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Abstract

This research explores the affective responses of five upper-secondary English ESL/EFL students using computer-mediated peer feedback (CMPF), in a writing assignment. The pragmatic approach to the research makes use of a thematic analysis using, motivation, anxiety, attitude, and self-confidence. These themes were extrapolated from Krashen’s Affective filter theory because they are hypothesized to affect second language acquisition. Additionally, the four themes offer a pragmatic framework for exploring student’s affective experiences. The primary data was collected through a series of semi-structured interviews. The interviews were recorded and transcribed to create the primary data. The participants reveal that their learning environment was characterized by distinctly, positive affective responses, low affective filters and favorable conditions for second language acquisition. It is noteworthy that the lack of real time communication alleviated communication apprehension, but also contributed to test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation. The minor negative affective responses documented in the study were offset by consistent and constant use of both the computer mediated learning platform, and peer feedback. The results of this study are worth consideration for academics and professionals who are interested in how affective responses impact second language acquisition.
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1. Introduction

During my teacher training and education in Sweden, I became aware that time and other resource restraints, dictate that difficult choices must be made in order to better facilitate my students' different learning processes. Greenwood (2016) found that computer mediated peer-feedback (CMPF) can address some of these concerns and lead to statistically better result. However, the results also showed, that the participants in the studies had a broad range of both positive and negative affective responses to using CMPF. This in conjunction with the fact that none of the studies focused on upper-secondary education inspired me to address these factors.

The conflicting demands made by the National Curriculum for the upper-secondary school in Sweden, and the reality of praxis dictated by local factors are the source of many unresolved tensions in the Swedish school system (Nihlfors, 2012). In accord with Nihlfors (2012) and of concern to this study is the tendency for teachers pressed for time and other resources to give more and more responsibility to students for their own education. This decision is often made at the local level but is encouraged on the national level.

The National curriculum states for example that all students individually should:

- take personal responsibility for their studies and their working environment;
- actively exercise influence over their education and the internal work of the school;
- based on knowledge of democratic principles further develop their ability to work in democratic ways (Skolverket, 2013 p. 1).

The tendency towards a student-centric educational setting leaves students more dependent on their already existing capitals. Leaving the capital-poor at a decided disadvantage. This systematic exclusion of capital poor students can result in myriad of individual responses that are counterproductive to second language acquisition (Nihlfors, 2012). Simply put, shifting from a teacher-centric approach to a student based pedagogy may not be equally beneficial for all students and therefore a concern.

According to Jarvis and Krashen (2014) students’ computer-mediated communication is a source of authenticity which can address individual difference. As a result of this perceived authenticity students can be motivated to learn a second language. This may not only be useful in second language acquisition (SLA), but when combined with the democratic inclusion of peer
feedback, it could address many of the local and national requirements. According to Xiaoyan Du (2009), Krashen’s affective filter theory (AFT) explains that factors such as motivation, anxiety, attitude, and self-confidence are important in both the teacher- and student-centric environments. And yet, because the teacher may be less present in the student centric model, their ability to observe and mitigate negative affective responses would be limited. Each students’ unique responses to CMPF can lead to substantial individual learning variation and effect its democratic value. Therefore, it is important for educators and policymakers to understand student experiences, and how these experiences might impact students.

1.1 Purpose and Research Question

To sum up the Introduction, the shift from a traditional teacher-centric classroom towards a computer mediated learning environment may hinder a teacher's ability to observe and mediate negative affective responses. This shift while helping some, may leave others at a disadvantage. Greenwood (2016) found that the CMPF research focuses, almost entirely, on post upper-secondary education. The purpose of this research is to document the upper-secondary student’s affective responses to using CMPF, with the aims to provide education professionals and researchers alike with valuable insights into the life experience of 5 ESL/EFL students by answering the questions:

- What affective experiences did students have when using CMPF?
- How can these experiences be understood to affect second language acquisition according to Steven Krashen’s affective filter theory?
2. Theoretical Context

This section addresses the previous research, concepts, and theories related to affective responses in CMPF in SLA writing contexts. In the first Section 2.2, the field of research is addressed and problematized by presenting the relevant aspects of the previous research. In section 2.3, individual differences are presented and problematized, setting relevant concepts in their historical and conceptual context. In section 2.4 affect in SLA is presented with special attention paid to Krashen's AFT. This theory, as it is explained, forms the basis of the thematic analysis presented in the Results and Discussion section. In the concluding section 2.5 the research stance and approach is addressed by presenting the concept of a research lens as a visual aid. Concepts are defined in context throughout this section.

2.2 CMPF in EFL/ESL Contexts

The term computer mediated peer feedback is the result of combining the term computer mediated communication (CMC) with the term peer-feedback. Rollinson (2005) states that “Peer feedback in English as a Second Language (ESL) writing classrooms has been generally supported as being a potentially valuable aid for its social, cognitive, affective, and methodological benefits” (p. 23).

These four categories, while serving their purposes in (Greenwood 2016), are problematic upon closer scrutiny. Chen, Petit, and Wu (2015) explain that Vygotskian sociocultural theory is often used to explain the social nature of learning in CMPF. Stating that in these contexts learning is the product of socially constructed learning, and is not solely the result of the individual's effort. The results of Greenwood (2016) indicate that positive social experiences were perceived as vital for the validity and authenticity of CMPF. However, Chen, Petit, and Wu (2015) also explain that this type of learning improves the student’s motivation to participate. Here we can see the connection between motivation (an affective individual difference) and the social theory commonly used to describe the success of using peer feedback in the ESL/EFL context (p. 60).

Ciftci and Kocoglu (2012) state that computer-mediated communication (CMC) such as learning platforms, google docs, blogs, emails, and chats assist students in creating, accessing,
and distributing texts (p. 62). These characteristics are particularly well suited to the social nature of peer feedback. The compatibility of peer feedback and CMC has been generally acknowledged as playing a key role in facilitating its use in a second/foreign language writing environment (Xu, 2007).

For the purposes of this paper, and in accord with Kachru’s (1992) *Circles of English*, the terms English as a second language (ESL), and English as a foreign language (EFL) are used to describe English learners, who do not use English as a primary language, but use English institutionally and historically. This choice excludes the *expanding circle* of English speakers who do not use English historically, or for institutional purposes. Because EFL/ESL is used in the selection criteria in this study to address comparability, these two abbreviations need to be addressed. However, they are often incorporated in the more general term second language acquisition (SLA) when appropriate. This pragmatic choice will serve to assist in describing several overlapping fields when more specific terminology is not necessary.

