



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

***EFFECTIVENESS OF FACE-TO-FACE AND FACEBOOK
COLLABORATIVE WRITING IN MALAYSIAN ESL UNDERGRADUATES'
WRITING PERFORMANCE***

SITI SHUHaida BINTI SHUKOR

FPP 2014 20



**EFFECTIVENESS OF FACE-TO-FACE AND *FACEBOOK*
COLLABORATIVE WRITING IN MALAYSIAN ESL UNDERGRADUATES'
WRITING PERFORMANCE**

By

SITI SHUHaida BINTI SHUKOR

**Thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia
in the Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Science**

June 2014

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement of the degree of Master of Science

**EFFECTIVENESS OF FACE-TO-FACE AND *FACEBOOK*
COLLABORATIVE WRITING IN MALAYSIAN ESL UNDERGRADUATES'
WRITING PERFORMANCE**

By

SITI SHUHaida BINTI SHUKOR

June 2014

Chairman: Habsah Hussin, Ed.D

Faculty: Educational Studies

This study investigated the effects of *Facebook* collaborative writing on a group of English as Second Language (ESL) undergraduates' writing participants of the study were 33 second year ESL undergraduates at the Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia. They were categorized into two groups i.e. experimental and comparison groups using the matching-only design. The experimental group was assigned to *Facebook* collaborative writing tasks while the comparison group was assigned with face-to-face tasks. Face-to-face is considered as the conventional method in this study. This study employed a quasi experimental design with quantitative data. Instruments of the study were pre- and post- writing tests, as well as a set of questionnaire. The fieldwork was conducted in one semester. Data obtained were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean scores, standard deviations, frequency and percentages while inferential statistics such as independent sample t-test and paired sample t-test were utilized in finding the mean differences in the writing performance. The findings of the study indicate that there were no significant differences in the overall post-test writing performance between face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative writing and similar findings were found in content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. However, when the mean scores were compared within each group, for face-to-face collaborative writing, it was found that there were significant differences for overall writing performance ($t=-3.523, p=.003$), content ($t=-5.694, p=.000$), organization ($t=-2.743, p=.014$) and vocabulary ($t=-3.536, p=.003$) except for language use and mechanics. Meanwhile for *Facebook* collaborative writing, there were significant differences for overall writing performance ($t=-6.864, p=.000$), content ($t=-8.035, p=.000$), organization ($t=-5.730, p=.000$), vocabulary ($t=-3.083, p=.008$), language use ($t=-3.301, p=.005$) and mechanics ($t=-2.711, p=.016$) as well. Besides, perceptions towards *Facebook* collaborative writing were also found to be fairly positive with the aggregated scores ranging from (M= 3.00 to M= 3.18). As a conclusion, *Facebook* collaborative writing was proven to be a good platform in ESL learning context. The role of *Facebook* collaborative writing in writing performance was

statistically and practically significant.



© COPYRIGHT UPM

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

**KEBERKESANAN KUMPULAN PENULISAN BERSEMUKA DAN
FACEBOOK BERKOLABORASI TERHADAP PENCAPAIAN
PENULISAN PELAJAR IJAZAH SARJANA MUDA ESL DI MALAYSIA**

Oleh

SITI SHUHaida BINTI SHUKOR

Jun 2014

Pengerusi: Habsah binti Hussin, Ed.D

Fakulti: Pengajian Pendidikan

Kajian ini mengkaji kesan kumpulan penulisan berkolaborasi menggunakan *Facebook* terhadap pencapaian penulisan sekumpulan pelajar ijazah sarjana muda Bahasa Inggeris Sebagai Bahasa Kedua (ESL). Seramai 33 pelajar ESL tahun dua dari Fakulti Pengajian Pendidikan, Universiti Putra Malaysia telah terlibat di dalam kajian ini. Mereka telah dikategorikan ke dalam dua kumpulan iaitu kumpulan eksperimen dan kumpulan bandingan menggunakan kaedah rekabentuk padanan. Kumpulan eksperimen telah ditentukan ke dalam kumpulan penulisan *Facebook* manakala kumpulan bandingan pula ditentukan untuk tugas secara bersemuka. Kaedah bersemuka dianggap sebagai kaedah konvensional di dalam kajian ini. Kajian ini menggunakan kaedah separa kajian dengan data kuantitatif. Instrumen kajian yang digunakan di dalam kajian ini adalah ujian penulisan pre dan pos tempoh pengolahan serta satu set soal kaji selidik. Kerja lapangan ini telah dijalankan selama satu semester. Data yang diperolehi telah dianalisa menggunakan statistik deskriptif seperti markah purata, sisihan piawai, kekerapan dan peratus manakala statistik inferensi seperti ujian-t bebas dan ujian-t berpasangan telah digunakan bagi mencari perbezaan purata dalam pencapaian penulisan. Hasil dapatan dari kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa tiada perbezaan yang ketara bagi keseluruhan pencapaian penulisan selepas tempoh pengolahan diantara kumpulan penulisan kolaborasi bersemuka dan *Facebook* serta dapatan yang sama juga diperolehi bagi isi kandungan, struktur, perbendaharaan kata, penggunaan bahasa dan pengurusan penulisan. Walaubagaimanapun, apabila purata markah dibandingkan dalam setiap kumpulan, bagi kumpulan penulisan berkolaborasi bersemuka, terdapat perbezaan ketara bagi keseluruhan pencapaian penulisan ($t=-3.523, p=.003$), isi kandungan ($t=-5.694, p=.000$), struktur ($t=-2.743, p=.014$) dan perbendaharaan bahasa ($t=-3.536, p=.003$) kecuali bagi penggunaan bahasa dan pengurusan penulisan. Manakala bagi kumpulan penulisan berkolaborasi *Facebook*, terdapat perbezaan ketara bagi keseluruhan pencapaian penulisan ($t=-6.864, p=.000$), isi kandungan ($t=-8.035, p=.000$), struktur ($t=-5.730, p=.000$), perbendaharaan bahasa ($t=-3.083, p=.008$), penggunaan bahasa ($t=-3.301, p=.005$) serta pengurusan penulisan ($t=-2.711,$

$p=.016$). Selain itu, persepsi pelajar terhadap kumpulan penulisan berkolaborasi *Facebook* adalah positif dengan markah agregat berkadar dari ($M=3.00$ ke $M=3.18$). Sebagai kesimpulannya, kumpulan berkolaborasi *Facebook* telah terbukti sebagai landasan yang baik bagi kaedah pembelajaran Bahasa Inggeris Sebagai Bahasa Kedua. Peranan kumpulan berkolaborasi *Facebook* dalam prestasi penulisan juga didapati berkesan secara statistik dan praktikal.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my greatest gratitude to Allah S.W.T for giving me this opportunity to complete my journey until this far with many helping hands of wonderful people around me. My deepest appreciation goes to my helpful chairman, Dr. Habsah Hussin who has shown her concern, assistance and kind thoughts throughout my thesis journey. Also, I would like to thank my co-supervisor, Dr. Nooreen Noordin, who has spent her time and effort in assisting me throughout my thesis writing and was there during my viva voce to show her unconditional support. Her generous thoughts and substance of a genius will never be forgotten. I believe without supervision and assistance from both committee members, I would not be able to make it until this level.

In addition, I would like to thank the experts who had validated my questionnaire without any hassle, Dr. Abdul Rahim bin Haji Salam and Assoc. Prof. Fatimah Puteh. Thank you for the useful comments, remarks and engagement throughout this journey. Not to forget, both raters who had helped me in marking the test papers diligently, Madam Samundeeswari AP Muniandy and Miss Nurhanida binti Yang Razali. Furthermore, I would like to thank the participants, TESL Titans, who have willingly shared their precious time during the class and *Facebook* sessions.

I also wish to extend my gratitude to the Ministry of Higher Education and Universiti Perguruan Sultan Idris for providing me the financial support in completing my study and their encouragement has made me a tougher person despite all hurdles that I had gone through.

Last but not least, to my beloved husband and daughters, Shahrul Ikram bin Buyong, Nur Irdina Humaira and Nur Insyirah Hazirah, thank you for your endless support and unconditional love throughout the entire process, both by keeping up with me and always standing by me. To my beloved parents, Shukor bin Hassan and Sabariah binti Jamil, I could not thank you enough for what you have done for me especially by helping me putting the pieces together. You are my idols, my role models and my whole life. To my siblings, Siti Suriah, Mohd Shukri and Muhamad Shahir, thank you for your kind words and love in keep me going. Again, thank you everyone for believing in me and always be there when needed, through my thick and thin. My thesis dissertation would not have been possible without the help from everyone involved. May Allah bless and repay each one of you with infinity kindness. Thank you with all my heart.

APPROVAL

I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on (19 June 2014) to conduct the final examination of (Siti Shuhaida binti Shukor) on her thesis entitled “Effectiveness of Face-To-Face and *Facebook* Collaborative Writing on ESL Undergraduates’ Writing Performance” in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the (Master of Science).

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Roselan Baki, PhD

Dr.
Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Arshad Abd. Samad, PhD

Assoc. Professor Dr.
Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Rosnaini Mahmud, PhD

Dr.
Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Sarimah Shamsudin, PhD

Assoc. Professor Dr.
Educational Studies
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
Malaysia
(External Examiner)

Noritah Omar, PhD

Assoc. Professor Dr. and
Dean
School of Graduate
Studies
Universiti Putra
Malaysia

Date:

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Habsah Hussin, Ed.D

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Nooreen Noordin, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)



BUJANG BIN KIM HUAT, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

DECLARATION

Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any other institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research Rules 2012);
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software.

Signature: _____

Name and Matric No.: Siti Shuhaida binti Shukor
GS30511

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- the supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) are adhered to.

