of narrative text written by students, 120 descriptive feedback (comments) were obtained with 20 comments for each aspect (story setting, character traits, complications, resolution, and morals). Among those feedbacks, 90.83% are eligible and the rest (9.17%) are not.

Appropriate descriptive feedbacks (comments) are in the form of a precise review of the strengths and/or weaknesses of certain aspects of the draft. Meanwhile, inappropriate descriptive feedback (comments) are reviews that are not specific or incorrect/correct regarding the strengths and/or shortcomings of certain aspects of the draft essay.

Regarding feedback in the form of suggestions for improvement, 81% of them are appropriate and the remaining 19% are not. Inappropriate improvement suggestions are basically caused by the fact that the intended suggestions are already dealt with in the draft.

## 2) Effectiveness of corrective feedback with lecturer's instructions

Based on the data obtained, overall corrective peer feedback given by students are considered appropriate (81%). Meanwhile, narrative texts received the most corrective feedback (65.3%). In general, the most corrected aspects in peer corrective feedback are mechanics (43.1%), such as the use of capital letters, periods, and commas, followed by grammatical corrections of 41.7%. The grammatical aspects that were given feedback are related to the use of tenses, articles, and plural/singular.

In this study, students gave descriptive feedback focusing on certain aspects of the composition. In relation to narrative texts, five of the features of narrative texts, namely story setting, character traits, complications, resolutions, and morals are the focus of feedback. The data show that almost all of their feedback is accurate.

The corrective feedback given by students in this study is also focused on several aspects of the essay, namely grammar, punctuation (mechanics), word choice, and paragraph structure. The data also show that most (81%) corrective peer feedbacks given by students are feasible.

Both findings indicate that the provision of guided and area-limited feedback facilitate students to provide effective feedback. This finding confirms the results of research by Zahida, et al. (2014) that the feedback requested can be limited to certain aspects to be effective.

### c. Learner aspirations related to the implementation of peer reviews in the online learning of English writing

Based on the data, there are five aspects that make peer feedback quality. The first aspect is the accuracy of the feedback (36%), the second aspect is the clarity of the feedback (29%), the third is detailed instructions from the lecturer (14%), then the motivation is given by peers (14%), and the last is the mastery of the material given by the teacher (7%).

Related to the need for feedback from lecturers after receiving feedback from peers, data obtained show that 89% of students state that they still need it and 11% of students do not need it. Meanwhile, the data suggest that 94.1% of students felt that they learned more about writing through their involvement in giving feedback to peers and only 5.9% of students felt that they did not learn more.

Feedback expected to be received from peers is of high quality. The data show that according to students, there are five aspects that make peer feedback quality, namely the accuracy of feedback, clarity of feedback, detailed instructions from lecturers, motivation from peers, and command of English.

The need for feedback from lecturers after receiving feedback from peers was supported by 89% of students. This point is in line with the opinion of Richards (2015) who suggests that peer feedback needs to be supported by teacher feedback. In addition, Tai, Lin and Yang (2015) through their experiments also found that peer reviews combined with teacher feedback made a significant positive contribution to students' writing development.

The relationship between material mastery and the quality of feedback in providing peer feedback is very clear. Appropriate feedback can only be given by someone who has a good command of the writing of the text under review. The mastery in question includes the structure of the text and linguistic elements. If students do not have good mastery of these two things, they will not be confident in giving feedback and the feedback given may not be appropriate.

Meanwhile, students' aspirations that one of the points that make their feedback quality is the instructions from the lecturer supports Moore's (2013) suggestion that teachers need to prepare detailed instructions on the process and how to give feedback. He states that the instructions in question were written and contained aspects of the feedback that needed to be given, the time, duration, and method of providing direct or indirect feedback.



Another important aspiration is that students feel they are learning more about writing through their involvement in providing peer feedback. This aspiration is in line with Nguyen's (2016) statement that peer feedback has been widely applied because it is an effective strategy to support the improvement of students' writing skills. Peer reviews naturally make learners intensively involved in the learning process that facilitates learner-centred learning.

Another student's aspiration is that peer motivation is needed by them in order to provide quality feedback. Husna (2017) through her research found that students who are involved in peer reviews are motivated to write more and enjoy writing.

#### 4. Conclusions

Based on the results of data analysis, several conclusions can be drawn. First, peer reviews with lecturers' instructions can make Bachelor and MA students give each other descriptive and corrective feedback on online writing learning. Second, peer review with lecturer instructions is likely to work better on learners with a higher maturity level. Third, the feedback provided by peers with teacher guidance is effective as indicated by the feasibility of most of the feedback. Fourth, students need detailed instructions from the lecturer, good command of English, and motivation from friends in order to provide quality peer feedback.