According to Rollinson (2005), peer feedback in SLA can be negatively affected by the large variation in SLA that may exist in these contexts. Chen, Petit, and Wu (2015) illustrate that this variation in language proficiency can also assist SLA by allowing students to read and analyze each other's work. This process stimulates the students to cognitively engage in learning, by helping them to better gauge their own language ability. In doing this, CMPF contributes to improved motivation and learning outcomes. Here again we can see how the social, cognitive, and affective factors together lead to improved result. This however, within the field of research, is mostly attributed to Vygotskian Sociocultural theory, and in doing so shifts focus away from individual difference. In the following section, individual difference in SLA will be addressed.

### 2.3 Individual Difference

The observation that second language research veers away from individual differences is congruent with Peter Skehan’s (1989) observation of second language research. He explains that the field often emphasizes “common, even universal, features in language... or best approach to teaching, with less attention being paid to constraints on the operation of methodology or on the way it may affect some people in diverse ways” (p. 276). According to Greenwood (2016), individual differences (ID) are often treated more as outlying factors, and are often glossed over
by receiving little to no theoretical consideration. This is in accord with Skehan’s (1989) observation that ID is often avoided as a consequence of searching for “the best method”, or for the sake of emphasizing generalizable results associated with generalizable theory.

Dörnyei (2014) explains that IDs can be broadly defined in that “they concern anything that marks a person as a distinct and unique human being”. More specifically they “concern stable and systematic deviations from a normative blueprint”. ID-related studies date back to “the 19th century: for example, Charles Darwin’s cousin, Sir Francis Galton” was an early researcher who focused on psychological factors. ID research remained mostly within the confines of the fields of Psychology until it first appeared in the field of language acquisition in the 1960s, when ID became important within the field of second language acquisition (SLA). ID research is one of the most studied physiological aspects of SLA. ID is a “consistent” predictor of SLA success; nevertheless it has remained a relatively uninfluential branch within SLA research. ID can include a broad range of factors such as age, social, ethnic, and cultural differences, as well as emotional reactivity and cognitive ability. Many of these factors have obvious SLA implications. Despite this, ID research began to fall out of favor in the late 70’s, as more universally applicable theories, such as Krashen's “input hypothesis”, accrued popularity. In order to address ID, Krashen amended the “input hypothesis” with the AFT (p. 3-7.42). In the following section Krashen’s AFT will be addressed within the larger field of affect in SLA.

2.4 Affect in SLA

According to Bo Lundahl (2012) affective responses, such as feelings, motivation, stress, and attitudes, can both positively and negatively affect SLA outcomes (p. 196). Although the concept of affect will be expanded upon in this section this simple explanation provides a sufficient working definition.

Maftoon and Sabah (2012) point out that the cognitive-oriented researchers have treated cognition and affect as binary opposites within the field of SLA. Explaining that cognition is considered objective and testable while affective responses are considered subjective and untestable. The authors explain that this polemic stance has resulted in inadequate amounts of research focusing on affect. Furthermore, they indicate that the popular understanding of Vygotskian sociocultural theory has failed to substantially incorporate “less commonly discussed
aspect of Vygotskian-inspired Sociocultural Theory, and that is the role that emotion plays in learning and development”. The author continues to explain that Vygotsky was working to address affective responses in his manuscript titled “Teaching About Emotions: Historical-Psychological Studies”. This work was however never completed. (p. 38). Maftoon and Sabah are clearly implying that the major branches of SLA research have not given affective factors the attention they deserve. This is congruent with Skehan’s (1989) observations of SLA research. However, the authors do present Krashen’s (1981) AFT as an important and significant theory for addressing affective responses in SLA contexts. The author concludes by suggesting that Vygotsky's (2012) uncompleted work could bridge the gap between cognitive, affective and social factors, and in doing so imply that it has not yet been done. The decision to use Krashen’s affective filter theory in the analysis of this research was made because the field offers no other practical and widely accepted theory addressing the role of affective responses in SLA.

Krashen’s (1981) model of SLA is grounded in the idea that we naturally have the ability to learn languages in the same way that we learn our first language (L1). Krashen's theory is based on the premise that in order to learn a language we need access to language at a level appropriate to our second language(L2) abilities or as Krashen (1981) describes it *comprehensible input*. Despite access to comprehensible input factors associated with ID have a large effect on individual SLA (p. 4).

Krashen adopted Dulay & Burt ‘socio-affective filter’ to accommodate the largely varying degrees of success associated with learning a L2. Even though most L2 learners, and researchers understand that negative affective responses hinder L2 acquisition, contentions within the field still exist. These contentions are mostly directed at the vague explanation of how the filter works, and because Krashen’s theories disregard output (Zafar, 2011). Despite its critics, AFT remains central to understanding the role of affect in L2 environments (Maftoon & Sabah’s 2012.) Furthermore, pedagogies that are specifically designed to make use of its tenants have been shown to improve SLA (Lin 2008).

According to Krashen’s AFT when the affective filter is “raised”, due to negative affective responses, the filter blocks input from entering the language acquisition device (LAD). A lowered affective filter allows input to reach the LAD, facilitating language acquisition. In this way, the affective filter is responsible for ID in SLA. The affective filter is hypothesized to take form around puberty, and is presumed to not affect younger children. Motivation, attitude,
anxiety, and self-confidence are the 4 major affective factors that contribute to the raising or lowering of the affective filter.

Motivation, one of the more studied affective responses, can be either integrative or instrumental. Integrative motivation is the result of a willingness to learn a language for its benefits or for the pleasure derived from participation. On the other hand, instrumental motivation is the result of wishing to achieve or to gain another result, such as a getting a grade or creating status. Attitude can be described as an “evaluative emotional reaction”. A negative evaluation of the SLA’s value raises the affective filter by reducing the student's commitment and participation. When the evaluation of the SLA is positive the student is more committed and more likely to participate. Anxiety for the purposes of SLA can be divided into communicative apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of evaluation. Communicative apprehension is an individual's fear and anxieties that are centered around communication with one or more persons. Test anxiety is the experience of performance reducing distress experienced either before, during or after, examinations. Fear of negative evaluation is anxiety caused by being overconcerned with others’ negative evaluations. Fear of negative evaluation leads to avoidance behaviors and therefore reduced performance. Self-confidence affects the L2 user's ability to engage in the target language. Students with considerable amounts of self-confidence succeed more because they tend to engage more in the target language. On the other hand, students who lack self-confidence fail to engage and miss chances to participate in the L2 (Krashen, 1982, Xiaoyan, 2009).