Signature: _____

Name of
Chairman of
Supervisory
Committee:

Habsah Hussin, Ed.D
Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Signature: _____

Name of
Member of
Supervisory
Committee:

Nooreen Noordin, PhD
Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
APPROVAL	vi
DECLARATION	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xv

CHAPTER

1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.0 Introduction	1
	1.1 Background of the Study	3
	1.2 Statement of the Problem	6
	1.3 Objectives of the Study	8
	1.4 Research Questions	8
	1.5 Null Hypotheses	9
	1.6 Significance of the Study	11
	1.7 Limitations of the Study	12
	1.8 Definition of Terms	13
	1.9 Summary	14
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	16
	2.0 Introduction	16
	2.1 Definitions of Writing	16
	2.2 Writing Process Approach	17
	2.3 Writing in ESL context	21
	2.4 Collaborative Writing	22
	2.5 Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL)	24
	2.6 Web 2.0	26
	2.6.1 Social Media	27
	2.6.2 <i>Facebook</i>	28
	2.6.3 <i>Facebook</i> as a Promising Instructional Tool in Malaysia Education	29
	2.6.4 Advantages of using <i>Facebook</i> in English language teaching and learning	30
	2.6.5 Disadvantages and Challenges of Using <i>Facebook</i> for English Language	32

	Teaching and Learning	
	2.7 Sociocultural Theory	32
	2.8 Past Studies	34
	2.8.1 Perceptions on <i>Facebook</i> as online learning environment	34
	2.8.2 Second Language Writing on <i>Facebook</i>	37
	2.9 Theoretical Framework of the Current Study	45
	2.10 Conceptual Framework of the Current Study	47
	2.11 Summary	48
3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	50
	3.0 Introduction	50
	3.1 Research Design	50
	3.2 Population and Sampling	52
	3.3 Location of the Study	53
	3.4 Instrumentation	53
	3.4.1 Writing test	54
	3.4.2 Writing Scale	54
	3.4.3 Questionnaire	55
	3.5 Research Procedure	56
	3.5.1 Pilot Study	56
	3.5.2 Actual Study	56
	3.5.2.1 Comparison Group	58
	3.5.5.2 Experimental Group	59
	3.5.3 The process of delegating participants in groups	60
	3.5.4 Test of normality for writing performance	63
	3.5.5 T-test analysis of Pre-test for Comparison and Experimental Groups	64
	3.6 Assessment of the Papers	65
	3.6.1 Raters	65
	3.6.2 Inter-rater reliability	67
	3.7 Threats to Internal Validity	67
	3.7.1 History	67
	3.7.2 Maturation	67
	3.7.3 Statistical Regression	67
	3.7.4 Selection	67
	3.7.5 Experimental Mortality	68
	3.7.6 Testing	68
	3.7.7 Instrumentation	68
	3.8 Data Analysis	68

	3.8 Summary	72
4	FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	73
	4.0 Introduction	73
	4.1 Demographic data	73
	4.2 Results of Writing Performance for Comparison and Experimental Groups	75
	4.3 Results of five writing components in Jacob's et al. (1981) ESL Composition Profile	76
	4.4 Null hypotheses of the study	77
	4.4.1 Null hypothesis 1: Results	77
	4.4.2 Null hypothesis 2: Results	78
	4.4.3 Null hypothesis 3: Results	79
	4.4.4 Null hypothesis 4: Results	79
	4.4.5 Null hypothesis 5: Results	80
	4.4.6 Null hypothesis 6: Results	80
	4.4.7 Null hypothesis 7: Results	81
	4.4.8 Null hypothesis 8: Results	81
	4.4.9 Null hypothesis 9: Results	82
	4.4.10 Null hypothesis 10: Results	82
	4.4.11 Null hypothesis 11: Results	83
	4.4.12 Null hypothesis 12: Results	83
	4.4.13 Null hypothesis 13: Results	84
	4.4.14 Null hypothesis 14: Results	84
	4.4.15 Null hypothesis 15: Results	85
	4.4.16 Null hypothesis 16: Results	86
	4.4.17 Null hypothesis 17: Results	86
	4.4.18 Null hypothesis 18: Results	87
	4.5 Perceptions towards <i>Facebook</i> collaborative writing	87
	4.6 Discussion of the Findings	92
	4.6.1 Effects of face-to-face and <i>Facebook</i> collaborative writing on ESL students writing performance	92
	4.6.2 Perceptions towards <i>Facebook</i> collaborative writing	94
	4.6.2.1 Students' perceptions on the use of <i>Facebook</i> as digital learning platform	95
	4.6.2.2 Students' perceptions on the use of collaborative writing in language learning	95
	4.6.2.3 Students' perceptions on the use of <i>Facebook</i> in collaborative writing for	96

	language learners	
	4.6.2.4 Effects of <i>Facebook</i> usage in collaborative writing for language learners	97
	4.11 Summary	97
5	SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	98
	5.0 Introduction	98
	5.1 Summary of the research	98
	5.2 Implications	100
	5.2.1 Theoretical Implications of the Study	100
	5.2.2 Pedagogical Implications of the Study	101
	5.3 Recommendations for Future Research	102
	5.4 Conclusion	103
	REFERENCES	104
	APPENDICES	120
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	171
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	172

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Guidelines of Data Interpretation in Perceptions Questionnaire	55
3.2 Duration of Overall Research Procedure	57
3.3 Writing Instructions of Face-to-face Collaborative Writing	58
3.4 Writing Instructions of <i>Facebook</i> Collaborative Writing.	59
3.5 Tests of Normality	61
3.6 Independent Samples t-test for Pre-test writing performance	62
3.7 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine homogeneity for each collaborative writing	63
3.8 Test of normality for writing performance based on skewness and Shapiro-wilk	63
3.9 Independent Sample t-test for Pre-test scores	64
3.10 Inter-rater reliability, Pearson Correlation	66
3.11 Summary of null hypotheses, independent and dependent variable and appropriate statistical tools for this study	69
4.1 Length of time being <i>Facebook</i> member	73
4.2 Frequency log in to <i>Facebook</i>	74
4.3 Purpose of using <i>Facebook</i>	74
4.4 Open-ended item in questionnaire ‘Other’ option	75
4.5 Descriptive analysis of Pre-test and Post-test for the comparison and the experimental groups	75
4.6 Percentages of Face-to-face and <i>Facebook</i> groups in five writing components based on Jacob’s et al. (1981) ESL Composition Profile	76
4.7 Post-test Results of Overall Writing Performance between Face-to-face and <i>Facebook</i> collaborative writing	77
4.8 Results of Post-test for five writing components in Jacob’s et al. (1981) ESL Composition Profile	78
4.9 Post-test Results of Content	78
4.10 Post-test Results of Organization	79
4.11 Post-test Results of Vocabulary	79
4.12 Post-test Results of Language Use	80
4.13 Post-test Results of Mechanics	80
4.14 Overall Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Face-to-face collaborative Writing	81
4.15 Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Face-to-face Collaborative Writing in terms of Content	81
4.16 Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Face-to-face Collaborative Writing in terms of Organization	82
4.17 Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Face-to-face Collaborative Writing in terms of Vocabulary	82
4.18 Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Face-to-face Collaborative Writing in terms of Language Use	83
4.19 Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Face-to-face Collaborative Writing in terms of Mechanics	83
4.20 Overall Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the <i>Facebook</i> collaborative Writing	84
4.21 Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the <i>Facebook</i> Collaborative Writing in terms of Content	85

4.22	Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the <i>Facebook</i> Collaborative Writing in terms of Organization	85
4.23	Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the <i>Facebook</i> Collaborative Writing in terms of Vocabulary	86
4.24	Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Face-to-face Collaborative Writing in terms of Language Use	86
4.25	Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the <i>Facebook</i> Collaborative Writing in terms of Mechanics	87
4.26	Questionnaire Results of Students' Perceptions Towards <i>Facebook</i> Collaborative Writing in Improving Writing Performance	88



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Cognitive Process Model of the Composing Process	20
2.2	Theoretical Framework of the Current Study.	46
2.3	Conceptual Framework of the Current Study.	49
3.1	Comparison Groups the Matching-only Pre-test/Post-test Design	51
3.2	Flowchart of the Methodology of the Study	60



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CALL	-	Computer Assisted Language Learning
CMC	-	Computer Mediated Communication
CMCs	-	Course Management Systems
EFL	-	English as Foreign Language
ESL	-	English as Second Language
F2F	-	Face-to-face
ICT	-	Information and Communication Technologies
IIUM	-	International Islamic University of Malaysia
L1	-	First Language
L2	-	Second Language
MUET	-	Malaysian University English Test
PMR	-	Penilaian Menengah Rendah
SPM	-	Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia
SPSS	-	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
STPM	-	Sijil Tinggi Pelajaran Malaysia
TESL	-	Teaching English as Second Language
UPM	-	Universiti Putra Malaysia
VLEs	-	Virtual Learning Environments

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

Since the early 1960s, dramatic changes on how languages are taught have been witnessed by language teachers from time to time. Multifarious changes have happened in language learning in various perspectives from reading to writing, speaking to listening which had given enormous impact in the paradigm of learning per se. With the assistance of technology in language learning, a transformation known as Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) had changed the role of computers in the language classroom. Technologies no longer existed as machines or just functioning as a machine anymore, but it has become a broad form of social proprioception (Thompson, 2007). According to Thompson (2007), social proprioception provides a sense of connectedness and awareness to others without direct communication although the communities are not within sight.

The 1970s, witnessed various initiatives being facilitated by the Malaysia government to boost a wider adoption of ICT in every field including education. Education has shifted radically over the past decade especially with the existence of World Wide Web specifically the Internet. Multimedia technologies as well as the Internet come together in the form of the World Wide Web. Prensky (2001) asserts the changes that had happened to our students' ways of learning as a radical shift. Current methodology in teaching had shifted to a different perspective unlike what previous educators had employed before. With the emergence of technologies in education repertoire, the impact on pedagogy has become more apparent. The complexity of the implementation process has also become more apparent. Lanham (1993) emphasizes the importance of integrating computers in human life and especially in education due to the fact that students nowadays deal with a lot of writing and reading on the electronic screen. He further emphasizes that most current students who were born in the latest generations, are considered as techno-savvy learners whereby almost anything are electronic-text related. For instance, students nowadays can get their lecture notes just by downloading the paper from their education portal or institution websites instead of having it in handout forms like the old days. Additionally, besides having classroom discussion, they can have also online discussion without having to meet in real life.