#### REFERENCES

Bomia, L., Beluzo, L., Demeester, D., Elander, K., Johnson, M., & Sheldon, B. (1997). The impact of teaching strategies on intrinsic motivation. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED418925.pdf>. Downloaded 12/02/2021.

- [1] Cronk, M. (2012). Using Gamification to Increase Student Engagement and Participation in Class Discussion. In T. Amiel & B. Wilson (Eds.), *Proceedings of EdMedia 2012--World Conference on Educational Media and Technology* (pp. 311-315). Denver, Colorado, USA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE)
- [2] Eseryel, D., Law, V., Ifenthaler, D., Ge, X., & Miller, R. (2014). An investigation of the interrelationships between motivation, engagement and complex problem solving in game-based learning. *Educational Technology & Society*, 17(1), 42-53
- [3] Fredricks, J.A., Blumenfeld, P.C. & Paris, A.H. (2004). School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59-109.
- [4] Gilboy, M. B., Heinerichs, S., & Pazzaglia, G. (2015). Enhancing student engagement using the flipped classroom. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behaviour*, 47(1), 109-114.
- [5] Gray, J.A. & DiLoreto, M. (2016). The Effects of Student Engagement, Student Satisfaction, and Perceived Learning in daring Learning Environments. *NCPEA International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, Vol. 11, No. 1–May, 2016.
- [6] Husna, A.H. (2017). The Effect of Peer review on EFL Students' Writing Skill in Writing "Nursing Care Documentation". *Journal of English Teaching and Research*, 2(2), 109-123.
- [7] Jordan, R.R. (1999). *Academic Writing Course*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited
- [8] Kennedy, G. (2015). What is student engagement in daring learning and how do I know when it is there? Melbourne CSHE Discussion Paper, May 2020.
- [9] Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health*, 74(7), 262-273.
- [10] Krause, K.L. & Coates, H. (2008). Students' engagement in first-year university. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 493-505.
- [11] Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE: benchmarks for effective educational practices. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 35, 24-32

- [12] Moore, C. & Teather, S. (2013). Engaging students in peer review: Feedback as learning. *Issues in Educational Research*, 23(2), 2013: Special Issue.
- [13] Nguyen, H.T. (2016). Peer Feedback Practice in EFL Tertiary Writing Classes. *English Language Teaching*, Vol. 9(6), 76-91.
- [14] Oshima, A. and Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to Academic Writing*. New York: Pearson Education.
- [15] Pike, G. R., Kuh, G. D., & McCormick, A. C. (2011). An investigation of the contingent relationships between learning community participation and student engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 52(3), 300-322
- [16] Pittaway, S. (2012). Student and staff engagement: Developing an engagement framework in a Faculty of Education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(4), 37-45. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2012v37n4.8>
- [17] Richards, J.C. (2015). *Key issues in language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- [18] Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. J. (2009). A motivational perspective on engagement and disaffection: Conceptualization and assessment of children's behavioral and emotional participation in academic activities in the classroom. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 69(3), 493-525.
- [19] Stovall, I. (2003). Engagement and daring Learning (Electronic Version). UIS Community of Practice for E-Learning. <http://otel.uis.edu/copel/EngagementanddaringLearning.ppt>
- [20] Tai, H.C., Lin, W.C., & Yang, S.C. (2015). Exploring the Effects of Peer review and Teachers' Corrective Feedback on EFL Students' daring Writing Performance. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, Vol. 53(2) 284-309.
- [21] Tomas, L., Lasen, M., Field, E. & Skamp, K. (2015). Promoting daring Students' Engagement and Learning in Science and Sustainability Preservice Teacher Education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(11), 79-106.
- [22] Wefald, A. J., & Downey, R. G. (2009). Construct dimensionality of engagement and its relation with satisfaction. *Journal of Psychology*, 143(1), 91-112.
- [23] Wong, L. (2013). Student Engagement with daring Resources and Its Impact on Learning Outcomes. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Innovations in Practice*, Vol. 12.
- [24] Zahida, R., Farrah, M. & Zaru, N. (2014). The Impact of Three Types of Written Feedback on the Motivation and Writing Skill of English Major Students at Hebron University. *An - Najah Univ. J. Res. (Humanities)*. Vol. 28(5).
- [25] Zemach, D.E. and Rumisek, L.A. (2005). *Academic Writing: From paragraph to essay*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.