Anxiety, attitude, motivation, and self-confidence will be used as thematic and organizational themes in the results and discussion section of this paper. In the next subsection, this study will be further contextualized in Swedish educational policy.

2.5 The Swedish National Curriculum

CMPF is not specifically mentioned in the Swedish national curriculum; however, Skolverket (2011) states that English should be taught in a “functional and meaningful way” (p. 1). The prevalence of CMC amongst contemporary youth indicates CMC serves a meaningful communicative function in contemporary society. Additionally, the peer feedback aspect allows students time to work and self-organize within the peer environment. This can rather easily be
said to “develop their ability to work in democratic ways” (Skolverket, 2013 p. 1). English 6 also states that students should engage in “the processing of language and structure, of their own and others, written presentations, even in formal settings and by adapting to the genre, situation and purpose” (Skolverket 2011, p. 6, translation). The statement that the student needs to be able to process “language and structure “of other's” is directly applicable to peer feedback. The idea that students should do this in different “settings and by adapting to the genre, situation and purpose” gives validity to working with a variety of mediums such as can be found in CMC.

Skolverket (2013) also states that students should “take personal responsibility for their studies and their working environment” (p. 1). Due to diminished local resources, I myself have seen teachers interpreting this statement in a way that places the burden of education almost entirely on the shoulders of the student. This may suit some students quite well. However, students who lack culturally inherited capitals, such as academic language, need more explicit instruction (Nihlfors, 2012). Furthermore, a peer oriented approach could easily limit a teacher's ability to “be observant of and support students in need of special support” as Skolverket (2013) states they should (p. 9). In this situation, capital poor students may not get the support they need for full participation. If a teacher is unaware of this they could not be said to “take as the starting point each individual student’s needs, circumstances, experiences and thinking” into account as Skolverket (2013) explains is necessary (p. 9). This paper aims to address this by illuminating five “individual student’s needs, circumstances, experiences and thinking” (p. 9). In this section, this study has been contextualized in Swedish educational policy. In the following section a “research lens” will offer insights into the research; paradigm, phenomenology, and approach.

2.6 Research Lens

The purpose of this research is to provide both educational professionals and researchers with insights into the affective experiences of five students after using CMPF. Due to the nature of this research, I will use Savin-Baden and Major’s (2013) research lens to describe my research process. This can provide both the reader and the researcher with a visual metaphor, or map if you will, to help guide the reader through the research. My intention in using this visual device is to reinforce the idea that all the research choices (represented by the five aspects of the research
lens shown in figure 1.) affect how the data is received. This section will address the paradigm and the approach to this research. In the Methods section, I will address Data collection, and Data Analysis.

Figure. 1 Research Lens

1. Paradigm: pragmatism/phenomenology
2. Phenomenon: student’s affective responses to CMPF
3. Approach: pragmatic qualitative research
4. Data collection: semi-structured interviews
5. Data analysis: thematic analysis

Data: Transcripts from 5 Student Interviews

2.6.1 Paradigms and Phenomena

Figure 1. Portrays an interpretation of the Savin-Baden and Major (2013) research lens. As this interpretation of the research lens shows my research is guided by a paradigm influenced by both pragmatism and phenomenology. First and foremost, this research is affected by pragmatism. The pragmatic paradigm is often used by “professionals” who are “concerned with practical results” (p. 171). In accord with my previously stated concerns about the problem area I have chosen a pragmatic approach to mitigate the tension caused by national demands and the reality of praxis. This stance lies between “objectivity and intersubjectivity” (p. 59). As a researcher and a future teacher, I will need this objectivity as students are at their most subjective, in this case showing affective responses to teaching methods. For this reason, I believe this research is pragmatic in nature for educational professionals and educational researchers alike. In addition to the pragmatism, phenomenology also has had paradigmatic influence on this research due to the awareness of the role ID plays in SLA. Phenomenology can be described as more subjective than pragmatism, occupying the middle ground between objectivity and subjectivity. I chose to include aspects of this more subjective paradigm as I believe “meaning is shaped through an
individual's experience of the world” and that knowledge can be created “through systematic review” of this experience (p. 61). By creating this knowledge this research aims to gain insight into the 5 students “interpretation[s] of their [affective] experience[s]” in relation to CMPF; this is the “phenomenon” described in figure 1. (p. 64).

2.6.2 Approach
According to Savin-Baden and Major (2013) the approach should be influenced by both the purpose and the discipline. The pragmatic qualitative research approach “draws on the most sensible and practical method available in order to answer a given research question” (p. 171). As mentioned earlier, the purpose of this research is to document upper-secondary student’s affective responses to using CMPF. The aim of this is to provide education professionals and researchers alike with valuable insights into the life experience of these 5 SLA students. In this purpose statement, we see the word insight, implies description; the term affective responses implies a thematic analysis, and the term educational professional implies the research is directed toward the discipline of education.

The results and discussion, by making use of affect as an organizational theme can be described as both interpretive and descriptive. “Interpretive description” is considered on the subjective side of the pragmatic qualitative research spectrum, because of the use of interpretation rather than objective description (p. 172). The AFT will provide a thematic analysis of the results because, as described in the background, it is the most “sensible and practical method available” (p. 171). The focus is on the five student’s experiences; however, because Krashen's AFT will be used in the analysis, this pragmatic qualitative research approach can be said to have a thematic “cast” (p. 174).
3. Method

This section describes and discusses the research methods used in obtaining and analyzing the primary sources presented in the results section. By individually presenting and discussing the setting, participants, data collection, data analysis, and ethical considerations of the research this section aims to give a comprehensive and critical view of the research methods used in this study.

3.1 Participants

The participants in the study satisfied the selection criteria because they

- are in their late teens;
- study at upper secondary school;
- study in an EFL/ESL context;
- and because they use CMPF.

By fulfilling these basic criteria, the study will be able to address the lack of CMPF research focusing on upper secondary EFL/SL writing contexts.

The participants were not only chosen because they suit the research purpose, but also because their academic advisor agreed to facilitate the research. This pragmatic selection of participants was influenced by the social, professional, and local resources available to the researcher during the research period. The facilitating advisor has been teaching for five years, has a master’s degree in English and History Education, a bachelor's degree in Political Science, as well as the appropriate teaching certification. According to their advisor, the five students are characterized as receptive and engaged. He also deems the participants to be academically proficient. The choice to limit the study to five participants was motivated by the focus on quality and not quantity, which is congruent with the subjective nature of the purpose (Kvale, 2007, p. 43).