Technologies have offered unlimited services that are reachable from industrial automation up to the field of education. It is indeed being stressed as a promising tool for advanced support of teaching and learning process. This provides insights that both teacher and students can be showered with infinite benefits when the technologies are utilised wisely in order to provide useful information to users. Besides, these technologies have also potential in becoming powerful tools for teaching and learning purposes. Having characteristics that allow negotiation through

technologies, academic discourse communities can be created with the integration of academic writing analysis in the field of academic purposes using socio-cognitive approaches (Swales, 1990).

Additionally, new roles for users based on collective intelligence and social intelligence have been developed through innovative appearance are now playing an active part in the community by giving opinions, creating content, accessing the page, editing the information and also participating in the discussion and other activities as well. Earlier, the internet world had started with Web 1.0 where users play passive roles due to the limited passive viewing of content. Now, with the existence of Web 2.0, users are no longer assuming passive roles but they have become as a part and parcel of the content and information transmission (Cormode and Krishnan (2008). In comparison to Web 1.0, the roles have changed totally via Internet evolution. Available features and application in Web 2.0 created an urge to invest in computer-mediated collaborative knowledge learning at any levels (Grant, Owen, Sayers and Facer (2006).

As far as Web 2.0 is concerned, the advancement of technologies nowadays have allowed virtual synchronous discussions and provide useful applications that give freedom to users to share information either formally or informally in the most convenient way that one had ever imagined. Additionally, through the shared activities, learning process could be initiated and benefited by all users widely. The Internet acts not only as the medium for learning but also considered as a goldmine where people can dig in and search for whatever tools and information they like.

Social media is one of Web 2.0 tools and many existing tools have major implications for how learning takes place (Crook, Cummings, Fisher, Graber, Harrison, Lewin, Logan, Luckin, Oliver and Sharples (2008). Web 2.0 and social media applications have opened another portal where information can be transferred and collaboration can take place across borders without limitations of distance (Crook, et al. 2008). Accessible social media applications on the Internet allow connectivity within the educational environment that encourage creative thinking on how educators and students can benefit from the sharing, discussing and building upon and learning from content without limitations. Social media such as Twitter, Wikis and *Facebook* provide an interactive window on the world in real-time. The social practice of using such tools either synchronous or asynchronous collaboratively leads to active participations among users (Franklin & Van Harmelen, 2007). As Gerlach (1994) notes “when participants talk among themselves through social act, collaborative learning occurs through the talk (p.12)”.

Aside from Wikis which is widely known in collaborative writing, *Facebook* has also emerged as a promising tool for collaborative synchronous and asynchronous writing due to its evolving applications (Chang, Pearman and Farha (2012). When *Facebook* first came up, people always update their status through “Write Status” application just for the purpose of socializing. Now, with the mushrooming of various

applications via *Facebook* for instance *Facebook* group, plenty opportunities have been created which took into account the educational features in the socializing activities. For example, users can find promising platform for users to communicate and create discussion over their writing tasks. Besides comment, message and chat applications, users are offered with immensely means to have thorough discussion either synchronous or asynchronous and even open or close debate. The emergence of these tools has shifted the teaching of writing from an end-product approach to a process approach (Schultz, 2005).

Collaborative writing on the other hand, shows prominent potential in language learning either in the first language (L1) or in the second language (L2). Most studies on collaborative writing indicate that through collaborative writing, reflective thinking is encouraged and learners are assisted to have in-depth focus on grammatical accuracy, lexis, discourse and deeper understanding on the language (Storch, 2002; Hirvela, 1999; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; DiCamilla & Anton, 1997; Donato, 1994). Personal voice, the writer's interactions with community and collaborative writing are three criteria that can be found in writing instruction models. With the advancement of technology in education, such criteria are definitely matched with Web 2.0 features such as collaborative content, interactivity and personalisation (Millard and Ross, 2006).

Web 2.0 has provided a design that allows students to participate actively in a learning community (Franklin & Van Harmelen, 2007). In *Facebook* group, feature such as "Write Post" gives students the opportunity to share their thoughts and ideas over any topic discussed. On top of that, "Chat" and "Message" features give students another option if they opt to discuss discretely. Another pivotal available feature that is important in assisting writing is "Files" application which allows students either to upload a document or create a new one. Students can post comment on the uploaded documents afterwards. Such applications encourage students to be actively involved in the discussion in order to finish their final product. Kearsley (2011) emphasizes that active dialogue can be established through comments from collaboration with others and simultaneously, knowledge and other prominent principles could be constructed through self-discovery.

1.1 Background of the Study

Over the last few decades, language teaching has been considered as more of an art than a science where teachers apply their intuition, skills and conviction in their teaching. The factors of human nature and behaviour too have made it harder to treat language teaching with scientific rigor that can create better learning (Reeves, 2011). However, recent methods and approaches saw the establishment of scientific discipline as an important feature in language teaching. Hence, technologies such as the Internet more like any other technologies may contribute significantly to the education repertoire.

These technologies are getting more advanced and sophisticated that individual acquires, retains and retrieves information apparently become more distinct (Chang, et al. (2012). Learning is perceived as a process of receiving knowledge and skills, or a process of acquiring and adapting new information. In the perspective of learning through technologies, available computer programmes, software had changed the way information is imparted to people especially students. Before the existence of social media tools, multimedia elements had taken place earlier in the imparting process (Warschaeur and Healey, 1998). For example, many teachers used to implement learning software such as CD-ROMS to replace or as complement to workbooks in schools that had brought the learning perspective one step above without neglecting the pedagogical implication.

However, recent advancement in technology has brought up learning repertoire to a higher level than before. For instance, the Internet has many web sites offering learners with unlimited version of intriguing multimedia elements such as animation, video, even narrative and written text. With additional self-assistance from the sites, learning had become so much fun and easier as compared to the traditional, one-way monotonous learning (Warschaeur and Healey, 1998). In the last few years, the emergence of various social networking websites such as *MySpace*, *Friendster*, *Facebook* and many more, have changed the way our people communicate and improve interpersonal relationship to another level. The emergence of such websites has also changed ways of learning to a more interactive and engaging activity.

The presence of social networking sites and applications have provided new and exciting opportunities for educators to enlighten learning platform for students in a more dynamic, collaborative and at the same time allowing them to socialize in a positive way. Potential transformation had been incarnated through this World Wide Web for educators and students alike (Richardson, 2006). Moreover, bigger and wider collaboration could be enhanced through Web 2.0 and networks of community can be created where resources can be shared especially among students (Rasha Fouad AlCattan, 2014). These applications include blogs, forums, e-learning, wikis, social bookmarking, social-networking sites and many more.

In order to fulfil the netizens' needs especially students, an academic evolution that focuses on empowering them with vibrant skills to fully utilize such technologies should be created and implemented (Crook et al., 2008). A profound change is needed in order to deviate the focus from emphasizing on classroom disciplines only, to developing students' personal attributes more, via technologies. The educational system should be refashioned and adapted so that more interactive learning will be based on creativity and collaboration among teacher and students.

In second language learning, through the change of “read” in Web 1.0 to “read and write” in Web 2.0, educators and researchers have discovered new ways in anticipating students' active participation. Technology savvy students can learn in online social networking with proper educational activities. With unlimited access

worldwide, students are spoilt for choices with unlimited opportunities to write or speak for an international and broader audience. Online social networking sites have become alternative tools in language learning and teaching (Stanciu, Mihai and Aleca, 2012). Online social networks are no longer used for socializing. Instead it can be implemented as a platform for language learners to strengthen relevant skills in English language learning. Such application together with appropriate strategies can encourage informative conversation and collaborative content sharing worldwide. Autonomy and engagement in exchanging ideas and knowledge can be done through many social software tools for instance *Facebook*, wikis and blogs due to active roles played by students (Lee, McLoughlin & Chan, 2008; Ashton & Newman, 2006).

As one of the Web 2.0 tools, *Facebook* is a website that offers groups application of which contents can be edited by members of the page, giving opportunities for users to easily create and edit files collaboratively. In addition to that, *Facebook* group's privacy settings can be arranged to either open, closed or secret which allow students to work in group discreetly. Students no longer need to be afraid with the idea that lecturers might be able to access their profiles anymore. Wan Rusli Wan Ahmad and Nuraihan Md Daud (2011) point out in their research that students are normally against the idea on using *Facebook* in classroom setting due to invasion of privacy. However, with the evolving application, *Facebook* has offered group page which could initiate activities without intruding students' privacy life. In *Facebook* group, it entails no "Add Friend" connection (Wan Rusli Wan Ahmad and Nuraihan Md Daud, 2011). Everyone can be members of the group without the need to add others. In spite of that, students are still able to receive notifications made by the group members in every post and comment. This gives a huge advantage to researchers in tracking students' activities in the *Facebook* group.

The idea of integrating social networks and language teaching and learning is not widely employed in the education setting due to its initial purpose which is for socializing only. In fact, some scholars also emphasized that they could not see the relation of *Facebook* and any Web 2.0 tools in teaching and learning repertoire and identified them as inappropriate platform for that purposes (Waycott, Bennett, Kennedy, Dalgarno & Gray, 2010; Salaway, Caruso & Nelson, 2007; Lohnes & Kinzer, 2007). However, recent studies conducted by researchers from all over the world might have changed people's perception about social networking sites. With regards to writing, it is seen as the most difficult skill among the four skills involved in language learning. Some scholars also agree that writing is difficult to learn compared to other skills in language learning such as reading, listening and speaking. As Tribble (1996) identifies writing as "a language skill which is difficult to acquire" (p.3). It "normally requires some form of instruction" and "is not a skill that is readily picked up by exposure" (Tribble, 1996, p. 11). In Malaysia, writing skill has been taught since primary school until tertiary level of education. However, the quality of students' writing is still questionable despite their many years of exposure and learning the shells. Since all the four skills are taught integratedly, little time is provided to emphasize on each skill.

In response to writing problems among ESL learners, collaborative practices are seen as great potential and solutions to be advocated in second language classrooms. Through collaboration, students' interest to be involved in collaborative writing can be increased (Kessler & Bikowski, 2010; Elola & Oskoz, 2010; Arnold, Ducate and Kost, 2009; Kessler, 2009; Storch, 2005). Usually, collaborative activities involve pair work project, and not many activities with more than two writers could be found. Storch (2005) also emphasizes that collaboration that involves more than two writers are difficult to find in collaborative writing projects and actually undertaken. Besides, he also points out there were only a small number of research studies for these types of projects and "scant attention" especially on students' views on writing collaborations, the processes involved and the produced output (p, 155).