In accordance with the subjective aim of recording the participant’s experiences, I present my general impression of the participants below. Accompanying the general impressions will be some quotes that are intended to add to this impression. The intention in describing the
participants in this manner is not to reduce them to a few lines or data points, but rather the opposite. The aim here is to give the participants identifying attributes and in doing so humanize the study. Furthermore, the participant’s names in this paper are replaced with the colors used in the coding process. Non-gendered pronouns such as they, and them will be used as alternative to he, and she. This is done because the gender of the participants is unknown, and seen as beyond the scope of this study.

Red is enthusiastic and forthcoming with their ideas, and seems eager to make a positive impression. Red respects the student body and appreciates the “academic standards” of the school. They explain how “clear” instructions are important and how they help them to understand the grading criteria. Red gives the impression of being substantially more confident, and extroverted than the other participants.

Blue appears to be a considerate and motivated student. They point out that the school feels rather large. Stating that with a “lot of students...the corridors are full”, but that the teachers are “good”. They explained that they have enjoyed their time and are enthusiastic about attending postsecondary school. Blue gives the impression of being slightly reserved, observant, and academically talented.

Orange seems to be a social and charismatic person. They communicate in an easy and comfortable fashion and enjoy the “multicultural” aspect of the school. They appreciate that it is a “large” school with “many activities”. Orange is proud to attend a school with a “great” reputation and gives the impression of being a competent and socially oriented person.

Green looks as if they are reserved, and appears to be concerned with giving the wrong answer. They use short succinct replies that demonstrate strong language awareness. Due to difficulties with dyslexia, Green would rather use a text to speech program for listening to texts rather than reading from a computer screen. Green gives the impression of being reserved and exhibits substantially more introverted personality qualities than the other participants.
Purple displays a formal professional demeanor and presents rational arguments. They characterize the school as a “multilingual” and “international school” with students from “all over the world”. Purple seems to appreciate the speed and efficiency of using computers and is comfortable using academic language.

3.2 Setting

3.2.1 The School
According to the student advisor, the school is in a metropolitan area in southern Sweden. It is a well-known public college preparatory school with a strong international program. In addition to the international program the school also has Swedish national programs specializing in Economics, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. The international program and the bilingual program, taught in both Swedish and English, focus on Social Sciences and International Business Management.

3.2.2 The Program
The advisor adds that approximately a third of the students at the school participate in the international or bilingual programs. The respondents in this research attend the bilingual social science program, which is like the Swedish national program, except that it is taught predominantly in English.

3.2.3 The Assignment
As reported by the advisor, it is required of the students, in both the bilingual and the Swedish national programs, that they complete a senior project. Successful completion of the yearlong project gives 100 credits and has a substantial effect on their grade point average. The supervisor for the five students interviewed, gave them the choice of either an interview-based or a survey-based field research study as the basis for their senior project.
3.3 Data Collection

3.3.1 Semi-structured Qualitative Interview

As the purpose of this study is to document student experiences, the choice to use interviews was easily made. According to Savin-Baden and Major (2013) qualitative researchers typically choose from structured, semi structured, unstructured, or informal interviews. An unstructured interview in which the interviewer “spontaneously generates questions” was deemed inappropriate due to the complexity that a thematic approach, using the AFT, would entail. A structured interview was deemed inappropriate due to its “standardized approach”, which would limit the ability to spontaneously “explore” the depth and breadth of ID (p. 359-360).

A “semi-structured life-world interview” was chosen with the aim of obtaining “descriptions of the life-world of the interviewee with respect to interpreting the meaning of the described phenomena” (Kvale, 2007, p. 52); in this case for documenting student’s affective experiences when using CMPF. This method was chosen primarily because it provides enough structure to address the thematic aims of the research. In addition, it provides the flexibility to explore the participant’s ID. I was aware that this approach is a compromise between the structured and unstructured approach and might not allow for the full range of the participants “own unique perspective” (p.359). To adjust for this concern, I incorporated aspects of an informal interview that might help me gain the “trust” of the participants. The first accommodation in this regard, was to allow the conversation to take its own course, despite the order of the interview guide. Moreover, I leaned towards using informal English. These accommodations were made to create a “conversational” tone and create rapport, in accordance with informal interview techniques (p. 360).

An interview guide (Appendix 1) was created to facilitate a semi-structured quality in the interview. The guide was divided into six sections, an introduction, four thematic sections, and a conclusion. The themes were derived from the previously presented AFT, which explains how motivation, attitude, anxiety, and self-confidence affect SLA. The questions within these sections were extrapolated from the four affective responses as presented in the background.
3.3.2 Procedure

The interviews were recorded using an online voice recorder. After the recording was started, the participants were offered movie vouchers as a token of appreciation. They all accepted. The students were then given consent forms (see Appendix 2) outlining the intended research, their rights to anonymity, and their right to withdraw participation at any time. All five students gave their written consent. Initially, three interviews were conducted on 12/16/16 at the aforementioned upper secondary school. Each of the initial interviews lasted between 20 and 30 minutes and were carried out in a small group room provided by the school. The second interview was conducted in the same manner; however, the participants were asked if they preferred to do the interviews individually or as a group. They indicated that they would like to do a group interview. This interview took place on 3/24/17 and was conducted in a large group room provided by the school. The decision to use a group interview was influenced by the time restraints; however, a group structure was also offered with the intention of creating a “natural” and dynamic communication pattern (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013, p. 38).

In the first phase of the interview, basic details were collected about the interviewees while they were assured anonymity. This was not only done to collect basic information but also in accordance with Kvale’s (2007) recommendations for creating an environment “free and safe to talk of private events for later public use” (p. 8). In this stage, I also made notes about the participant’s characteristics on the research guide. These notes were memory aids, intended to help assist identifying the participants later in the research process. This initial stage was followed by the “briefing” stage of the interview, as described by Kvale. It was designed to inform and record the interviewees understanding of the terms and concepts used in the interview (Kvale, p. 56). After the briefing phase, more general questions were asked about the student’s experiences of CMPF in accordance with the chosen themes. These simple and direct initial open questions were intended to contribute to the “dynamic nature” of the interview (p. 63). The more general open questions were then expanded upon using follow up questions. These “follow up questions” were designed to clarify and confirm the student’s experiences in relation to the themes (p. 63). Finally, in the conclusion phase of the interview, the participants were informed of their rights to review the paper and reassured that their consent to participate could be withdrawn at any time.
3.4 Data Analysis

With the aim to better understand student’s affective experiences, this study analyzes transcripts using Krashen’s AFT. In accordance with this, the research uses motivation, attitude, anxiety, and self-confidence as themes for organizing and analyzing the transcriptions.

In the first phase of the analysis, the recorded interviews were transcribed. The transcriptions included all verbal communication. The transcription, due to the scope of the project, omitted non-verbal sounds and pauses.

In the second phase of the analysis, individual profiles were made for all the participants. Each participant's profile was divided into the four major themes with their appropriate sub-categories. The participant’s responses were then categorized according to the nature of the response, in congruence with the definitions of the terms provided in the background. This created five participant profiles.

In the third phase, thematic profiles were created by conjoining all the participant’s responses to particular themes in their own rubrics. This created four thematic profiles.

In the final stage of analysis, all responses were codified by the effects that the experience would have on the affective filter. The responses indicating a raising of the affective filter was codified as negative. If a response indicated a lowering of the affective filter it was codified as positive. If the response was neither negative or positive, it was codified as being neutral. The codified results were combined in one matrix which was divided into the four themes. This facilitated comparing the data. The results of the interviews were then synthesized with the theoretical background forming the Results and Discussion section.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

According to Vetenskapsrådet (2002), when conducting research, one should follow the four tenets of research ethics. The first tenet indicates that the participants should have access to information pertaining to the research. This tenant was observed when the participants were informed of the purpose and aims of the research. The second tenant concerning consent, was observed when the participants were informed that participation was voluntary and could be retracted at any time. The participants were given pseudonyms, the advisor’s identity is not revealed, and the name and location of the school are withheld to create confidentiality in accord
with the third ethical tenant. The final ethical tenet was fulfilled when the participants were informed that data will not be used for anything other than the specified purpose.
4. Results and Discussion

In this section, the interviews along with identifying character observations are presented, analyzed, and discussed. The interview transcripts are organized according to the four themes extrapolated from Krashen’s AFT including: motivation, attitude, anxiety, and self-confidence. Within these four sections, the results are further organized into subcategories relevant to the themes as presented in the background section. Within each thematic section the results are summarized and discussed from the perspectives of AFT and the relevant field of research. Finally, the Pedagogical Implications of the results will be discussed from the perspective of upper-secondary English education in Sweden.

4.1 Student Motivation

In this section, comments that pertain to student motivation are presented and discussed. First comments that allude to a willingness to use CMPF because of its perceived value in SLA are presented under the heading Integrative. Comments that portray a motivation based on secondary benefits, such as getting a better grade or increasing status, are included under the heading Instrumental. A “Discussion of Student Motivation” is presented last.

A clear majority of comments indicated that the students were mostly motivated to use CMPF for commenting on and addressing local problems such as spelling, grammar, and punctuation. Addressing the type of comments used Purple stated; “Yes, I guess I got mostly the local comments, since I think there is more of them, than the overarching”. Purple’s observations are thoughtfully reasoned in this next comment; “I guess in this type of feedback I think the local was more useful because the bigger questions are easily explained when we are talking to one another”.

All the students had a clear preference for the markup tool, and saw no use for using the chat function as a means of participating in CMPF. Purple candidly offered this statement: “I use only the markup. I don’t really know how the other thing works. It’s a chat you said? I guess I chat with others through other social media so I don’t need another chat”. They all made this choice even though they were encouraged to use the chat function by their advisor.
4.1.1 Integrative
The majority of students stated that using CMPF is a valuable and useful technique. When asked if and why they would use CMPF Green pointed out that “It helps me to… develop and see what I have done, see what I’ve done wrong”. Accordingly, the positive result allowed them to know that “the next time I write something I’ll keep that in mind and not do that mistake again”. Blue thoughtfully commented on the belief in their peers observing that if “they can find something from their perspective, [that] would make the essay better. They will often say it”. Red also made it clear they felt that CMPF was a useful alternative because of its “efficiency”, signifying integrative motivation. The definitively positive responses, demonstrating integrative motivation for using CMPF, would lower the affective filter and facilitate students SLA.

However, Red added if given the choice they would rather have their teacher's voice, “constantly saying you should think of this, think of this, you should think of this”. This statement depicts Reds preference for teacher feedback. Suggesting that teacher feedback might lead to even more integrative motivation for Red.

4.1.2 Instrumental
All the comments were either positive or neutral to the idea that CMPF had value because it would lead to a better grade. Blue for example, explained that they “don't know if it has ever affected my grade” and yet reasoned in the next sentence “Actually, I don't know if it has, but it does contribute to better work”. In this way, all positive and neutral responses were followed by confirmations of its integrative value. By counterbalancing these statements, the students effectively moderated the idea that CMPF has mostly instrumental value, indicating that participants were only partly motivated by the instrumental value of using CMPF.

4.1.3 Discussion of Student Motivation
The respondents clearly indicate that the participants are primarily motivated to use CMPF because it helps them to write better. The student’s comments indicate that their integrative motivation stems from the perception that the medium is considered authentic and efficient. This integrative motivation for using CMPF would lower the affective filter and facilitate students SLA. This result is similar to Ciftci and Kocoglu’s (2012), findings that demonstrate that CMPF
leads to integrative motivation because it improves writing outcomes. This integrative motivation based on authenticity is however not confirmed by Wichdee’s (2013) findings, which reveal that some students found CMPF to lack authenticity. In this study, no comments indicated that the students perceived CMPF to lack authenticity. In fact, the consistent use of the CMPF platform was attributed to authenticity and led to good integrative motivation.

The students recognize that using CMPF has instrumental value but this was primarily seen as a consequence of its integrative value. Because the instrumental value is for the most part only consequential and not motivational this would have negligible effect on the raising or lowering of the affective filter. It is important to note that the only substantial variance from this observation was made by Red who felt the teacher could give more accurate feedback. Reds preference for expert feedback shows that Reds motivation in using CMPF was partly instrumental. This is consistent with Wichadee’s (2013) findings that some students are more motivated by expert feedback.

Much of the instrumental motivation was avoided in this study because the students chose not to use aspects they deemed ineffectual, such as using the chat or making global comments. The student’s choice not to use the chat is inconsistent with Yoonjung’s (2009) findings that reveal students find the chat function useful. The participants in this study motivated their decision not to use the chat function because it was deemed a less efficient form of CMPF. Yoonjung (2009), confirms the validity of the student’s decision not to use the chat by showing that the addition of a chat does not necessarily lead to better writing.