Conversely, with the emergence of technologies such as Web 2.0 tools, activities like reading, writing and responding (replying to comments) can be done over the Internet more easily and not only restricted to pair work activities, but with more than two writers at the same time. Web 2.0 offers researchers as well as educators huge opportunities on how to integrate collaborative writing in the technologies and give additional insight in comprehending the effect from such technologies in collaborative writing process (Kessler et al., 2012). These activities can be realised due to the nature of Web 2.0 which allows many-to-many instead one-to-one communication only. In addition, composition or writing is still widely used as one of the methods to test language skills not merely in English but in other languages as well. The notion of studying students' writing ability in composition or essay forms does not only result in high motivation for writing but also acted as an excellent backwash effect on teaching (Ping Wan, 2009).

With the emergence of technologies such as web-based platforms has created another space for students to be involved in interactive and stimulating learning experience in an informal learning environment. The advancement of technologies provides students a place to practice their English in a non-intimidating way, safer, more anonymous and change their insecurity and fear of making errors gradually outside classroom teaching. Most research related to Web 2.0 tools have pointed out the advantages that students and educators can gain in the implementation of such tools in writing. This view is supported by Hoopingarner (2009) who strongly agrees that "writing process can be enhanced through the Web 2.0 tools and encourage them to show their final output of writings" (p. 228). Thus, this study hopes to shed some useful insights for educators especially writing instructors and educators.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Writing is a challenging task even in L1. In order to practice writing activities, it usually consumes the individual's time and involves physical efforts. Many learners perceive writing as a mundane activity and with additional obstacles in linguistics, psychological and cognitive problems, writing is seen as the least favourite activity among the four skills in language learning. People barely produce any written

products be it on a piece of paper or in any technology devices such as computers, smart phones and word based gadgets. But, in English learning, writing is one of unavoidable activities to be done in the process of mastering the four language skills.

ESL learners with writing problems usually face difficulties in social and cognitive challenges related to second language acquisition (Myles, 2002). This results in the inability to produce good, quality essays and has jeopardized the flow of the teaching and learning process in ESL classes. Although many ESL learners at university have general understanding of grammar rules, not many are able to write academically at levels expected of them (Noriah et al. 2012). This is due to many of them who were not keen enough to make proper planning before writing and were not drafting or revising seriously ((Noriah Ismail, Sumarni Maulan and Nor Haniza Hassan, 2008). Students with poor English writing skills usually reduce the chances to be hired by either government or private sectors. Consequently, the rate of unemployed graduated students is rising due to the lack of quality skills especially in the English language (Zaliza Hanapi and Mohd Safarin Nordin (2014).

A good piece of writing requires students to practice efficient strategies in the writing process. This is what our students often lack of. Most of them fail to plan what they want to write. According to Noriah Ismail et al. (2008), students usually write in one process without attempting to plan and review sufficiently. In addition, another prominent problem in writing is that many ESL teachers ignore students' engagement and interest towards the writing activities and provided tasks (Noriah Ismail et al., 2010). Successful writing will only take place if the ESL teachers consider these factors seriously.

Besides writing in a conventional classroom teaching, teachers can expose students to other writing methods for variety in teaching writing skills, for example the use of collaborative writing. Collaborative writing is not a new method in ESL context. In this digital age, students can experience a new level of collaborative activities. Students are no longer required to meet up for the collaborative learning to take place. Besides, a more personalized attention and dialogue interaction is able to be established through the use of technologies. This can be achieved via innovative learning method such as online learning instruction (Supyan Hussin, 2006). In this current study, a social networking site, *Facebook* was utilized as a platform in collaborative writing in order to address students' writing problems and overcome their weaknesses in writing skill.

From this study, the researcher hopes that the educators and writing instructors will urge their students to make use of the additional writing instructions using social networking site like *Facebook* outside of class time. Therefore, the present study was carried out in an attempt to find out whether *Facebook* has the potential to improve students' writing performance through collaborative writing activities or otherwise.

Additionally, the study also investigated students' perceptions towards the use of Facebook collaborative writing on ESL undergraduates' writing performance.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are:

- 1.3.1 To investigate the effect of face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative by comparing:
 - 1.3.1.1 the overall writing performance of the face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative writing of ESL students in terms of their post-test scores.
 - 1.3.1.2 the writing performance of the face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative writing of ESL students in terms of their post-test scores based on five main categories: content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics.
 - 1.3.1.3 the overall writing performance of the face-to-face collaborative writing of ESL students in terms of the pre- and post- test scores.
 - 1.3.1.4 the overall writing performance of the Facebook collaborative writing of ESL students in terms of the pre- and post- test scores.
 - 1.3.1.5 the writing performance of the face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative writing based on five main categories: content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics.
- 1.3.2 To investigate the ESL students' perceptions toward *Facebook* collaborative writing on their writing performance.

1.4 Research Questions

- 1.4.1 Is there any significant difference between the face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students?:
 - 1.4.1.1 overall writing performance in the post-test?
 - 1.4.1.2 writing performance in the post-test in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics?
- 1.4.2 Is there any significant difference between the face-to-face collaborative writing of ESL students' pre- and post-test writing performance:

- 1.4.2.1 overall?
- 1.4.2.2 in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics?
- 1.4.3 Is there any significant difference between the *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students' pre- and post-test writing performance:
 - 1.4.3.1 overall?
 - 1.4.3.2 in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics?
- 1.4.4 What are ESL students' perceptions toward *Facebook* collaborative writing on their writing performance?

1.5 Null Hypotheses:

There is no significant difference between the face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students' writing performance.

H₀ 1: There is no significant difference between the face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students' overall post-test mean scores.

H₀ 2: There is no significant difference between the face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students' post test mean scores in terms of content.

H₀ 3: There is no significant difference between the face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students' post-test mean scores in terms of organization.

H₀ 4: There is no significant difference between the face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students' post-test mean scores in terms of vocabulary.

H₀ 5: There is no significant difference between the face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students' post-test mean scores in terms of language use.

H₀ 6: There is no significant difference between the face-to-face and *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students' post-test mean scores in terms of mechanics.

There is no significant difference between the pre- and post-test writing performance of the face-to-face collaborative writing on ESL students.

H₀ 7: There is no significant difference between the overall pre-and post-test mean scores of the face-to-face collaborative writing on ESL students.

H₀ 8: There is no significant difference between the overall pre- and post-test mean scores of the face-to-face collaborative writing on ESL students in terms of content

H₀ 9: There is no significant difference between the overall pre- and post-test mean scores of the face-to-face collaborative writing on ESL students in terms of organization.

H₀ 10: There is no significant difference between the overall pre- and post-test mean scores of the face-to-face collaborative writing on ESL students in terms of vocabulary.

H₀ 11: There is no significant difference between the overall pre- and post-test mean scores of the face-to-face collaborative writing on ESL students in terms of language use.

H₀ 12: There is no significant difference between the overall pre- and post-test mean scores of the face-to-face collaborative writing on ESL students in terms of mechanics.

There is no significant difference between the pre- and post-test writing performance of the *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students.

H₀ 13: There is no significant difference between the overall pre- and post-test mean scores of the *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students.

H₀ 14: There is no significant difference between the overall pre- and post-test mean scores of the *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students in terms of content.

H₀ 15: There is no significant difference between the overall pre- and post-test mean scores of the *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students in terms of organization.

H₀ 16: There is no significant difference between the overall pre- and post-test mean scores of the *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students in terms of vocabulary.

H₀ 17: There is no significant difference between the overall pre- and post-test mean scores of the *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students in terms of language use.

H₀ 18: There is no significant difference between the overall pre- and post-test mean scores of the *Facebook* collaborative writing on ESL students in terms of mechanics.

1.6 Significance of the study

The nature of teaching and learning has undergone a substantial change in the past 20 years and continues to change. In line with the change, technologies have also evolved from allowing us to do work on a computer to enabling us to read information from tablets or smart phones. The existence of new environments like virtual world has created additional opportunities and challenges for teaching and learning especially in the ESL context. Therefore, this current study is hopefully to shed light to education stakeholders in tertiary level of education in order to keep up with the advancement of technology. The significance of this study is to utilize students' interest on *Facebook* since this particular social network has been used frequently as socializing platform. *Facebook* applies some of CMC features that allow students to share, tag and like pictures, links, give comments either synchronous or asynchronous with people around the world at ease. The available features are believed to be used for academic purposes by utilizing collaboration element through comment and files application in *Facebook* group. Studies show that students actively post and respond by giving comments on the wall of their own or others because they feel obliged to do so (Melor Md. Yunus, Hadi Salehi., Choo Hui Sun, Jessica Yong Phei Yen, and Lisa Kwan Su Li, 2012). As a result, students are able to practice their writing skills through giving comments as supported by Kabilan, Norlida and Jafre (2010) in their study that writing structures were improved by reading peers' comments and posts on the wall. Therefore, this study had employed *Facebook* group as a platform for ESL students to practice their writing skills using guided guidelines as proposed by Flower and Hayes (1981) for novice writers.

Apart from that, this study also is hoped to shed some insights to educators by giving ideas on how to integrate Web 2.0 tool specifically social networking in teaching specifically writing composition per se. From the result of this study, it is hoped that it can lead to improvement in language teaching. As far as the English language is concerned, teaching and learning English could be a daunting task even for students who demonstrate good literacy in English. Learning from Web 2.0 tools specifically social media tools can provide students and teacher with extra opportunities in teaching and learning English from the comfort of their own homes or any places they want to. Web 2.0 can engage students in active learning whereby they can develop, create, and share their thoughts online. Thus, an attempt to develop pedagogic support for Web 2.0 tools using social networking websites will enable educators to find the potential impacts of its use in education. Moreover, it is believed that in the future, the use of this type of tools will be a fundamental part of communication with students in both teaching and learning academically.

Albeit there are many advantages of the use of social media in language learning, it is found that there were only few documented studies on use of *Facebook* and face-to-face in collaborative writing. Hence, in these circumstances students should be exposed to writing in social networking academically so that they will be able to practice their writing skill not only in a classroom but also outside formal classroom

as well. The perception that differentiates between writing in social networking as ‘communication’ and writing in classroom as ‘writing’ hope to be changed accordingly.

Conversely, with regards to *Facebook* nature, it does not have complete features similar to actual processing words tools likewise Ms. Words or other social networking site that has more complete words processing tools than *Facebook* like Wikis. In *Facebook*, there are only eight words functions for instance bold, italic, underline, numbering, bullets, spacing, title box and spell-check feature. Therefore, due to this limitation, *Facebook* might not be available to show the process of drafting, revising and finalizing the essays writing clearly.

Additionally, from this study, educators may also find the easiest and cheapest ways to engage students actively in the learning through the social media. Despite social media has been used widely by instructors and students yet very little valid evidence is available concerning the use of social networking sites on students’ engagement in learning as well. This is the duty of the educators to manipulate the available platform and make it beneficial to the teaching and learning field. With proper exposure to the use of *Facebook*, learners are being well-guided and able to make their learning more personalized as well as fun simultaneously.

1.7 Limitations of the study

One of the limitations of this study is that the respondents were from one intact class only. A class of undergraduate ESL students from the Faculty of Educational Studies was chosen to participate in the *Facebook* collaborative writing. Therefore, due to the small number of sample, results may not be implied beyond the specific population which the sample was drawn which in this case to the rest of the population of ESL undergraduates in Malaysia. This group could not represent the whole population. Additionally, there is also the probability in terms of small number of sample or there are people who refuse to participate in this study or even there might be some of the respondents who drop out part way through. Besides, there also might be another obstacle in terms of time constraint. Since this study has nothing to do with participants’ curriculum activity, some of the writing activities might interfere with their existing curriculum schedules. Hence, it will affect the result of the finding to this study.

Additionally, this research utilized *Facebook* as a medium in collaborative writing. In order to create homogenous criteria for comparison and experimental groups, there was no teacher’s feedback for comparison because in experimental group, they utilized *Facebook* as a part of their treatment without getting feedback from teacher. Thus having teacher’s feedback will affect the outcome and result to biasness and become a threat to this study in terms of homogeneity.

1.8 Definition of Terms

In the present study, the following definitions are provided to ensure uniformity and comprehension of these terms throughout the study. The key terms used in the study are as follows:

Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL)

Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) as defined by Levy (1997: 1) is “the search for and study of applications of the computer in language teaching and learning”. It is a field about language learning that includes computer technologies along the learning process.

Second Language (L2)

L2 stands for second language or foreign language which any language a person knows, is learning or is acquiring in addition to their native language or mother tongue. In Malaysia, English is the second language. Therefore, students who learn English in Malaysia are considered as L2 learners.

English as a Second Language (ESL)

According to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (2005), “English as a Second Language refers to the teaching of English as a foreign language to people who are living in a country in which English is either the first or second language.” (p. 517). In this study the ESL learners comprised of a total of 33 second year undergraduates from Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC)

Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) is defined as transaction between networked computers that consists of communicative actions. The examples of CMC are instant messages, e-mails, chat rooms as well as text messaging.

Facebook

Facebook refers to a popular online social networking site that is used to accommodate students in collaborative writing for the present study. *Facebook* is free for everyone and does not require any fees upon registration and user-friendly in terms of interface and functions. In this study, students’ personal accounts were not intruded due to the use of *Facebook* group application.

Face-to-face

A face-to-face communication is a process of conveying information in real time by sender and receiver. In this current study, face-to-face collaborative writing refers to a group of students who meet in a classroom setting and have discussion using the conventional method for the collaborative writing tasks.

Writing Performance

Writing performance in this study refers to the scores obtained by respondents in pre-writing test and post-writing test given by two raters (see Appendix A). The proportion of marking scheme is based on Jacobs' et al. (1981) ESL Composition Profile namely content (30%), vocabulary (20%), organization (20%), language use (25%) and mechanics (5%). However, there are many factors that could influence students' scores such as teachers' feedback, motivation and anxiety level. To ensure the groups' homogeneity, such factors were not considered throughout this study.

Collaborative Writing

According to Wells (2000), collaborative writing is an activity that requires people to work together in the writing activity by creating and re-creating knowledge in the discourse. Meanwhile, according to Farkas (1991), collaborative writing can have more than two writers to compose, modify, edit, or review a document based on the ideas of the persons. In this study, the face-to-face collaborative writing consisted of three groups of four and one group of five people meanwhile *Facebook* collaborative writing consisted of four groups of four members.

Comparison group

In this study, the comparison group is a group that received conventional treatment of face-to-face collaborative writing instead of not having any treatment at all. According to Krathwohl (1993) and Campbell and Stanley (1963), there is no control group in a quasi experimental research and this kind of group is recognized as 'treatment' and 'comparison' group. Although there was no control group, the researcher used this comparison group as control group meanwhile the treatment group as experimental group.

1.9 Summary

In this chapter, the researcher has explained the background of the study. The role of Web 1.0, Web 2.0, social networking, collaborative writing, writing problem in ESL in education has also been explained thoroughly. The statement of problem was also discussed in detail and suggestions to solve the problem through this study were also pointed out either theoretically or practically. The limitation of this study will be

useful guideline for future researchers to consider. There are also definitions of terms presented to describe certain terminology involved in the study.



© COPYRIGHT UPM

REFERENCES

- 2008 *Horizon Report*. (2008). The New Media Consortium. Retrieved on June 2013, 8 from: <http://www.nmc.org/pdf/2008-Horizon-Report.pdf>
- Abdul Hameed Abdul Majid, Siti Hamin Stapa & Yuen, C.K. (2012). Blended Scaffolding Strategies through *Facebook* to Aid Learning and Improving the Writing Process and Writing Performance. *Iosr Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSRJHSS)*. Volume 1, Issue 4 (Sept-Oct 2012), PP 36-40.
- Ageyev, V.S., Miller, S. (Eds.). (2003) *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ahmad, K., Corbett. G., Rogers, M. & Sussex, R. (1985). *Computers, language learning and language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ajjan, H., & Hartshorne, R. (2008). "Investigating faculty decisions to adopt Web 2.0 technologies: Theory and empirical tests." *The Internet and Higher Education*, 11(2), 71-80.
- Alavi, M. (1994) Computer-Mediated Collaborative Learning: An Empirical Evaluation, *MIS Quarterly*, 18,(2), 159 –174.
- Allen, K. (2005). Online Learning: Constructivism and conversation as an approach to learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 42(3), 247-256.
- Arnold, N., & Ducate, L. (2006). Future foreign language teachers' social and cognitive collaboration in an online environment. *Language Learning & Technology*, 10(1), 42-66. Retrieved March 21, 2012, from <http://ilt.msu.edu/vol10num1/arnoldducate/default.html>
- Arnold, N., Ducate, L., & Kost, C. (2009). Collaborative writing in wikis: Insights from culture projects in intermediate German classes. In L. Lomicka & G. Lord (Eds.), *The next generation: Social networking and online collaboration in foreign language learning* (pp. 115–144). CALICO Monograph Series Volume 5. San Marcos: Texas State University
- Ary, D, Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A (2002). *Introduction to Research in Education*. 6th Edition. California:Wadsworth Group/Thomson Learning Inc.
- Ashton, J., & Newman, L. (2006). An unfinished symphony: 21st century teacher education using knowledge creating heutagogies. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 37(6) 825-840. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00662.x.
- Bailey, K. M. (1998). *Learning about language assessment:Dilemmas, decisions, and directions*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Barnard, R. & Campbell, L. (2005). Sociocultural theory and the teaching of process writing: The scaffolding of learning in a university context. *The TESOLANZ Journal*, 13, 76-88.

- Bartlett-Bragg, A. (2006). "Reflections on pedagogy: reframing practice to foster informal learning with social software." Retrieved on Jan 3, 2013 from <http://www.dream.sdu.dk/uploads/files/Anne%20Bartlett-Bragg.pdf>.
- Belisle, R. (1996). E-mail Activities in the ESL Writing Class. The internet TESL Journal, 2(12). Retrieved on December 2, 2013 from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Belisle-Email.html>.
- Berge, Z. and Collins, M. (1995). *Computer-Mediated Communication and the Online Classroom in Distance Learning*. Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- Bernard, R.M., Rojo de Rubalcava, B., & St-Pierre, D. (2000). Collaborative online distance learning: Issues for future practice and research. *Distance Education*, 21 (2), 260-269.
- Biggs, J. (1987). *Student approaches to learning and studying*. Hawthorne, Vic.: ACER
- Blattner, G., & Fiori, M. (2009). "Facebook in the language classroom: Promises and Possibilities." *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, 6(1). Retrieved on May 5, 2012 from http://www.itdl.org/journal/jan_09/article02.htm.
- Bonk, C. J., & Graham, C. R. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer Publishing.
- Bosch, T. E. (2009). Using online social networking for teaching and learning: Facebook use at the University of Cape Town. *Communicatio*, 35 (2), 185 – 200. Doi: 10.1080/02500160903250648.
- Boyle, T. (2005). A dynamic, systemic method for developing blended learning. *Education, Communication & Information*, 5(3), 221-232.
- Budiman, A. (2008). *Virtual online communities: A study of internet based community interactions* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Scripps College of Communication of Ohio University, Ohio.
- Bugeja, M. J. (2006). Facing the Facebook. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January, 27, C1. Classroom, 11–23. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Byrne, D. (1988). *Teaching Writing Skills*. Harlow: Longman.
- Campbell, D. & Stanley, J. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally.
- Campbell, Donald T. (1970). "Reforms as Experiment", *American Psychologist* Vol. 24. No. 4, S. 409–429.
- Chang, C-W., Pearman, C. J. and Farha, N. (2012). Second Language Acquisition: Implications of Web 2.0 and Beyond. *Academy for Educational Studies*. 3(2).
- Che Musa, N. Koo Y. L, & Azman, H. (2012). Exploring English Language Learning and Teaching in Malaysia. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*. Volume 12(1), Special Section, January 2012 (pp. 35-51).

- Cheong, C. Y. M. & Chow, D. U. T. (1998). Sub-stratum Transfer among Low Proficiency Students in Written English. Retrieved May 12, 2013, from: <http://melta.org.my/modules/sections>.
- Cloete, S., Villiers, C. D, Roodt, S. (2009). *Facebook* as an academic tool for ICT lecturers. South Africa: SACLA '09.
- Coirier, P., Andriessen, J. E. B., & Chanquoy, L. (1999). From planning to translating: The specificity of argumentative writing. In J.E.B. Andriessen & P. Coirier (Eds.), *Foundations of argumentative text processing*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Conroy, M. A. (2010). Internet tools for language learning: University students taking control of their writing. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 26(6), 861-882. <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet26conroy.html>.
- Cormode, G. and Krishnamurthy, B. (2008). Key differences between Web 1.0 and Web 2.0. *First Monday*, 13(6). <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2125/1972>.
- Cotten S.R. (2008) Students' technology use and the impacts on well-being. In *Using Emerging Technologies to Enhance Student Engagement. New Directions for Student Services Issue #124 (eds R. Junco & D.M. Timm)*, pp. 55–70. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Criswell, E.L. (1989). *The Design of Computer-Based Instruction*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Crook, C. Cummings, J., Fisher, T., Graber, R., Harrison, C., Lewin, C., Logan, K., Luckin, R., Oliver, M. and Sharples, M. (2008). Web 2.0 technologies for learning: The current landscape – opportunities, challenges and tensions. Retrieved July 9, 2014, from <http://www.becta.org.uk>.
- Denscombe, M. (2007). *The Good Research Guide for Small Scale Social Research Projects* (3rd edition). NY: Open University Press.
- DiCamilla, F., & Antón, M. (1997). Repetition in the collaborative discourse of L2 learners: A Vygotskian perspective. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 53, 609–633.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–56). Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Driscoll, M. (2000). *Psychology of learning for instruction* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ebinezar, J. (1997) Writers Block in Process of Writing: A Case Study. *Unpublished term paper for B. Ed. (TESL)* Universiti Putra Malaysia.

- Ebner M., Lienhardt C., Rohs M. & Meyer I. (2010) Microblogs in higher education – a chance to facilitate informal and process-oriented learning. *Computers & Education* 55, 92–100. forthcoming.
- Ede, L. and A. Lunsford (1990): *Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaborative*
- Elola, I. & Oskoz, A. (2010). Collaborative Writing: Fostering Foreign Language and Writing Conventions Development. *Language Learning & Technology. Volume 14, Number 4, pp 51-71*. Retrieved 15 March 2012, from: <http://llt.msu.edu/vol14num3/elolaoskoz.pdf>
- Falsgraf, C., & Semmer, M. (2004). Standards-based Measurement of Proficiency. *Learning languages, 10(1)*. Rubric available at www.avantassessment.com and used with permission
- Flower, L. & Hayes, J. R. (1981). *College Composition and Communication*. Vol. 32, No. 4. Pp. 365-387. Retrieved May 2013, 22 from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/356600>
- Fogarty, R., & McTighe, J. (1993). Educating Teachers for Higher Order Thinking: The Three-Story Intellect Theory into Practice. *Teaching for Higher Order Thinking, 32(3)*, 161-169.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education, Eighth Edition*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill International Edition.
- Franklin, T. & Van Harmelen, M. (2007). *Web 2.0 for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*. London: The Observatory of Borderless Higher Education. Retrieved April 3, 2012 from <http://www.obhe.ac.uk/resources-new/pdf/651.Pdf>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Seabury Press
- Garrison, R. & Kanuka, H (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering transformative potential in higher education. *Internet and Higher Education, 7(2)*, 95-105.
- Garlikov, R. (2000) Significant Differences Between Writing and Talking: Why Talking Seems Easier. Retrieved October 10, 2012 from: <http://www.garlikov.com/talkwrite.htm>
- Garrison, D.R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education, 2(2-3)*, 87-105.
- Gay, L. R. & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application, 6th edn*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gay, L. R. & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application, 7th edn*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Gerlach, J. M. (1994). "Is this collaboration?" In Bosworth, K. and Hamilton, S. J. (Eds.), *Collaborative Learning: Underlying Processes and Effective Techniques*, New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 59.
- Gilliver, R. S., Randall, B. & Pok, Y.M (1998), 'Learning in cyberspace: shaping the future', *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, Vol. 14(14), 212-222.
- Glassman, M. & Wang, Y. (2004). On the interconnected nature of interpreting Vygotsky: Rejoinder to Gredler and Shields does no one read Vygotsky's words. *Educational Researcher*, 33, 19-22.
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2008). Emerging Technologies Mobile-Computing Trends: Lighter, Faster, Smarter. *Language Learning and Technologies*, 12(3), 3-9. Retrieved December 2012, 12, from: <http://llt.msu.edu/issues/june2011/emerging.pdf>
- Gokhale, A. A. (1995). Collaborative learning enhances critical thinking. *Journal of Technology Education*, 7(1), 22-30.
- Graham, C. R. (2006). Blended learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions. In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs* (pp. 3-21). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer Publishing.
- Grant, L., Owen, M., Sayers, S. and Facer, K. (2006). Social software and learning. Opening Education Reports. Bristol: Futurelab. Retrieved November 5, 2012, from: [http://www.futurelab.org.uk/resources/documents/opening_education/Social Software report.pdf](http://www.futurelab.org.uk/resources/documents/opening_education/Social_Software_report.pdf)
- Gredler, M.E. (1997). *Learning and instruction: Theory into practice* (3rd ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Greenspan, A. (2001). *The growing need for skills in the 21st century*. US Department of Labor 21st Century Workforce Summit [article en linia]. Washington. Retrieved December 2012, 12, from: <http://www.federalreserve.gov/boarddocs/speeches/2000/20000405.htm>
- Grossec G. & Holotescu C. (2009) Can we use Twitter for educational activities? Proceedings of the 4th International Scientific Conference: eLearning and Software for Education, Bucharest, Romania. Retrieved December 2012, 12, from: http://adlunap.ro/eLSE_publications/papers/2008/015.-97.1.Grossec%20Gabriela-Can%20we%20use.pdf
- Habsah Hussin. (1999). *The effects of Selected Critical Reading Strategies on Critical Reading performance of Selected Malaysian ESL Secondary School Students*, Unpublished Master Thesis, UKM.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (Ed.), 1991. *Assessing Second Language Writing in Academic Contexts*. Ablex, Nor-wood, NJ

- Hargittai, E. & Hsieh, Y.P.(2010). Predictors and Consequences of Differentiated Social Network Site Usage. *Information, Communication and Society*, 13(4):515-536.
- Hatime, C. & Zeynep, K. (2012). Effects of Peer E-Feedback on Turkish EFL Students' Writing Performance. *The Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 46(1), 61-84.
- Haverback, H. 2009. *Facebook: Uncharted territory in a reading education classroom*, Reading Today, 27(2), 2009.
- Healey D. & Johnson N. (1995b) "A brief introduction to CALL". In Healey D. & Johnson N. (eds.) *1995 TESOL CALL interest section software list* Alexandria, VA: TESOL Publications: iii-vii. in Mark Warschauer
- Herschbach, D. (1994). Addressing vocational training and retaining through educational technology: Policy alternatives. In Lee, K.W. (2000). *English Teachers' Barrier to the Use of Computer-assisted Language Learning*. Retrieved January 2012, 12, from: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Lee-CALLbarriers.html>
- Higgings, R., Hartley, P., & Skelton, A. (2002). The conscientious consumer: Reconsidering the role of assessment feedback in student learning. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(1), 53-64.
- Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), (2007). *College freshmen and online social networking sites*. Retrieved February 2014, 2, from <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/PDFs/pubs/briefs/brief-091107-ocialNetworking.pdf>
- Hirvela, A. (1999). Collaborative writing: Instruction and communities of readers and writers. *TESOL Journal*, 8(2), 7-12.
- Hoopingarner, D. (2009). Best practices in technology and language teaching. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 3(1), 222-235. doi:10.1111/j.1749-818x.2008.00123.x Retrieved February 2012, 7, from: http://www.pewinternet.org/w/media/Files/Reports/2009/PIP_Generations_2009.pdf
- Hrastinski, S. (2009). A theory of online learning as online participation. *Computers and Education*, 52, 78-82. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978).
- Hughes A. (2009) *Higher education in a Web 2.0 world. JISC Report*. Retrieved January 2013, 2 from: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/publications/heweb20rptv1.pdf>.
- Hughes A. Jones S. & Fox S. (2009) *Generations online in 2009*. Data memo. Pew Internet and American Life Project, Washington, DC. Retrieved December 2011, 23 from: http://www.pewinternet.org/~media/Files/Reports/2009/PIP_Generations_2009.pdf
- Huot, B. (1996). Towards a new theory of writing assessment. *College Composition and Communication*, 47(4), 549-566.

- Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S.A., Wormouth, D.R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*. Rowely, MA: Newbury House.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1994). *Cooperative learning in the classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Jonassen, D.H., Land, S.M.: Preface. *Theoretical Foundations of Learning Environments*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, pp. iii – ix (2000)
- Jones, S., & Fox, S. (2009). Generations online in 2009. Data memo. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project. Retrieved July 6, 2012, from.
- Junco R. & Mastrodicasa J. (2007) *Connecting to the Net. Generation: What Higher Education Professionals Need to Know about Today's Students*. NASPA, Washington, DC.
- Kabilan, M. K. (2007). English language teachers reflecting on reflections: A Malaysian experience. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(4), 681–705.
- Kabilan. M.K., Ahmad, N. and Zainol Abidin, M.J., (2010). *Facebook: An online environment for learning of English in institutions of higher education?*. *Internet and Higher Education* 13, 179-187.
- Karpati, A. (2009). Web 2 technologies for net native language learners: A “social CALL.” *ReCALL*, 21(2), 139-156.
- Kavanaugh-Brown, J. (1998). Online or offline teacher training: What is best? *Converge*, 1(11). In Velazquez-Torres, N. (2006), *How Well Are ESL Teachers Being Prepared to Integrate Technology in Their Classrooms?*, *TESL-EJ*, Vol. 9, No 4, 2.
- Kearsley, G. (2011). The theories. In *Explorations in learning & instruction: The theory into practice database (condition of learning)*. Retrieved Feb 21, 2012, from <http://tip.psychology.org/gagne.html>.
- Kessler, G. (2009). Student-Initiated Attention to Form in Wiki-Based Collaborative Writing. *Language Learning & Technology. Volume 13, Number 1, pp 79-95*. Retrieved 15 March 2012, from <http://llt.msu.edu/vol13num1/kessler.pdf>
- Kessler, G., & Bikowski, D. (2010). Developing collaborative autonomous language learning abilities in computer mediated language learning: Attention to meaning among students in wiki space. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23, 41-58. doi:10.1080/09588220903467335
- Kessler, G., Bikowski, D., & Boggs, J. (2012). Collaborative Writing among Second Language Learners in Academic Web-Based Projects. *Language Learning & Technology. Volume 16, Number 1, pp 91-109*. Retrieved 7 March 2013, from <http://llt.msu.edu/issues/february2012/kesslerbikowskiboggs.pdf>
- Kim, I.S. (2009). The relevance of multiple intelligences to CALL instruction. *The Reading Matrix*, 9(1), 1-21.

- Ko, S., & Rossen, S. (2001). *Teaching online: A practical guide*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Kolek, E., & Saunders, D. (2008). Online disclosure: An empirical examination of undergraduate *Facebook* profiles. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 45(1), 1–25.
- Kowal, M. and Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness* 3/2: 73-93.
- Kozulin, A., Gindis, B., Ageyev, V.S., Miller, S. M. (2003). Socio-cultural theory and education: Students, teachers and knowledge. In: Kozulin, A., Gindis, B., Ageyev, V.S., Miller, S. (Eds.). (2003) *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Krathwohl , D.R. (1993). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Kwong, V. (2007). Reach out to your students using MySpace and *Facebook*. *Indiana Libraries*, 26(3), 53–57.
- Lado, R. (1964). *Language Teaching: A scientific Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lam, F. S., & Pennington, M. C. (1993). The Computer vs. the Pen: A Comparative Study of Word Processing in a Hong Kong Secondary Classroom. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning*, 8(1), 75-92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0958822950080106>
- Lanham, R.A. (1993). *The electronic word: Democracy, technology, and the arts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, M. J. W., McLoughlin, C. & Chan, A. (2008). Talk the talk: Learner-generated podcasts as catalysts for knowledge creation. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(3), 501-521
- Lempe, C., Ellison, N., & Steinfield, C. (2006). A face(book) in the crown: Social searching vs. social browsing. Proceedings of the 20th Anniversary Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, Banff, Alberta, Canada.
- Levy M. (1997). *CALL: context and conceptualisation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lightbown, P.M. and Spada, N. (2000). *How Languages are Learned: Revised Edition*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Lockyer, L., & Patterson, J. (2008). “Integrating social networking technologies in education: A case study of a formal learning environment.” In Proceedings of 8th IEEE International conference on advanced learning technologies (pp. 529-533). Spain: Santander.

- Lohnes, S. and Kinzer, C. (2007). "Questioning Assumptions about Students Expectations for Technology in College Classrooms." *Innovate*. Volume 3, Issue 5. Retrieved September 26, 2012 from http://www.innovateonline.info/pdf/vol3_issue5/questioning_assumptions_about_students%27_expectations_for_technology_in_college_classrooms.pdf
- Long, M. (1996): the role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In De la Fuente, M. J. (2003). Is SLA interactionist theory relevant to CALL? A study on the effects of computer-mediated interaction in L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 16(1), 47–81.
- Lynch, M. M. (2002). *The online educator: A guide to creating the virtual classroom*. New York: Routledge.
- Mangelsdorf, K.. 1992. Peer Reviews in the ESL Composition Classroom: What Do the Students Think? [J] *ELT Journal*, 46 (3): 274-84.\
- Marlyna Maros, Tan Kim Hua, & Khazriyati Salehuddin. (2007). Interference in learning English: Grammatical errors in English essay writing among rural Malay secondary school students in Malaysia. *Journal e-Bangi*, 2(2), 1-15.
- Matney M. & Borland K. (2009) *Facebook, blogs, tweets:How staff and units can use social networking to enhance student learning*. Presentation at the annual meeting of the National Association for Student Personnel Administrators, Seattle,WA.
- Mazman, S. G., Usluel, Y. K., (2010). Modeling educational usage of *Facebook*, *Computers & Education*, 55(2).444 -553. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2010.02.008.
- McBride, K. (2009). Social-Networking Sites in Foreign Language Classes: Opportunities for Re-creation. In L. Lomicka & G. Lord (Eds.), *The Next Generation: Social Networking and Online Collaboration in Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 35-58): CALICO.
- McCarthy, J. (2010). Blended learning environments: Using social networking sites to enhance the first year experience. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 26(6), 729-740. Retrieved September 29, 2012 from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet26/mccarthy.html>
- McLoughlin, C. & Lee, M. (2007). Social software and participatory learning: Pedagogical choices with technology affordances in the Web 2.0 area. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/singapore07/procs/mcloughlin.pdf>.
- McLoughlin, C. & Lee, M. J. W. (2008). Mapping the digital terrain: New media and social software as catalysts for pedagogical change. In *Hello! Where are you in the landscape of educational technology? Proceedings ascilite Melbourne 2008*. Retrieved April 2013, 4, from: <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/melbourne08/procs/mcloughlin.pdf>
- McLoughlin, C. & Lee, M.J.W. (2010). Personalised and self regulated learning in the Web 2.0 era: International exemplars of innovative pedagogy using social software. *Australian Journal of Educational technology* 26(1), 28-43.

- McQuail, Denis. (2005). *Mcquail's Mass Communication Theory*. 5th ed. London: SAGE Publications.
- Melor, Md. Yunus. Hadi Sallehi, Choo H. S, Yong J. P. Y., Kwan, L. S. L. (2012). Using *Facebook* Groups in Teaching ESL Writing. *Recent Researchers in Chemistry, Biology, Environment and Culture*. p. 75-80.
- Meng, Y. & Stanley, N. (2013). Yue Meng and Nile Stanley see the educational value in social networking sites. *The Journal of Communication & Education Language Magazine*. May 2013. Retrieved on May 20, 2013 from: http://languagemagazine.com/?page_id=4707
- Midgette, E., Haria, P. and MacArthur, C. (2008). The effect of content and audience awareness goals for revision on the persuasive essays of fifth-and eighth-grade students. *Reading and Writing: an interdisciplinary journal*. 21:1-2, 131-51.
- Millard, D. E. & Ross, M. (2006) . Web 2.0: Hypertext by Any Other Name? HT'06 pp. 22-25.
- Mills, N. A. (2009). *Facebook* and the use of social networking tools to enhance language learner motivation and engagement. Paper presented at the Northeast Association for Language Learning Technology (NEALLT) Conference, Yale University, New Haven, CT, 30–31 October.
- Mohan, Rajani Chandra. (2003). The influence of Peer Conferencing on Writing Skills Among ESL Students. Unpublished Master Thesis, UM, Kuala Lumpur.
- Mohd Khaled Nordin (2012, February 23). Khaled: Use *Facebook* in varsities. *New Straits Times*. Retrieved February 2012, 28, from: <http://www.nst.com.my/latest/khaled-use-Facebook-in-varsities-1.50763>
- Mory, E. H. (2004). Feedback research revisited. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 745-783). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Myles, J. (2002). Second Language Writing and Research: The Writing Process and Error Analysis in Student Texts. *TESL-EJ*. 6(2), pp. 1-20.
- Nadzrah, A. B., & Mickan, P. (2003). Students' experiences in computer-based English language classroom. *Proceedings of the 2003 ASIA CALL Conference*. Gyeongju University, South Korea: ASIACALL.
- Neuwirth, C. M., Kaufer, D. S., Chandhok, R., & Morris, J. H. (1994). Computer support for distributed collaborative writing: Defining parameters of interaction. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW '94)*, (pp. pp. 145-152). Oct. 22-26, Chapel Hill, NC: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Noel, S & Robert, J. M. (2004). *Empirical Study on Collaborative Writing: What do Co-Authors Do, Use, and Like*. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work*. Netherlands. : Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Nor Aslah Adzmi. (2009). The academic English language needs of industrial design students in UiTM Kedah, Malaysia. *English Language Teaching*, 2(4), 717-718.
- Noriah Ismail, Sumarni Maulan & Nor Haniza Hassan. (2008). The impact of teacher feedback on ESL students' writing performance. *Jurnal Akademik UiTM Johor*, 8(1), 45-54.
- Noriah Ismail, Suhaidi Elias, Intan Safinas Mohd Ariff Albakri, P. Dhayapari Perumal & Indrani Muthusamy. (2010). Exploring ESL students' apprehension level and attitude towards academic writing. *The International Journal of Learning*, 17(6), 475-783.
- Noriah Ismail, Supyan Hussin and Saadiyah Darus. ESL Students' Attitude, Learning Problems and Needs for Online Writing. (2012). *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies. Volume 12(4)*, 1089-1107.
- Nussbaum, E. M. (2005). The effect of goal instructions and need for cognition on interactive argumentation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 30, 286-313.
- Oduor, P. (2010). Kenya: How students use technology. KenyaCurrent, in Kabilan, M.K., et. al (2010) *Facebook: An online environment for learning of English in institutions of higher education?*. Internet and Higher Education 13, 179-187.
- Osguthorpe, R. T., & Graham, C. R. (2003). Blended learning environments: Definitions and directions. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 4(3), 227-233.
- Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (1991). Writing academic English. A writing and sentence structure handbook (2nd ed.). NJ: Longman.
- Paloff R. M. & Pratt, K. (2001). *Lessons from the cyberspace classroom: The realities of online teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Paloff, R. M. & Pratt, K. (1999). *Building learning communities in cyberspace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pasfield-Neofitou, S. (2011). Online domains of language use: second language learners' experiences of virtual community and foreignness. *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(2), 92-108.
- Ping, W. (2009). The Inter-rater Reliability in Scoring Composition. *English Language Teaching. Vol 2. No 3. September 2009*. Retrieved 12 December, 2012, from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal.html>
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. *On the Horizon: Vol 9 (5)*. MCB University Press.
- Pritchard, R. J. & Honeycutt, R. L. (2005). "The Process Approach to Writing Instruction: Examining Its Effectiveness", excerpted from *Handbook of Writing Research*, edited by MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S. & Fitzgerald, J. Guilford Press. Retrieved May, 14 2012 from <http://www.nwp.org/cs/public/print/resource/2384>

- Pye, J. & Sullivan, J. (2001). "Use of computer-based instruction in teaching middle school social studies." *International Journal of Social Education* 15(2): 92-104.
- Rasha Fouad AlCattan. (2014). Integration of Cloud Computing and Web 2.0 Collaboration Technologies in E-Learning. *International Journal of Computer Trends and Technology (IJCTT)*, 12(1), pp. 46-55.
- Rankin, M. (2009). Some general comments on the 'Twitter experiment.' Web post by Monica Rankin. Available at: Retrieved May 29, 2012, <http://www.utdallas.edu/~mrankin/usweb/twitterconclusions.htm>.
- Reid, J. M. (1996). *Teaching ESL Writing*. Prentice-Hall: New Jersey.
- Reeves, T. C. (2011). Can educational research be both rigorous and relevant ? *Journal of the International Society for Design and Development in Education*. 1(4), 13.
- Richardson, J. C., & Swan, K. (2003). An examination of social presence in online courses in relation to student's perceived learning and satisfaction. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning*, 7(1).
- Richardson, W. (2006). *Blogs, Wikis, Podcasts and Other Powerful Web Tools for Classrooms*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Corwin Press.
- Rivers, W. M., & Temperley, M. S., (1978). *A practical guide to the teaching of english as a second or foreign language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, W. G. (2009). *Facebook Interactions and Writing Skills of Spanish Language Students*. Thesis. Concordia College.
- Roblyer, M. D. (2003). Exploring the Interaction Equation: Validating a rubric to Assess and Encourage Interaction in Distance Course. *The Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks Vol.8(4)* , 24-37. [15]
- Roehler, L. R., & Cantlon, D. J. (1997). Scaffolding: A powerful tool in social constructivist classrooms. In K. Hogan & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Scaffolding Student Learning: Instructional Approaches and Issues* (pp. 6-42). Cambridge, MA: Brookline.
- Rozina Abdul Ghani and Nuraihan Mat Daud (2003) CMC: Its Pedagogical Aspects and Considerations, *Teaching English with Technology: A journal for Teachers of English*, 3(2), 15-21.
- Rubio, R., Martin, S., Moran, S. (2007). *Collaborative Web Learning Tools: Wikis and Blogs*. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, 1-12. Retrieved May, 12, 2012 from http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/122322371/abstractCRET_RY=1&SRETRY=0.
- Sanchez, R. A., Cortijo, V., Javed, U. (2014). Students' perceptions of Facebook for academic purposes. *Computers & Education*. 70(2014) 138-149.
- Salaway, G., Caruso, J. B., and Nelson, M. R. *The ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology, 2007*. Boulder, Colo.: EDUCAUSE, 2007. Retrieved September 27, 2012 from <http://www.educause.edu/library/resources/ecar-study-undergraduate-students-and-information-technology-2007>

- Saovapa Wichadee & Pornrape Nopakun (2012). The Effects of Peer Feedback on Students' Writing Ability. *European Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 33 No 3 September, pp. 393-400.
- Schroeder A., Minocha S. & Schneider C. (2010). The strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of using social software in higher and further education teaching and learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* 26, 159–174. forthcoming.
- Schultz, J. M. (2005). Computers and collaborative writing in the foreign language curriculum. In M. Warschauer & R. Kern (eds.). (2000). *Network-based Language Teaching. Concepts and Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 6, 3rd edition, 121.
- Schwartz, H. (2009). *Facebook: The New Classrooms Commons? The Chronicle of Higher Education* , B13.
- Selwyn, N. (2009). *Faceworking: Exploring students' education-related use of Facebook*. *Learning, Media & Technology*, 34(2), 157–174. Doi:10.1080/17439880902923622
- Shih, R. C. (2011). Can Web 2.0 technology assist college students in learning English writing? Integrating *Facebook* and peer assessment with blended learning. In J. Waycott & J. Sheard (Eds), *Assessing students' Web 2.0 activities in higher education*. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 27(Special issue, 5), 829-845. Retrieved January 2012, 8, from: <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet27/shih.html>
- Shin, H.J., & Son, J. B. (2007). EFL Teachers' Perceptions and Perspectives on Internet Assisted Language Teaching. *CALL-EJ online*, 8(2). Retrieved December 5, 2012 from http://www.tell.is.ritsumeai.ac.jp/callejonline/journal/8-2/h-js_j-bs.html
- Silva, Tony. (1990). "Second Language Composition Instruction: Developments, Issues, and Directions in ESL." In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second Language Writing. Research Insights for the class-room* (pp. 11-23). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Simons, P. R.-J. (1992). Constructive learning: The role of the learner. In T. M. Duffy, J. Lowyck, D. Jonassen & T. M. Welsh (Eds), *Designing environments for constructive learning* (pp. 291-313). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Stanciu, A., Mihai, F., Aleca, U. (2012). Social Networking as an Alternative Environment for Education. *Accounting and Management Information Systems*. 11(1), pp. 56-75.
- Stevens V. (ed.) (1989) "A direction for CALL: from behavioristic to humanistic courseware". In Pennington M. (ed.), *Teaching languages with computers: the state of the art* pp. 31-43., La Jolla, CA: Athelstan.
- Storch, N. (2002). Patters of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language learning*, 52, 119-158.

- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14 (3), 153 –173.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescents French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320–337.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Symonds, W. C. (2000, September 25). Wired schools: A technology revolution is about to sweep America's classroom. *Business Week Online*. Retrieved April 16, 2012, from http://www.businessweek.com/2000/00_39/b3700121.htm.
- Taylor M. & Perez L. (1989) *Something to do on Monday*, La Jolla, CA: Athelstan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 165-187. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3586647>
- Thanawan Suthiwartnarueput & Punchalee Wasanasomsithi (2012). Effects of Using *Facebook* as a Medium for Discussions of English Grammar and Writing of Low-Intermediate EFL Students. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching 2012, Vol 9, No. 2, pp. 194-214*. Retrieved 13 May 2013, From <http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v9n22012/suthiwartnarueput.pdf>.
- Thomas, M (2009). *Handbook of Research on Web 2.0 and Second Language Learning*. Hershey, New York: Information Science Reference.
- Thompson, C. (2007). How Twitter Creates a Social Sixth Sense. *Wired Magazine: Issue 15.07*. Retrieved March 2013, 3, from http://www.wired.com/techbiz/media/magazine/15-07/st_thompson.
- Totten, S., Sills, T., Digby, A. & Russ, P. (1991). *Cooperative learning: A guide to research*. New York: Garland.
- Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford University Press.
- Tsai, C.C & Tseng, S.C (2007). On-line peer assessment and the role of the peer feedback: A study of high school computer course. *Computers & Education*, 49(4), 1161-1174.
- Turuk, M. (2008). The Relevance and Implications of Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory in the Second Language Classroom. *ARECLS. Vol 5, p 244-262*.
- Voon F. C. T. (2007). The Effects of the Process-Genre Approach to Writing Instruction on the Expository Essays of ESL Students in a Malaysian Secondary School. Unpublished PhD thesis, Universiti Sains Malaysia. Penang, Malaysia.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society*. London: Harvard University Press

- Wan Rusli Wan Ahmad and Nuraihan Mat Daud. (2011). Developing Arabic Writing Skills Using *Facebook*. International Language Conference (ILC) (pp. 1-17). Malaysia: International Islamic University Malaysia. (Unpublished).
- Wang, P. (2009). The inter-rater reliability in scoring composition. *Language Teaching September. School of Foreign Languages, Northwest University of Politics & Law*.
- Wang, Y., & Chen, N. (2007). Online synchronous language learning: SLMS over the Internet. *Innovate*, 3(3), 1-7 www.innovateonline.com.
- Warschauer, M. & Healey, D. (1998). *Computers and Language Learning: An overview*. *Language Teaching* 31, 57-71.
- Warschauer, M. (1996). Computer Assisted Language Learning: An Introduction, In S. Fotos (Ed.), *Multimedia Language Teaching*. Tokyo: Logos International. pp. 3-20
- Warschauer, M. (2006). *Laptops and literacy: Learning in the wireless classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Warschauer, M., & Kern, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press Applied Linguistics Series.
- Waycott, J., Bennett, S., Kennedy, G., Dalgarno, B. & Gray, K. (2010). Digital divides? Student and staff perceptions of information and communication technologies. *Computers & Education*, 54(4), 1202-1211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2009.11.006>
- Weigle, S.C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wells, G. (2000). Dialogic inquiry in education. Building on the legacy of Vygotsky. In C. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygostkian perspectives on Literacy research. Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry* (pp. 51-85). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity by Etienne Wenger (1999, Paperback): Etienne Wenger (1999)*. MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge Ma: Harvard University Press.
- Wier, C. J. (1993). *Understanding and developing language tests*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Wiffin, S. (2002). A conceptual framework for K-12 blended instruction design. Retrieved March 6, 2012, from

<http://www.pinetree.sd43.bc.ca/teachers/whiffin/papers/K12BlendedDesignModel.pdf>.

- Worthy, J., Broaddus, K., and Ivey, G. (2001). *Pathways to independence: Reading, writing and learning in Grades 3-8*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Yancey, K. (2009). Writing by any other name. *Principal Leadership*, 10(1), 26–29.
- Yang, S. C., Chen, N. S., Chen, A.S. (2002). “A student-generated web-based oral history project.” *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* 18(3): 272-281.
- Zaliza Hanapi and Mohd Safarin Nordin (2014). Unemployment Among Malaysia Graduates: Graduates’ Attributes, Lecturers’ Competency and Quality of Education. *International Conference on Education & Educational Psychology 2013 (ICEEPSY 2013)*.
- Zamel, V. (1982). The composing process of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 165-187. In Reid, J. (2001). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zimmerman, B. J. & Schunk, D. H. (Eds) (1989). *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Springer-Verlag.