4.2 Student Attitudes

In this section, comments that pertain to student attitudes will be presented and discussed. First, comments that allude to the student’s dedication to using CMPF are presented under the heading commitment. Statements that reveal students making use of peer comments are included under the heading participation. Finally, in the “Discussion of Student Attitudes” the results will be summarized and discussed from the perspectives of both AFT, and the relevant field of research.

In general, students attitude towards using CMPF were positive, but a few were more ambivalent. This can possibly be explained by Blue’s attitude toward participation. Asked if they used all the comments made on their paper during the exercise with CMPF, Blue was blunt with
a simple “No, but that's just because I can't remember everything”. Purple casually remarked that the experience was “positive in that, you can sit by yourself and just correct”. To summarize themselves Purple added “and so, that’s positive. I think because it is very practical as well”. The attitude here is not only positive, it is also practical. Blue, further answers the question explaining that “I think every comment is worth something. Even though I might not agree with a comment, he still has seen something that I didn't”, thereby re-affirming the observation that student attitudes often vacillated.

4.2.1 Commitment
The student’s commitment to understanding comments was mostly positive. Little to no references were made indicating that the students questioned the value of understanding comments, even if at times their conviction wavered. Red expressed that they were committed to making use of all the comments they received, stating that “there are some things that one might think like, ok? but it was some small petty things”. And yet they reason that “sometimes it's the small petty things” that improve “the overall [quality] of the essay that makes [it] great”.

Purple expressed that after using CMPF for extended periods their commitment to understanding comments diminished slightly, but only because “maybe you get more tired”. This indicates that the ideological commitment to using CMPF was strong even if their physical or mental ability to continue was diminished. Red aptly points out that for their generation, “we have so much technology and everything… is…through screens”. Emphasizing their point noting they state: “I don't know about you, my eyes sometimes, it's like irritated, it's more like I get kind of tired but not physically tired, it's more like just tired in my mind from having so much screen”. This statement explains most of the student’s comments that indicate wavering commitment.

4.2.2 Participation
Even though most students indicated a strong commitment to understanding comments throughout the length of the CMPF session, some indicated that they chose to disregard comments after they were considered. Purple acknowledges a certain reticence toward other comments saying “you imagine that your essay is your own, and maybe you use a certain word and you want to use this, because you want to portray what you want to say more. So, you don’t
want to change it”. While others indicated more commitment to using the feedback regardless of preferences. Purple finishes their thought admitting “some of the comments I skipped”.

4.2.3 Discussion of Student Attitudes

The students had a generally positive attitude to using CMPF. It is particularly noteworthy that students reported being very committed to understanding and considering all CMPF. This commitment was however moderated or enhanced by the students’ decision to implement or disregard the input. In this case implementing of a suggestion was considered a positive attitude which led to increased participation and should be understood to assist SLA. Disregarding a comment should be considered the result of a negative attitude that diminished participation. According to AFT diminished participation is said to be a result of a raised affective filter and a reduction of SLA. However, because students actively made decision to disregard comments, the issue of defining participation needs to be addressed.

Most students chose to actively disregard comments based on their own attitudes about the value of the comment. Wichadee (2013) confirms personal preference as a factor affecting student’s attitudes about CMPF. Red expressed a preference for expert over non-expert feedback, their preference for expert feedback was explicitly referred to more than once. Similarly, to Ho (2015), this study also shows that participants received, favored and used more local comments than global comments.

The results of this study show that participants often chose not to use comments because they were either too broad in scope, or because they were more skeptical of local type comments. This inconclusive result points to a possible problem in interpreting the AFT. At first glance, disregarding a comment should be considered non-participation; however, actively choosing to disregard a comment can also be considered a decision, and therefore an action and participation.

4.3 Student Anxiety

In this section, comments that pertain to student anxiety are presented and discussed. First, comments that allude to anxiety about communicating through CMPF are presented under the heading Communitive Apprehension. Comments indicating stress resulting from the perception that they were being assessed by the teacher are included under the heading test anxiety.
Statements that portray stress resulting from the student’s fear that their peers may judge them negatively are included under Fear of Negative Evaluation. Finally, in the Discussion of Student Anxiety the results are summarized and discussed from the perspectives of both the AFT and the relevant field of research.

4.3.1 Commutative Apprehension
Most of the students indicated that they experienced only inconsequential, or no anxiety around communicating through the CMPF platform. Blue explains this idea, noting that “online, people can say whatever”. Anonymity seems to play a part when they continue pointing out that “you don't have a face, you don't have to see the response. So, you can be more honest with the computer”. Green indicates that tensions are lessened since “I think you have more time with the computer”, which allows for “more time to think about the actual thing that needs changed”. Orange offered another perspective stating, “English isn’t my first language” making it “hard to form questions sometimes, but I don’t think there were major issues getting comments or to respond to the comments”. A few students agreed with Green who confides that they were “Just a little nervous”. Red did indicate that they would rather receive comments from the teacher and expressed some frustration about understanding comments on “grammatical stuff”.

4.3.2 Test Anxiety
Almost all the students felt as if their ability to use CMPF was being observed by the teacher somehow, and that this would somehow affect their grade. This however was correlated to only small amounts of stress. Red admitted that “you want to make the teacher proud”. They also said that they believed that authority would make them nervous because the “teacher, they give you the grade”. In this statement, they indicate that the peer aspect of CMPF does reduce test anxiety.

4.3.3 Fear of Negative Evaluation
Most of the students interviewed expressed apprehension about the quality of their comments, or their language skills. Orange mentioned that CMPF made it easier to assess language ability because “it’s easier for her to see what I am doing using Google docs”. Green indicated that using CMPF could result in some fear of evaluation stating that “you want to say exactly that
word”. Red gave a more neutral response indicating that their language ability was adequate but that this may not always be the case, expressing concerns that it would depend on the “level of” the peer’s proficiency.

### 4.3.4 Discussion of Students Anxiety

Most comments pertaining to motivation point to low communication anxiety. Those students were very aware that CMPF exposed their ability to communicate. Nevertheless, the students reported, similarly to Xu (2007), that they experienced minimal levels of communication anxiety. They explained that this is the result of the nature of CMC. However, unlike Xu (2007), very little negative ID was reported by the participants as a result of CMC issues. Green who was self-identified as dyslexic, and was observed to demonstrate introversion expressed that CMPF substantially reduced the anxiety that they often experienced while communicating. This is congruent with Ho (2015) whose observation highlights how more introverted students, who deal with feelings of exclusion, benefit most from CMPF. Using CMPF as a medium for communication in this study has resulted in low or alleviated communication anxiety. This would indicate that the participants experienced a lowered affective filter regarding communication during CMPF sessions.

The students stated that they felt their ability to use CMPF was being assessed. These feelings are described to contribute to low levels of anxiety. Furthermore, one student explained that the peer aspect reduces anxiety in comparison to receiving comments made by an authority figure. Similarly, regarding students’ test anxiety, most students did express apprehension about their ability to give quality feedback. This apprehension was caused by the perception CMPF more readily revealed their level of English.

Both the students’ test anxiety and fear of evaluation may be the result of diminished negotiation and interaction associated with the decision to not use chat function. Yoonjung (2009) and Lin and Yang (2011) found that the addition of a chat feature facilitated negotiation and interaction and alleviated hierarchy concerns by contributing to the social aspect of CMC. The student’s felt that they were being tested and evaluated led to some anxiety, thus raising the affective filter.
4.4 Student Confidence

In this section, comments that pertained to student confidence will be presented and discussed. In the Discussion of Student Confidence, the results are summarized and discussed from the perspective of both the AFT, and the relevant field of research.

Most of the students’ comments in this section indicate that the students were confident in their ability to give CMPF. While Purple admits that, “I know how to do the things that I do, so it’s not like advanced, I don’t have like advanced computer skills”, but “Yeah, I get around”. This confirms that they were comfortable giving feedback. Orange mentions that they “don’t think my skills are that good”. And again, the same student asserts a level of confidence noting, “that I’ve been very used to using Google docs because we used it ever since the first year here”. It seems that at least some of the confidence was a result of familiarity with the platform, as this statement suggests: “So, if we were to use something else I wouldn’t be that comfortable, but with Google docs I am comfortable”.

When the students were asked if using CMPF reduced their self-confidence the student responses were mostly neutral and indicated that reduction of self-confidence was situational and not dependent on the medium. Blue explains “I think it depends. It gives me confidence when I can answer some of his questions”. They added: “I know my subjects, I know that my paper is good”. Reaffirming and expanding the idea of the situational dependency of their confidence, they explain further “but if he would have asked a question which I didn't know the answer to I wouldn't feel confident at all”.

4.4.1 Discussion of Students Confidence

Most of the students seemed to express average to low technical competencies. According to AFT this should lead to a raising of the affective filter, thus minimizing SLA. This lowered level of confidence was however, not reported to be transferred to using CMPF. This contradicts the Lin and Yang (2011) study that correlates computer skills to negative affective response. When asked to clarify this contradiction students referred to their familiarity with using the CMC platform and having had previous experiences with CMPF. The student’s abilities to maintain confidence would indicate a low affective filter and improved SLA. However, some students noted that their level of language proficiency affected their confidence in giving CMPF. This
confirms Wu and Chen’s (2015) findings that student’s confidence was reduced when they lacked the skills necessary to give the appropriate feedback and would raise the affective filter and diminish SLA.

4.5 Pedagogical Considerations

In this section, results that are particularly important for both education professionals, and education oriented academics will be presented and discussed. First, it should be noted that experiences using CMPF were generally positive and indicated a relatively low affective filter. One student commented that they “thought it was a really good way to do it, like I am happy that we did it”. This kind of positive affective response, should facilitate SLA according to the AFT.

The most notable variance from the positive responses is related to test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation. It is important to add that these anxieties were moderate in nature. Blue confided that the teacher "makes me nervous. You want to make him proud". This in turn had a minor effect on the student’s confidence level. These moderate negative responses stem from a lack of real time interaction. This may have resulted from the decision not to interact in real time on the chat function. Red believes that “we can't hide into our computer”, and again saying "we have to be able to meet people.” This was not so much a negative affective response, but was more a statement of preference. The lack of real time interaction was perhaps addressed by the face to face peer review session that followed the CMPF; however, this is beyond the scope of this research.

In this study, I found that the CMC platform and peer feedback were responsible for improved results over those commonly found in the relevant field of research (Lin & Yang, 2011; Wichadee, 2013). These positive results contributed to a SLA environment characterized by decisively positive affective responses. This generally positive environment offset the previously mentioned negative affective responses. This according to the AFT would further facilitate SLA.

The results of this project demonstrate the effective use of CMPF in the ESL/EFL context by addressing ID. For instance, one student was dyslexic and four said that their first language was not English. There was a more extroverted student and a more introverted student. While one student seemed to be less motivated, another was ambitious. All of them felt that CMPF made the task of writing a paper in English easier, using terms like efficient, it’s fast, and it’s
useful. One student was poetic as they said of using CMPF to complete an assignment is “like a fresh kinda mind”. Finally, another student illustrates their point of view declaring that: “You don't have a face, you don't have to see the response while I am reading. Another who often has substantial communication anxiety, enthusiastically confirms their experience with CMPF: "Yeah I think you have more time with the computer" and “more time to think about the actual thing that needs changed”. The democratic value is demonstrated in that CMPF has addressed “each individual student’s needs, circumstances, experiences and thinking” as Skolverket (2013) dictates should be done. Furthermore, the decisively positive affective responses to using CMPF imply that the participants were both willing and able to fulfil their goals.

The students’ needs may have been addressed, but the most extroverted student’s preference for more authoritative feedback was not addressed by CMPF. As Greenwood (2016) suggests, “when considering students preferences, it is important to consider the previously mentioned ideals put forth by Skolverket. The subjective nature of the phrase “functional and meaningful learning” indicates that the preferences, and relative positions of students should be taken into account (p. 20). Red’s preference did affect the quality of their motivation. This preference is important to highlight for pedagogical consideration, however if and how this preference was met later in the project is beyond the scope of this study. I do however propose, as I have noted in Greenwood (2016), that “it may be necessary to use both CMPF and traditionally mediated peer feedback” (p. 20). This is necessary to suit the variety of preferences, needs, and students that can be found in ESL/EFL contexts in Sweden.
5. Conclusion

In this section, the results and discussion section are, first, summarized with the aim of answering the research questions:

- What affective experiences did students have when using CMPF and how did the students understand those experiences?
- How can these experiences be understood to affect second language acquisition according to Steven Krashen’s affective filter theory?

Following the summary of the results and discussion the limitations of study are presented. Finally, an overview of studies pedagogical implications is presented.

5.1 Summary of result and discussion

The results show that students were motivated to use CMPF primarily because of the belief that this helps them to write better. This positive affect is described by the AFT as integrative motivation and is considered to support SLA. The students were also motivated by the idea that this would lead to a better grade. This is considered instrumental motivation by the AFT. However, because the instrumental motivation was only seen as a consequence of writing better it would have less effect on SLA.

The students’ attitudes to CMPF were also decisively positive. In particular, the students showed a strong commitment to understanding feedback and considering its value. However, because consideration of comments was often moderated by active decisions to disregard the feedback the question of how to interpret participation becomes relevant.

The participants did report that CMPF alleviated communication anxiety. However, they reported that they felt like their performance was being tested by the teacher, and evaluated by their peers leading to some test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation. These feelings were attributed to the perception that the CMC platform revealed their level of competency. The alleviation of communication anxiety was understood to be the result of having consistent and constant exposure to both the learning platform and peer feedback. The level of ease that students expressed over the use of these techniques compensated for the circumstantial test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation associated with the task.
The students expressed a lack of confidence in using technology; however, this was not reportedly transferred to using CMPF. Small amounts of test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation did affect the student’s confidence somewhat. The students explain that teacher feedback or highly proficient peers might diminish their confidence, but that they for the most part felt that their skills were sufficient. The participants explained again that these concerns were offset by the consistent and constant use of both the CMC platform and peer feedback.

The participants generally positive affective responses using CMPF can been understood to facilitate SLA. The positive affective responses are dependent on many situational variables, including those often referred to by both the cognitively and socially oriented fields of pedagogical research.

5.2 Limitations and future research

In the discussion of student attitudes questions were raised about the interpretation of participation. Furthermore, additional correlations were made showing that the interplay of factors can have offset negative affective responses. This indicates that the AFT may not be a universally applicable pedagogical theory. The complexity of this finding is beyond the scope and purpose of this paper. I therefore suggest that these results might be best addressed by future research.

Because contemporary pedagogical theory does not substantially integrate affect with the cognitive and social fields this research is limited in its value for educational systems which are heavily influenced by social and cognitive theory. I propose, like Maftoon and Sabah (2012), that the more complete incorporation of affect into contemporary educational discourse could balance the tension between social and cognitive approaches to SLA. The effective incorporation of social, cognitive and affective factors could be used to create a powerful trifecta, and in doing so introduce new ideas into polemic educational discourse. I therefore propose that future research might focus on how these factors can be better integrated into a more complete pedagogical theory. The lack of contemporary support should not prohibit the prudent pedagogue from considering the pedagogical implications of affect in SLA presented below.
5.3 Implications

Although comprehensive theoretical and institutional support may not be readily available, this study makes some important correlations worth consideration. First it should be observed that students can be motivated to use CMPF if they believe it helps them to write better. The transparent nature of CMPF can lead to test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation. This however can be offset by continuously exposing students to the CMC platform, and peer feedback throughout the school year. The continuous use of CMPF techniques leads to positive attitudes, and generally positive environments for SLA.

CMPF can reduce communication anxiety; this is particularly important for students who often experience communication anxiety. A correlation between high confidence and a preference for traditional feedback is born from student experiences, and indicates that traditional methods may be more beneficial for students with high levels of confidence. However, again the continuous use of the CMPF platform and techniques offsets this negative correlation by further increasing student confidence.

This study correlates primarily positive affective responses to using CMPF. According to the AFT this supports SLA, and confirms the pedagogical value of the method. In particular, the democratic value of the method is confirmed in the face of ID. In addition to addressing individual difference CMPF could address individual preferences by incorporating real time interaction into CMPF. For example, the lack of real time interaction observed in this study could be addressed within the CMPF by incorporating a chat function, or by complementing CMPF with more traditional face-to-face peer feedback.
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# Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research overview</th>
<th>Anonymous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You can review research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You can withdraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informed consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can you all tell me a little bit about yourselves and what you think of your school?</th>
<th>Could you explain why you are writing these papers? What is your assignment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use computers for school related activities?</th>
<th>Do you prefer reading from paper or a computer? Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can you tell me what peer feedback is?</th>
<th>Can you tell me what CMPF is?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you used peer feedback in an English classroom before?</th>
<th>Have you used CMPF in an English language class?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Did you use both markup tool and the chat?</th>
<th>How, Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrative</th>
<th>Do you feel like CMPF helped improve the quality of your paper?</th>
<th>Global or local?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Do you use CMPF when it is not assigned? Would you?</th>
<th>Do you feel like the exercise will help you to get a better grade? Would this affect your decision to use CMPF in the future?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>What were your expectations of today's exercise before you came?</td>
<td>Can you compare your previous expectations with how you feel about it now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive/ Negative</td>
<td>How do feel about using a computer for getting peer feedback?</td>
<td>What were the most positive and what were the most negative aspects of the exercise?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>How much effort did you make trying to understand your peer’s comments?</td>
<td>Did the amount of effort you put into understanding your peer’s comments vary from the beginning to the end?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Have you considered using all the feedback you received?</td>
<td>What comments did you use? Which comments did you ignore? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>How did you feel during the exercise?</td>
<td>What was it that made you feel this way? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicati on</td>
<td>What aspects getting CMPF were more stressful? Why?</td>
<td>What was the easiest aspect of online feedback? Why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Did you feel that your participation in this event would be graded and affect your grade? Why?</th>
<th>How did this affect how you felt?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Were you nervous that people would think your English was not good?</td>
<td>When did you feel this?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was this a useful activity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the least useful parts of the exercise?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else that you’d like to mention?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Informed Consent
My name is Richard Greenwood and I am studying to be an English teacher at Malmö University. As part of my studies I am doing research into how Swedish students might respond to getting and giving computer-mediated peer feedback. To this end, I would like to interview you, and use the interview in a field research paper explaining the results of the aforementioned research. In addition to asking more broad questions about peer feedback, I will also ask questions pertaining to how computer mediated communication affects the respondent's motivation, attitude, anxiety, and self-confidence.

Participation is voluntary, and anonymous. You are welcome to withdraw your permission at any time. The interview will take approximately 30 min and an audio file will be made recording the interview. The audio file will be used to will be transcribed and create a record of your response. The transcription will be quoted, paraphrased and analyzed in the aforementioned field research paper.

I hereby agree to participate in the study described above and allow the results of this study to be published for the aforementioned academic purposes. The paper can be made available to upon request.

Date:

Location:

Printed Name:

Signature: