# AKRAN DÖNÜTÜ UYGULAMASININ İNGİLİZCE'Yİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN ÖĞRENCİLERİN YABANCI DİLDE YAZMA KAYGISI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ VE ÖĞRENCİLERİN AKRAN DÖNÜTÜ UYGULAMASI HAKKINDAKİ FİKİRLERİ

**Yülsek Lisans Tezi**

**MİHRİ KAYNAK**

**ESKİŞEHİR, 2017**

# IMPACT OF PEER FEEDBACK ON EFL LEARNERS' FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING ANXIETY AND THEIR IDEAS ABOUT PEER FEEDBACK

**Mihri KAYNAK**

**MA THESIS**

**English Language Teaching Program**

**Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya İPEK**

**Eskişehir**

**Anadolu University**

**Institute of Educational Sciences**

**April, 2017**

# AKRAN DÖNÜTÜ UYGULAMASININ İNGİLİZCE'Yİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN ÖĞRENCİLERİN YABANCI DİLDE YAZMA KAYGISI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ VE ÖĞRENCİLERİN AKRAN DÖNÜTÜ UYGULAMASI HAKKINDAKİ FİKİRLERİ

**Mihri KAYNAK**

**YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ**

**İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı**

**Danışman: Yar. Doç. Dr. Hülya İPEK**

**Eskişehir**

**Anadolu Üniversitesi**

**Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü**

**Nisan, 2017**

JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI

Mihri KAYNAK'ın "Impact of Peer Feedback on EFL Learners Foreign Language writing Anxiety and their Ideas about Peer Feedback" başlıklı tezi 11.04.2017 tarihinde, aşağıda belirtilen jüri üyeleri tarafından Anadolu Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim-Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliğinin ilgili maddeleri uyarınca Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngilizce Öğretmenliği programı yüksek lisans tezi olarak değerlendirilerek kabul edilmiştir.

| | Unvanı-Adı Soyadı | İmza |
|---|---|---|
| Üye (Tez Danışmanı) | : Yard.Doç.Dr. Hülya İPEK | ..... |
| Üye | : Prof. Dr. Gülsev PAKKAN | ..... |
| Üye | : Doç.Dr. Özgür YILDIRIM | ..... |
| Üye | : Yard.Doç.Dr. Gonca SUBAŞI | ..... |
| Üye | : Yard.Doç.Dr. Mine DİKDERE | ..... |

Prof.Dr. Handan DEVECİ
Anadolu Üniversitesi
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Müdürü

# ÖZET


AKRAN DÖNÜTÜ UYGULAMASININ İNGİLİZCE'Yİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN ÖĞRENCİLERİN YABANCI DİLDE YAZMA KAYGISI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ VE ÖĞRENCİLERİN AKRAN DÖNÜTÜ UYGULAMASI HAKKINDAKİ FİKİRLERİ

Mihri KAYNAK

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Nisan, 2017

Danışman: Yar. Doç. Dr. Hülya İPEK

Bu çalışma akran dönütü uygulamasının İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen Türk hazırlık okulu öğrencilerinin yaşadığı yabancı dilde yazma kaygısını üzerindeki etkisini ve bu öğrencilerin akran dönütü uygulaması hakkındaki fikirlerini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda katılımcılar akran dönütü uygulaması hakkında bilgilendirilip eğitilmiş, dokuz hafta boyunca akranlarından dönüt alıp akranlarına dönüt vermiş ve ikinci dilde yazma kaygısını ölçme envanteri çalışmanın başında ve sonunda uygulanmıştır. Bunların yanı sıra on beş katılımcı ile akran dönütü uygulaması hakkındaki fikirleri ve akran dönütünün yabancı dilde yazma kaygısı üzerindeki etkisi hakkında görüşülmüştür. Bu çalışma göstermiştir ki akran dönütü uygulaması üzerine eğitim almanın, akranlarına dönüt vermenin ve akranlarından dönüt almanın yabancı dilde yazma kaygısını azaltmak üzerinde önemli bir etkisi vardır. Öğrencilerin etkili bir şekilde dönüt vermek konusunda eğitilmelerini içeren iyi planlanmış bir uygulama programı ile ancak akran dönütü uygulaması yazma kaygısını azaltmada başarılı bir faktör haline gelebilir. Mevcut çalışmadaki katılımcıların belirttiğine göre akranlarından dönüt alıp akranlarına dönüt vermek daha rahat ve kendine güvenli hissetmelerine yardımcı olmuştur çünkü yazarken akranlarının da benzer hatalar yapıp benzer kaygılar taşıdıklarını fark etmişlerdir. Sonuç olarak, akran dönütü üzerine eğitim vermek ve uygulamalar yap(tır)mak yabancı dilde yazma kaygısını azaltarak ve yabancı dilde yazma farkındalığını arttırarak öğrencilerin başarılı olabileceklerine inanmaları açısından da etkili olma potansiyeline sahiptir.



**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce, Dönüt, Yabancı dilde yazma kaygısı, Akran dönütü, Öğretmen dönütü.

## ABSTRACT

IMPACT OF PEER FEEDBACK ON EFL LEARNERS' FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING ANXIETY AND THEIR IDEAS ABOUT PEER FEEDBACK

Mihri KAYNAK

English Language Teaching Program

Anadolu University, Institute of Educational Sciences, April, 2017

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya İPEK

The present study aims at researching the impact of peer feedback on foreign language writing anxiety experienced by Turkish prep school students studying EFL and their opinions about peer feedback. To achieve these aims, the participants in the experimental group got training on peer feedback, gave and received peer feedback for nine weeks. 120 participants in both control and experimental groups responded to Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) at the beginning and end of the study. Besides, 15 participants from the experimental group were interviewed about their thoughts regarding peer feedback and its impact on foreign language writing anxiety. The study revealed that training and practices on giving and receiving peer feedback had a significant impact on decreasing foreign language writing anxiety. The present study highlighted the idea that peer feedback practice needs to be a well-planned implementation supported with a continuous learner training on how to give peer feedback effectively and efficiently. For the participants in the present study, getting and giving peer feedback was helpful in feeling more relaxed and self-confident as they realized that their peers do similar mistakes and have similar worries during writing. As a conclusion, training and practices on peer feedback have the potential to lead learners to believe that they can be successful by reducing foreign language writing anxiety and increasing their awareness about EFL writing.


**Keywords:** EFL, Feedback, Foreign language writing anxiety, Peer feedback, Teacher feedback.

# ÖNSÖZ

Bu çalışmada amaç akran dönütü uygulamasının yabancı dilde yazma kaygısını üzerindeki etkisini ve katılımcıların akran dönütü uygulaması hakkındaki fikirlerini araştırmaktır. Araştırmadaki katılımcılara akran dönütü uygulaması hakkında eğitim verilmiştir. Katılımcılar dokuz hafta boyunca akranlarından dönüt alıp akranlarına dönüt vermiştir. Nicel veri toplamak için ikinci dilde yazma kaygısını ölçme envanteri çalışmanın başında ve sonunda uygulanmıştır. Nitel veri toplamak için on beş katılımcı ile akran dönütü uygulaması hakkındaki fikirleri ve akran dönütünün yabancı dilde yazma kaygısı üzerindeki etkisi hakkında görüşülmüştür. Bulgular akran dönütünün yabancı dilde yazma kaygısını azaltmak üzerinde önemli bir etkisi olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca akran dönütü uygulaması katılımcıları yazma dersiyle alakalı fikirlerini de olumlu yönde değiştirmiştir. Bu çalışma göstermiştir ki iyi planlanmış bir uygulama programı ile akran dönütü uygulaması yazma kaygısını azaltmada başarılı bir faktör haline gelebilir. Sonuç olarak, akran dönütü üzerine eğitim vermek ve uygulamalar yap(tır)mak yabancı dilde yazma kaygısını azaltarak ve yabancı dilde yazma farkındalığını arttırarak öğrencilerin başarılı olabileceklerine inanmaları açısından da etkili olabilir.

25/04/2017

## ETİK İLKE VE KURALLARA UYGUNLUK BEYANNAMESİ

Bu tezin bana ait, özgün bir çalışma olduğunu; çalışmamın hazırlık, veri toplama, analiz ve bilgilerin sunumu olmak üzere tüm aşamalardan bilimsel etik ilke ve kurallara uygun davrandığımı; bu çalışma kapsamında elde edilemeyen tüm veri ve bilgiler için kaynak gösterdiğimi ve bu kaynaklara kaynakçada yer verdiğimi; bu çalışmanın Anadolu Üniversitesi tarafından kullanılan "bilimsel intihal tespit programı"yla tarandığını ve hiçbir şekilde "intihal içermediğini" beyan ederim. Herhangi bir zamanda, çalışmamla ilgili yaptığım bu beyana aykırı bir durumun saptanması durumunda, ortaya çıkacak tüm ahlaki ve hukuki sonuçlara razı olduğumu bildiririm.

MİHRİ KAYNAK

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**İNGİLİZCE BAŞLIK SAYFASI**.....ii

**TÜRKÇE BAŞLIK SAYFASI**.....iii

**ÖZET**.....iv

**ABSTRACT**.....v

**ÖNSÖZ** .....vi

**ETİK İLKE VE KURALLARA UYGUNLUK BEYANNAMESİ**.....vii

**TABLE OF CONTENTS** ..... vii/ix

**LIST OF TABLES**.....x

**CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION** ..... 1

**1. 1. Introduction**..... 1

**1. 2. Background to the Problem** ..... 2

**1. 2. 1. Peer feedback** ..... 3

**1. 3. Statement of the Problem** ..... 4

**1. 4. The Purpose of the Study** ..... 5

**1. 5. Research Questions** ..... 6

**1. 6. Significance of the Study** ..... 6

**1. 7. Limitations of the Study** ..... 7

**1. 8. Definitions of the Terms** ..... 7

**CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE** ..... 8

**2. 1. Introduction**..... 8

**2. 2. The Role of Feedback in Writing as a Process** ..... 8

**2. 3. Types of Feedback**..... 9

**2. 3. 1. Forms of feedback**..... 9

**2. 3. 2. Sources of feedback** ..... 10

**2. 4. Review of Empirical Studies related to Peer Feedback in EFL/ ESL Contexts**..... 11

**2. 4. 1. Empirical studies on EFL/ESL writing anxiety and peer feedback.. 19**

**2. 5. Conclusion ..... 22**

**CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY ..... 24**

**3. 1. Introduction..... 24**

**3. 2. The Setting..... 24**

**3. 3. The Participants of the Study ..... 25**

**3. 4. Data Collection Instruments ..... 26**

**3. 4. 1. The second language writing anxiety inventory (SLWAI) ..... 26**

**3. 4. 2. Structured interviews ..... 26**

**3. 5. Data Collection Procedure ..... 27**

**3. 6. Data Analysis..... 30**

**CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION ..... 32**

**4. 1. Results ..... 32**

**4. 1. 1. The results on the impact of peer feedback on foreign language writing anxiety levels of the participants..... 32**

**4. 1. 2. The results on the opinions of the participants about peer feedback 36**

**4. 2. Discussion ..... 42**

**4. 2. 1. The impact of peer feedback on foreign language writing anxiety ... 43**

**4. 2. 2. Opinions of Turkish prep school students studying EFL about peer feedback..... 44**

**CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION..... 48**

**5. 1. The Impact of Peer Feedback on EFL Writing Anxiety..... 48**

**5. 2. The Opinions of the Participants about Peer Feedback ..... 49**

**5. 3. Implications..... 50**

**5. 4. Suggestions for Further Research ..... 51**

**REFERENCES..... 53**

**APPENDICES**

**ÖZGEÇMİŞ**

## LIST OF TABLES

**Sayfa**

**Table 4. 1.** The Comparison of Pre- and Post-Application of SLWAI of the Control Group ..... 33
**Table 4. 2.** The Comparison of Pre- and Post-Application of SLWAI of the Experimental Group ..... 33
**Table 4. 3.** The Comparison of Pre- and Post-Application of SLWAI of Both Group ..... 33
**Table 4. 4.** The Mean Scores and Anxiety Categories for the Experimental Group in the Pre-Application of SLWAI ..... 34
**Table 4. 5.** The Mean Scores and Anxiety Level Categories for the Experimental Group in the Post-Application of SLWAI ..... 35
**Table 4. 6.** The Number of Participants in the Experimental Group in the Pre- and Post-Application of SLWAI ..... 35

# CHAPTER 1

# INTRODUCTION

## 1. 1. Introduction

Writing can be defined from various perspectives. In process approach to writing, writing is defined as ‘‘a multiple-draft process which consists of generating ideas, writing a first draft with an emphasis on content; second and third drafts to revise ideas, and the communication of those ideas (Keh, 1990, p. 294)”. As mentioned in this definition, students learning to write proceed through multiple processes that involve planning, drafting, revising, and editing (Hyland, 2003; Keh, 1990). From a different perspective, writing is approached as a social process (Faigley, 1986). In this perspective, writing is defined as an interactive and a social activity, where the writer communicates with his/her target audience (Widdowson, 1984).

In the context of learning English as a second language (ESL) or as a foreign language (EFL), learners write to their teachers or their peers, their target audience, with the purpose of developing their writing skills in English. As an interactive and social process, then, writing activities should provide an opportunity for learners to communicate with their audience (Cinar, 2014). By this way, learners can develop awareness on their writing and have an idea of the strengths and weaknesses of their writing (Tsui & Ng, 2000). While proceeding through stages of writing, feedback provided to learners either by instructors or peers, or both becomes important in guiding them.

While learning to write in ESL or EFL contexts, feedback becomes essential for writing process to be successful (Chaudron, 1984). Especially, peer feedback that ESL and EFL learners get while developing their writing skills has been proven to have numerous benefits (Hansen & Liu, 2005; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994). One of the benefits of peer feedback is that it could reduce writing anxiety levels of ESL or EFL learners (Jahin, 2012; Kurt & Atay, 2007).

Thus, the present study aims at investigating whether peer feedback has an impact on foreign language writing anxiety experienced by Turkish prep school students studying EFL.

## 1. 2. Background to the Problem

In approaching writing as a social process, Faigley states “processes of writing are social in character instead of originating within individual writers (1986, p. 528)”. Also, Hirvela mentions that writing cannot occur ‘‘in a vacuum’’; but is rather shaped by the ‘‘expectations and demands of its intended community of readers (1999, p. 10)”. Therefore, the reader of a written text becomes very important as ‘‘the writer creates a picture of the reader, who thus becomes an ideal reader, attributes to this reader certain experience, knowledge, opinions, and beliefs on the basis of which the writer builds his message (Porto, 2001, p. 39)”. All these statements support the importance of audience element, which influence the quality of writing as a process. Thus, the feedback provided by the reader becomes significant in the writing process and development.

While acquiring productive skills such as speaking and writing, EFL or ESL learners may need regular and sufficient practice by producing speeches or texts in English language. In the case of writing, learners write multiple drafts and revise them constantly to develop their writing skills. Thus, the process of developing writing skills, especially in EFL/ESL contexts, requires lots of practice and adequate feedback from multiple sources, either by teachers or peers, or both (Keh, 1990). Feedback plays an important role for learners in guiding them in planning, drafting, revising, and editing stages.

EFL or ESL learners usually seek feedback provided by teachers to develop their writing in English, especially because the purpose of writing for EFL and ESL learners is to develop both writing and language skills. In EFL and ESL contexts, while giving feedback, writing instructors can provide both surface level feedback, aimed to focus on editing vocabulary, grammar, and punctuation errors, and global level feedback on the development of ideas, audience, purpose, and organization features (Hendrickson, 1978). Taking this into account, the feedback process may require more patience, effort, and time for writing process to lead development in learners’ writings (Rollinson, 2005). For this reason, peer feedback can be used as a second source of feedback for learners. By this way, learners can get feedback on their writing from a different source, which is their peer.

### 1. 2. 1. Peer feedback

Peer feedback can be defined as "the use of learners as sources of information and interactions for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained teacher, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both oral and written formats (Hansen & Liu, 2005, p. 31)". In peer feedback practice, which can also be termed as 'peer revision' or 'peer reviewing', student writers work in pairs or groups to read, criticize, and proofread each other's writing (Kroll, 2001). Peer feedback can be regarded as an important activity that allows writing teachers to help their students receive more feedback on their papers as well as give students an opportunity to practise a range of skills important in the development of language and writing ability, such as meaningful interaction with peers, a greater exposure to ideas, and new perspectives on the writing process (Hansen & Liu, 2005; Mangelsdorf, 1992). In peer feedback, peers become readers of others' work, provide written comments, and probably engage in oral sessions with the writers to negotiate meaning (Lockhart & Ng, 1995).

However, some common reasons for the ineffectiveness of implementing peer feedback were also determined: students are not knowledgeable enough to detect problems (Nelson & Murphy, 1993), students tend to ignore global level errors (Connor & Asenavage, 1994), and instructors are not willing to implement peer feedback (Chou, 1999). Nevertheless, benefits of peer feedback outweigh the reasons for the ineffectiveness of peer feedback in implementation and the common benefits are that peer feedback leads to cognitive development (Amores, 1997), creates a sense of text ownership (Tsui & Ng, 2000) and audience awareness (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994), increases motivation of learners (Bilen, 2014), helps students generate positive attitudes towards writing (Min, 2005), improves social interaction skills of students (Lockhart & Ng, 1995), fosters learner autonomy (Hansen & Liu, 2005), and reduces writing anxiety levels of language learners in EFL/ESL contexts (Cinar, 2014; Jahin, 2012; Kurt & Atay, 2007).

To conclude, it is proper to state that peer feedback might result in better revisions, overall improvements in writing quality, and reduction of EFL/ESL writing anxiety if instructors and learners invest enough time and effort (Jahin, 2012; Rollinson, 2005).

## 1. 3. Statement of the Problem

All over the world, a number of researchers have conducted studies to find out the factors affecting writing performance/competence of EFL/ESL learners (Erkan & Saban, 2011; Hassan, 2001; Susoy & Tanyer, 2013; Zhang, 2011). In these studies, foreign/second language writing anxiety has been found to have a negative impact on the writing performance of EFL/ESL learners (Al Asmari, 2013; DeDeyn, 2011; Negari & Rezaabadi, 2012; Zhang, 2011). Many researchers and instructors have provided suggestions on how to lower writing anxiety level of foreign/second language learners. Peer feedback has been suggested to be a beneficial application, which could reduce writing anxiety levels of language learners in EFL/ESL contexts (Jahin, 2012; Kurt & Atay, 2007). However, studies on the impacts of peer feedback on reducing writing anxiety are few and this relationship should be further studied.

Based on the previous studies conducted on the relationship between peer feedback and writing anxiety, it can be said that learners might generate more motivation and positive attitudes towards writing thanks to peer feedback application (Min, 2005) because peer feedback builds a sense of audience and provides the opportunity of writing to a real audience (Mangelsdorf, 1992; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Tsui & Ng, 2000). Besides, as peer feedback provides opportunities for students to be more active and autonomous in revision stage (Hirvela, 1999; Hyland, 2000; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994), it might help them be more self-confident. Learners becoming more self-confident might feel less writing anxiety. Additionally, the feeling of giving useful feedback to peers can potentially boost self-confidence and motivation (Min, 2005; Thompson, 2001; Topping, 2005). In addition to this, while giving feedback, learners become more aware of what the other learners experience through the writing process. Learners' increased awareness of the similar difficulties in writing might lead to learners' confidence in the writing process and thus their writing anxiety might reduce (Jahin, 2012; Kurt & Atay, 2007).

On the other hand, peer feedback might not be that effective to reduce foreign language writing anxiety. For instance, although peer reviewing helps writers be aware of other writers', and her/his own strengths and weaknesses (Dheram, 1995), an individual learner might focus more on the weaknesses rather than the strengths and feel anxious as a result.

Peer pressure might be another factor that can affect second language (L2) or foreign language (FL) writing anxiety and it might arise in peer feedback practices. Besides, as peer feedback lessens the reliance on teacher and makes students take more responsibility in their learning process (Thompson, 2001), it might negatively impact some learners who are not accustomed to being autonomous learners. Additionally, vague feedback is probable; therefore, students cannot build trust with peers, which might increase writing anxiety (Tsui & Ng, 2000).

When learners have low English language proficiency and limited knowledge about genre and topic, they might have difficulty in making corrections and giving feedback to their peers (Boughey, 1997; Hansen & Liu, 2005; Nelson & Murphy, 1993). In addition, due to not having enough knowledge and practice in giving peer feedback, EFL and ESL learners might experience anxiety. In these cases, ESL and EFL learners might still value teacher feedback over their peers' feedback (Connor & Asenavage, 1994). Therefore, they may not respond to and respect their peers' feedback, which can decrease EFL writers' self-confidence as the provider of feedback.

Thus, considering the scarcity of research on the effects of peer feedback on writing anxiety and the controversial results of present research, there is still a need to further investigate these concepts. The researcher of the present study is guided by these facts and aims at researching whether peer feedback has an impact on foreign language writing anxiety experienced by prep school students in Turkey, as an EFL context and what these impacts are.

### 1. 4. The Purpose of the Study

The current study aims at investigating whether peer feedback has an impact on foreign language writing anxiety experienced by Turkish prep school students studying EFL or not. Another aim of the study is to discover the ideas of Turkish prep school students about peer feedback practice.

## 1. 5. Research Questions

The following research questions were posed to guide the study:

1. What impact does peer feedback have on foreign language writing anxiety level of Turkish prep school students studying EFL?
2. What are the opinions of Turkish prep school students studying EFL about peer feedback?

## 1. 6. Significance of the Study

This study aims at investigating what impact peer feedback has on foreign language writing anxiety experienced by Turkish prep school students studying EFL. With this aim, the present study might enlighten the impact of language instructors on showing the benefits of implementing peer feedback in EFL classes. Drawing upon the possible suggestions that the present study can offer, peer feedback practice can be better implemented in EFL writing contexts to reduce writing anxiety level of language learners. Thus, language learners may have the opportunity to receive feedback from multiple sources in a collaborative language-learning environment.

Another contribution of the current study would be that as a result of EFL instructors' enlightenment on how to apply peer feedback to reduce writing anxiety, EFL learners may better understand the feedback procedure and can be better feedback givers and writers with lower EFL/ESL writing anxiety levels. Consequently, workload of EFL teachers and instructors for providing feedback to student papers may decrease thanks to effective implementation of peer feedback practice in EFL writing contexts. Furthermore, the ideas of learners and instructors who underestimate the value and effectiveness of peer feedback practice, especially in learning environments where the end product and getting good grades are regarded as more important than the overall process, may change and feedback from peers may be favoured more. Thus, learners may not be dependent on only teacher feedback.

Lastly, the present study can contribute to literature in EFL writing, peer feedback, and writing anxiety, and broaden the horizons of other researchers interested in this topic.

## 1. 7. Limitations of the Study

The present study is limited to 120 EFL learners at intermediate level, studying in a preparatory school at Anadolu University, Turkey. Further studies may include participants from different English proficiency levels. Due to the number of the participants, it may not be possible to generalize the results of the study to a larger scale. Additionally, learners' educational background is a variable that might impact how they respond to peer feedback as a process that requires learners to be more active and responsible in the learning process. A case study that examines the impacts of learners' educational background on their perceptions of peer feedback and their writing anxiety levels can be conducted. Another limitation of the study is that there can be some other factors which may have an impact on decreasing the foreign language writing anxiety levels of the participants. Practice, time, teacher feedback for class tasks and assignments, topic familiarity, and increase in the English proficiency level can be regarded as the other factors that contributed to the decrease in the foreign language writing anxiety levels of the participants. The final suggestion of the researcher of the current study is that researchers can investigate how peer feedback affects content, organisation, grammar, vocabulary, and spelling and to what extent.

## 1. 8. Definitions of the Terms

**Process Approach:** An approach used for teaching writing which focuses on writing process rather than the end product; provides writers with strategies to invent and discover; considers subject, purpose, and audience in writing; recursive; and distinguishes between aims and modes of discourse (e.g., persuasive, description, narrative, classification) (Connor & Kaplan, 1987). The main stages of this approach are: prewriting, planning, composing – drafting, revising, and editing (Keh, 1990).

**Revision:** A crucial stage of the writing process which involves reading the written work, deciding whether it is able to convey the intended message to; confirm, change or develop it through many drafts (Murray, 1978).

**Feedback:** "Input from a reader to a writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision (Flower, 1979, p.19)".

# CHAPTER 2

# REVIEW OF LITERATURE

## 2. 1. Introduction

In this chapter, the theoretical framework on which the study is based is given first. To accomplish this, process approach to writing is presented in detail. Related to this approach, the types of feedback, particularly peer feedback, are explained. The studies with negative and positive results were also presented. Finally, the relation between peer feedback and writing anxiety is discussed.

## 2. 2. The Role of Feedback in Writing as a Process

Feedback is one of the most crucial components of writing as it is a way of solving problems students encounter while writing. Feedback can be defined as ‘‘input from a reader to a writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision (Flower, 1979, p. 19)”. Feedback is essential as it is a ‘‘central and critical contribution to the evolution of a piece of writing (Arndt, 1993, p. 91)”. Feedback can be guiding for learners at any stages of their writing process. In the prewriting stages, communication of ideas generated by the writer can help the writer clarify his/her ideas before writing (Muncie, 2000). Also, as feedback is “what pushes the writer through the various drafts on the eventual end-product (Keh, 1990, p. 294)”, it can be guiding in drafting and revision stages, too.

Another broad benefit of feedback is that it enhances language learning as students have the chance to see their mistakes and learn the correct language forms and functions. This can be achieved by surface level feedback, which is about lexical accuracy, grammar, spelling, and punctuation (Hendrickson, 1978). For instance, correction of grammar errors, as surface-level errors, fosters development of grammar. Through global feedback, which is related to development of ideas, audience, purpose, and organizational features of a text (Hendrickson, 1978), learners can have the opportunity to see their weaknesses as writers and fix the problems in their texts related

to content and organization (Youngs & Green, 2001). Thus, feedback helps learners improve their writing skills by showing the problematic parts in their texts.

According to Leki (1991), feedback closes the gap between the writer and the reader as it develops a sense of audience. Sense of audience helps in ‘‘anticipating and considering viewpoints other than their own (Boughey, 1997, p.127)”. By this way, writers can be aware of whether they communicate the intended meaning.

What role feedback can play is determined by its source and form. How feedback can shape a particular writing is closely related to whether it is explicit or implicit, oral or written, and who provides it. The types of feedback, and particularly, peer feedback will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

## 2. 3. Types of Feedback

Types of feedback differ in terms of form and source. While the forms of feedback are written and oral, the sources of feedback can be teacher, peer, or self.

### 2. 3. 1. Forms of feedback

Written feedback can be defined as ‘‘written input from a reader to a writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision (Keh, 1990, p. 294)”. Written feedback can be provided in two different ways: explicitly or implicitly. Implicit feedback has various forms such as using codes, implying, asking questions etc. Explicit written feedback is to directly write the correct forms.

Implicit written feedback can sometimes be vague, confusing or illegible for the writers (Ihde, 1993; Kepner, 1991; Semke, 1984). When learners have difficulty in understanding codes in teachers’ feedback, teachers can give explicit oral feedback by explaining their feedback. In this case, written feedback is assisted by oral feedback in order to prevent confusion. On the other hand, written correction can leave little space for students in revision and editing stages, and less learning may occur. In summary, which method to use depends on the teacher, learners, and the task.

The literature defines oral feedback as ‘‘oral input from a reader to a writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision (Keh, 1990, p. 294)”. Oral

feedback sessions can be called as teacher-student or student-student conferences. Oral feedback can be provided in a one-to-one situation or with a small group. The major benefit of oral feedback is the opportunity provided for students to negotiate meaning. By this way, learners can have more active roles in the revising process. Also, students practise the target language while they are trying to negotiate meaning. As a conclusion, oral feedback is beneficial in terms of language practice, and creating active learners (Keh, 1990).

### 2. 3. 2. Sources of feedback

Source of feedback can be either a teacher or a peer, or both. Self-evaluation is another source of feedback. Each source of feedback can provide a different perspective on writing performance and is a valuable component in developing writing performance of a learner. Chaudron (1984) states that both teacher and peer feedback are beneficial for the improvement of writing skills.

As Muncie (2000) claims, using teacher feedback as the only source might result in learners' lacking critical thinking and evaluation skills, especially on their own progress as they might tend to rely heavily on teacher feedback (Ciftci, 2011). Besides, learners tend to blindly accept the teacher feedback as the only truth since the teacher is the grader (Sengun, 2002).

By getting feedback from their peers, learners can have many readers and not only the teacher as the source of feedback. Peer feedback practices where learners communicate their ideas on their writing can foster the collaborative learning environment (Cinar, 2014; Hansen & Liu, 2005). On the other hand, students tend to focus on surface level errors more while providing feedback to their peers as such errors are easier to detect than global ones (Beason, 1993; Berger, 1990; Hall, 1990; Leki, 1990; Yagelski, 1995). For this reason, students should be ready to incorporate surface and global level feedback to make peer feedback more effective (Chaudron, 1988; Pienemann, 1989) as students' views on feedback might affect developing their writing skills (Leki & Carson, 1994). In this sense, peer feedback can be seen as a supplementary or an additional source of feedback to teacher feedback. With adequate and proper training on how to give and incorporate feedback, learners can learn to provide more guidance for their peers. By this way, learners can also learn to be better self-evaluators.

## 2. 4. Review of Empirical Studies related to Peer Feedback in EFL/ ESL Contexts

Peer feedback might provide benefits in developing EFL/ESL writing skills (Mangelsdorf, 1992). However, research on peer feedback has yielded contrasting results. While there are studies indicating that peer feedback can be ineffective because of several reasons (Allei & Connor, 1990; George, 1984; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Nelson & Murphy, 1993), there are studies revealing the strengths of peer feedback in developing EFL/ESL writing skills (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Liu, & Carless, 2006; McLoughlin & Luca, 2004; Min 2005; Rollinson, 2005; Shaw, 2002; Topping 2005).

The first reason why peer feedback can be ineffective in writing classes is that the implementation of peer feedback may be overwhelming and can create confusion for teachers, especially when teachers are confused in terms of what exactly peer review involves and what the best way to utilize it is (Chou, 1999; Rollinson, 2005). Another possible reason for the ineffectiveness of peer feedback can be students' inability to provide concrete and useful feedback (Chou, 1999; Leki, 1990; Lockhart & Ng, 1993; Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger, 1992; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Tsui & Ng, 2000). Generally, students who learn English as a second/foreign language tend to give vague advice when reviewing peer texts. Some researchers suggest that this is probably because of students' lack of knowledge and skills for revision and their overdependence on teacher guidance (Flynn, 1982; George, 1984; Wiener, 1986). Villamil and DeGuerrero (1998) agree by stating that false corrections may occur through peer comments because of lack of knowledge and this may result in fossilization of errors.

Additionally, students may not trust their peers since they think their peers are not qualified enough in terms of English and writing knowledge to comment on drafts (Allei & Connor, 1990; George, 1984; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Nelson & Murphy, 1993). That is, when learners get feedback from their peers, they might distrust and underestimate the value of the feedback, and prefer their teachers to give them feedback (Tsui & Ng, 2000). In the same vein, Nelson and Carson (1998), Saito (1994), and Zhang (1995) view learners' ignorance of their peers as the main reason why students prefer teacher feedback to peer feedback.

In exam-oriented learning environments, writing is highly related to accuracy. That is, students are required to write accurate texts to pass the class or exams. As a result, peer comments might lose its value and teacher feedback might be preferred more than

peer comments (Harris, 1993; Hu, 2002; Porto, 2001; Sengupta, 1998; Tse; 1993). Sengupta's (1998) study proves these views and supports the idea that the context of learning environment, teacher and learner roles might impact learners' attitudes towards peer feedback, and thus their peer feedback practices.

The study by Sengupta (1998) investigated whether the changes that students made were a result of peer feedback and whether peer feedback raised their awareness as real readers. The participants were twelve learners learning English in Hong Kong. The participants were asked to do both self-evaluation and peer evaluation for their compositions. Then, two sheets were analyzed to investigate which changes they made were due to peer evaluation. After the analysis, six students were interviewed to reveal their ideas on the usefulness of peer evaluation, their abilities of giving peer feedback, the examination system in their school, their belief about knowledge and teachers' role, and how they perceive themselves as real readers.

The study concluded that the revisions on their compositions were not a result of peer evaluation. Students did not make the changes that their peers indicated until they realized the same points by themselves. The interviews revealed that the participants considered peer evaluation as useful, but they did not think that peer evaluation increased their awareness as real readers. Besides, the participants perceived themselves as inadequate in providing peer feedback and this perception is significantly correlated to their perception of teacher as the provider of correct knowledge. The results emphasize the impact of traditional role of teacher on learners' attitudes towards peer feedback. Lastly, the study concluded that the educational context was an important factor that made the participants think that the value of learning was less important than a good grade.

Connor and Asenavage's (1994) study revealed similar results with, and complementary to Sengupta's (1998) study in that it presented the amount of revisions that directly resulted from peer feedback. The participants of the study were eight ESL students and they were required to provide oral feedback to their peers. The oral feedback sessions were recorded and analyzed. The results showed that approximately 5% of the revisions done by the students resulted from peer feedback sessions. 35% of the revisions resulted from teacher comments and 60% of them were a result of self-revision and other factors. In short, this study showed that peer feedback had a small impact on students' revisions.

Building on the aforementioned studies, learners' ideas and perceptions can be an important factor in affecting the implementation of peer reviewing. Nelson and Carson (1998) designed a study with the purpose of finding out students' perceptions about their interactions during peer review. The participants were eleven Chinese and Spanish speaking ESL students at a university in the United States. To gather data, peer review sessions were recorded for six weeks and interviews were conducted with the participants. The data indicated that all students welcomed negative comments that indicated the problematic parts in their texts. However, the participants preferred teacher comments to peer comments because students stated that they were not satisfied with peer comments as they thought the comments were not beneficial in terms of grammar. Nelson and Carson (1998)'s study is relevant to the present study as it provided results on how learners' ideas on peer reviewing impact the implementation and efficacy of peer reviewing. As Paulus mentions, "if students are defensive, uncooperative, and distrustful to each other, or primarily trying to avoid conflict, little productive work will occur in the classroom (1999, p. 268)".

Teacher beliefs and attitudes can be influential in shaping learners' ideas on peer reviewing and reasons for the ineffectiveness of peer feedback, as well. The results of Dipardo and Freedman's (1988) study showed us that teachers might affect the nature and social progress of peer revision when they do not truly believe in the value of peer feedback. Besides, Saito and Fujita (2004) comment that teachers may not trust students for peer feedback as they think students are incapable of rating peers because of their lack of language ability, skill, and experience. As a result, peer feedback may become ineffective.

Finally, another underlying reason for inefficacy of peer feedback practices can be the time that needs to be allocated for peer reviewing. Rollinson (2005) stresses that whether oral or written, providing feedback to a peer takes much time. Reading a peer's paper, making notes about the problematic parts, and then negotiating with a peer before revision of the draft take up a significant amount of time. Moreover, not all students can work well together; the success of peer revision sometimes depends on the characteristics of participants.

Even though there are studies that have negative results in terms of implementing peer feedback in EFL/ESL writing, there are also a number of studies with numerous positive results in terms of implementing peer feedback in writing in EFL/ESL contexts.

Caulk (1994) aimed at researching the quality of peer feedback of learners, the differences between teacher and peer feedback, and to what extent the participants incorporated peer and teacher feedback. The participants of the study were 43 EFL students, whose ages ranged from 18 to 25. The participants were required to complete three essay-writing tasks in a semester. The students wrote the first drafts and received peer feedback with the help of guiding questions. Then, they got teacher comments. After getting feedback, the participants decided which of them, peer or teacher feedback, to incorporate in their second drafts. The researcher compared the percentage of peer comments and teacher comments used in the second drafts. The results of the study showed us that 89% of the participants made peer comments, which were considered as valid by the teacher. Secondly, 60% of the students mentioned about the things the teacher had not mentioned in his feedback. On the other hand, the teacher's comments were incorporated more than peer comments.

Another finding of the study was that the teacher commented on general problems of the text and about the whole text; whereas the students focused on specific problems and on a specific part of the text. Moreover, the researcher stated that the students preferred to give their comments directly, while the teacher preferred to comment indirectly. Another conclusion driven from the study was that both peer and teacher feedback focused on similar things; however, they were in different wording. Therefore, learners had the opportunity to see their mistakes from different perspectives. Caulk (1994) suggested that multiple comments may help a student writer understand her/his mistake in a written task or the problematic part in a text as teacher feedback can sometimes be vague; therefore, with the help of peer comments, writers can understand the problematic parts in their texts more easily.

Tsui and Ng's (2000) study investigated to what extent teacher and peer feedback facilitated revisions. 27 Chinese ESL learners were the participants of the study. Before the study, the writing tasks were composed of only one draft and only teacher feedback was provided, where the focus was on grammatical accuracy. With the study, the participants were introduced to process approach oriented writing cycles which consisted of whole class brainstorming activity, first draft based on these brainstorming activities, teacher feedback to whole class focusing on common problems in writing that particular task, peer feedback to first draft, oral feedback sessions in groups of three or four, second draft, teacher written comments, and final draft. This writing cycle procedure was

repeated six times with different writing tasks. In the fourth cycle, a questionnaire aiming to reveal the participants' attitudes towards process approach, usefulness of written and oral peer feedback, usefulness of teacher comments, and their ideas on the improvements in their writings was given to the participants. As another data collection tool, semi-structured interviews with six participants were conducted.

The results revealed that participants incorporated feedback from both teacher and peers. While the participants found teacher feedback accurate, and induce more revisions, they thought peer feedback provided them more concrete suggestions as a result of their discussion on their feedback. For them, teacher feedback was valuable in helping them to make revisions on content and organization, which was not possible by peer feedback. Besides, the participants mentioned that their teachers were used to reading their writing so the participants did not feel a need to make their writing clear as they knew the teacher would understand and correct them. Therefore, their peers created a sense of real audience and forced them to make their writing more clear. As a result of this, the participants mentioned that they got better at clarifying their intended meaning as they regarded their peers as real audiences. Another result of this study was that peer revision helped students to develop sense of ownership of their writings. The participants could take the initiative to decide whether to make the suggested changes or not. Lastly, the study concluded that peer feedback sessions raised the participants' awareness of their own weaknesses and strengths.

Peer feedback is a social activity, where learners negotiate meaning through their interactions (Farrah, 2012; Nelson & Murphy, 1992). Besides, peer feedback process necessitates collaboration among learners (Hansen & Liu, 2005). While giving and receiving feedback, learners communicate to clarify their intended meaning. Through interaction and dialogue, learners would ideally learn how to make meaningful revisions. Therefore, peer feedback is a valuable activity as it offers an opportunity for the development of writing and social interaction skills, which is necessary for language learning.

Another benefit of peer feedback application is that it has the potential of developing learners' critical thinking and self-evaluation skills, which can also lead to learners' monitoring their learning and progress in learning language and writing skills (Bilen, 2014; Farrah, 2012; Lundstrom & Baker, 2008; Rollinson, 2005; Thomas, Marting & Pleasants, 2011). Learners giving feedback would ideally develop creative

thinking skills to evaluate a paper. Similarly, learners incorporating peer feedback can possibly develop thinking skills to decide which feedback is valid and worth incorporating, which helps them to make appropriate revisions. Giving and using peer feedback are beneficial activities for learners that can help them to learn to critically evaluate their own writing (Rollinson, 2005). By this way, learners can better monitor their self-progress (Swain, Brooks, & Tocalli-Beller, 2002; Thomas, Marting, & Pleasants, 2011).

Research on peer feedback also indicated that it had a positive impact on fostering writing and language learning motivation (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Liu, & Carless, 2006; McLoughlin & Luca, 2004; Min 2005; Rollinson, 2005; Shaw, 2002; Topping 2005). For example, Farrah (2012) studied the impact of peer reviewing on students' attitudes towards peer feedback and their writing performances. 105 EFL students were the participants of the study. The pre- and post-writing performances of both control and experimental groups were compared to see whether peer feedback had an impact on the writing performance of participants in the experimental group. Another data collection instrument was a Likert type questionnaire, which was administered at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the study to reveal the participants' attitudes towards peer feedback and their motivation for writing and working collaboratively. The participants provided feedback to their peers throughout a semester under the guidance of the teacher. The study concluded that the writing performances of the participants who received peer feedback increased and they developed positive attitudes towards peer feedback. Besides, the study revealed that there was an increase in students' motivation to write due to peer-reviewing practices.

Although how to use peer pressure to increase motivation in peer feedback is not a clear phenomenon and is a challenge (Ransdell, 2001), peer effect may still well function as a strong motivator (Shaw, 2002). Knowing to be evaluated by their peers, learners might feel pressure, and this can create a competitive atmosphere. As a result of this, for their peers, who are equal to themselves in terms of knowledge and capacity, they might force themselves to do the best not to be seen less capable (Shaw, 2002). In addition to peer pressure, a pressure to give valid feedback for their peers can increase motivation of learners. This helps learners develop a sense of personal responsibility. Besides, learners' having the role of an instructor might increase their motivation and engagement in the process (Farrah, 2012; Rollinson, 2005; Shaw, 2002). By this way,

learners may realize that they are capable of giving good feedback and therefore develop self-confidence (Shaw, 2002).

Research on peer feedback revealed that peer feedback process can also enhance the development of language skills in EFL and ESL (Fallahi, Wood, Austad, & Fallahi, 2006; Gielen, Peeters, Dochy, Onghena, & Struyven, 2010; Liu & Carless, 2006; Lundstrom & Baker, 2008; McLouglin & Luca, 2004; Paulus, 1999). Among these studies, Lundstrom and Baker (2008) found that learners receiving and giving feedback successfully learnt to develop global and local level aspects of their writings. The study concluded that especially learners, who were trained to give feedback, had more gains in terms of global aspects than the learners who were trained to use peer feedback. For Lundstrom and Baker, an underlying reason for this is that "learning to review others' writing improves one's own writing and students learn from these activities to critically self-evaluate their own writing in order to make appropriate revisions (2008, p. 9)". This study emphasizes the importance of training on giving peer feedback and indicates that such training can develop both learners' self-evaluation skills and writing skills.

In the same vein, Efe found that training students on giving and using peer feedback and incorporating peer feedback into writing can contribute to development of learners' writing skills "as it enhances collaboration and interaction among students by creating an active classroom environment (2014, p. 39)". In addition to this, feedback training and feedback giving and receiving practices, if implemented in English, as the target language, constitute an opportunity for EFL/ESL learners to practise their listening and speaking skills (Lockhart & Ng, 1995; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Tang & Tithecott, 1999).

Finally, learners' attitudes towards peer reviewing might impact the implementation of peer reviewing in developing writing skills. Learners' preference of feedback, either teacher or peer, is related to their ideas on which one is the most effective for them (Rollinson, 2005). Besides, when learners give and receive peer feedback, and get training on how to give feedback to each other's writing, they might develop positive attitudes towards peer reviewing. To illustrate, Kastra (1987) investigated students' attitudes towards writing after peer response and teacher response. She found that students who participated in peer feedback practice showed more positive attitudes towards writing than the students who had received only teacher feedback.

Similarly, Zhang (1995) investigated eighty-one students' preferences for source of feedback, who studied writing in an ESL context in the USA. The aim of the study was to find out which feedback source -teacher, peer, or self- students would choose before writing the final draft if given a chance. Data were collected through a questionnaire. The results of the study indicated that students valued peer feedback as they thought it provided a sense of audience and created more social support than teacher feedback. Furthermore, students preferred peer feedback to self-revision because of the necessity for an audience.

In the same vein, Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, and Huang (1998) researched 121 Chinese students' attitudes towards peer feedback by making students use peer feedback as the only source of feedback. The results showed us that 93% of the participants favoured peer feedback when they had no other feedback source to receive feedback.

Finally, peer feedback may have an impact on learners' developing positive attitudes towards peer reviewing and benefit from peer reviewing if implemented after a well-planned training program with appropriate tasks, time, and patience (Rollinson, 2005).

Also, Sengun (2002) investigated whether a four-week training program could change the attitudes of students towards peer feedback. The participants were 15 students studying English at a foreign language department in an EFL context, Turkey. A questionnaire was administered before and after the training program and eight participants were interviewed after the application of the second questionnaire. The results revealed that the training program affected the attitudes of students towards peer feedback in a positive way.

Based on the studies mentioned in this section, it can be said that peer feedback may lead to cognitive development (Amores, 1997), create sense of text ownership (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Tsui & Ng, 2000) and audience awareness (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Tsui & Ng, 2000), increase motivation (Bilen, 2014; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Rollinson, 2005; Thompson, 2001; Topping, 2005), generate positive attitudes towards writing (Min, 2005), develop social interaction skills (Lockhart & Ng, 1995; Tsui & Ng, 2000), create autonomy (Hansen & Liu, 2005; Thompson, 2001), and improve writing skill (Lundstrom & Baker, 2008). Peer feedback can be an alternative feedback source or can be used as complementary to teacher feedback (Caulk, 1994) and it offers the opportunity of receiving feedback from multiple sources (Caulk, 1994; Mittan, 1989).

Furthermore, learners can learn how to increase text length (Berg, 1999), how to clarify the intended meaning (Tsui & Ng, 2000), and how to revise writing effectively (Lee, 1997) in peer feedback sessions. Finally, peer feedback may lead to collaborative dialogue and; therefore, cooperative learning (Hansen & Liu, 2005).

### 2. 4. 1. Empirical studies on EFL/ESL writing anxiety and peer feedback

Anxiety is a factor that impacts the writing performance of EFL/ESL learners, especially with low English writing proficiency (Abdel Latif, 2012; Hassan, 2001; Susoy & Tanyer, 2013). In other words, writing anxiety negatively affects ESL/EFL learners' writing quality (Hassan, 2001; Magno, 2008).

There are various sources of writing anxiety. Firstly, it might result from learners' having low self-esteem (Magno, 2008) and low self-efficacy (Cheng, 2002; Erkan & Saban, 2011; Rankin-Brown, 2006). In addition to these, leaners' worrying about their foreign or second language knowledge and ability is another reason for writing anxiety (Hertz-Lazarowitz & Bar-Natan, 2002). For Abdel-Latif, language learners experience anxiety "due to their low language and writing ability self-perceptions, communication apprehension and poor writing achievement history (2012, p.13)''. As Hassan (2001) stated poor knowledge and skill development of composing, lack of L2 linguistic knowledge, product based, and teacher oriented approach to language teaching are the underlying reasons of high level of writing anxiety. Besides, topic unfamiliarity and negative teacher feedback (Abdel Latif, 2012; Hassan, 2001; Ozturk & Saydam, 2014) can be other sources of writing anxiety. Abdel Latif summarizes the main sources of EFL/ESL writing anxiety as "linguistic knowledge level, perceived language competence, writing performance level, perceived writing competence, instructional practices and fear of criticism (2012, p.1)". Rankin-Brown also states that both the "fear of how the teacher will evaluate the writing" and "fear of how their peers will evaluate their writing (2006, p. 3)" can be reasons of anxiety no matter what the source of feedback is.

Bearing these causes of writing anxiety in mind, the simplest solution to reduce the anxiety level of L2 writers is to develop their linguistic knowledge and writing abilities, particularly by creating learning environments that can foster this goal in less threatening ways (Abdel Latif, 2012; Hassan, 2001; Rankin-Brown, 2006). The feeling of being knowledgeable and competent in L2 writing can possibly help learners to feel

less anxious and foster their writing abilities. This can be achieved by a learning context where the teacher is not dominant and not the only source of feedback (Hassan, 2001). In addition to this, Ozturk and Saydam assert that teachers need to be careful on their manners of giving feedback as "teachers may have an indirect effect on students' writing anxiety level (2014, p. 17)". Besides, to counteract anxiety, the type of feedback needs to be reconsidered to make sure that there is enough praise and constructive feedback from variety of sources, self, peer, or teacher (Abdel Latif, 2012). Lastly, awareness on the role of feedback through training can minimize the level of anxiety resulting from being evaluated (Rankin-Brown, 2006).

Research on peer feedback in ESL/ EFL contexts investigated whether peer feedback had a positive impact on reducing anxiety levels of EFL learners (Zhang, 2011). Research on the relation between anxiety and peer feedback has shown that training learners on how to give and receive peer feedback is of vital importance to enhance the positive impacts of peer feedback on reducing writing anxiety (Kurt & Atay, 2007; Susoy & Tanyer 2013; Zhang, 2011). Through training, learners can learn how to give constructive feedback and interpret feedback of their peers constructively (Ozogul & Sullivan, 2009). By learning this, students can benefit from peer feedback to boost their self-confidence as the provider of feedback (Min, 2005). Besides, during peer reviewing, seeing that they have similar worries and efficacies can help L2 learners increase the level of self-efficacy and self-esteem, which has a fundamental role in reducing anxiety and developing writing performance (Cinar, 2014; Jahin, 2012; Min, 2005; Zhang, 2011). Besides, training on giving feedback is crucial for learners to develop their skills in giving clear and unambiguous comments; which can help learners to better interpret and incorporate feedback. This contributes to the development of writing skills (Zhang, 2011); thus reduces writing anxiety.

Among the studies that investigated the impacts of peer feedback training on writing anxiety, Kurt and Atay (2007) conducted a research on whether peer feedback practices had any impacts on foreign language writing anxiety. 86 prospective EFL teachers were the participants of the study. Cheng's (2004) Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory was given to both the experimental and control groups at the beginning and end of the study. While the experimental group got both written and oral peer feedback for their essays, and grading for eight weeks, the control group received only teacher feedback for first drafts of their essays. Eight weeks later, 20 participants from

the experimental group were interviewed on their experiences of peer feedback.

The study concluded that the participants who had training on peer feedback and gave peer feedback for a period of time experienced decrease in their anxiety levels. The interviews revealed that the majority of the participants found peer feedback helpful and enjoyed the peer feedback discussions. The main reason for this was that the participants thought that their peers showed their mistakes, and provided them useful ideas and perspectives to develop their essays. The most significant reason why the participants liked peer feedback sessions was that they "felt less anxious, self-confident, and free (Kurt & Atay, 2007, p. 19)". Based on these results, Kurt and Atay (2007) emphasized the positive impact of feedback training and assistance that the participants were exposed to on participants' benefitting from peer feedback.

Jahin's (2012) study provided similar results with Kurt and Atay's (2007) study. The study aimed at investigating the relation between peer reviewing, second language writing anxiety, and ability. The participants of the study were 40 EFL students at an English teacher education program in Saudi Arabia. Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory by Cheng (2004) was administered to both control and experimental groups. In order to measure the participants' ability to write, both groups took three essay-writing tests at different times. Then, the participants in the experimental group received training on giving peer feedback for two class hours and then, evaluated their peers' essays by using a checklist of assessment rubrics. The peer reviewing sessions included both written feedback on surface and global level aspects of their essays and discussions on the feedback they provided. The participants in the control group were provided with only teacher grades and feedback. Later, the researcher and an independent EFL instructor graded both groups' essays.

The results of the study revealed that anxiety levels of the experimental group, who got training on peer feedback and gave and received peer feedback decreased more than the control group who got only teacher feedback. Besides, the scores of essay writing tests of the experimental group were significantly higher than the control group, which indicated that peer reviewing and multiple draft writing approach led to development in writing ability in EFL. Jahin (2012) suggested that meaningful peer feedback could contribute to learner motivation to develop writing ability and create a less threatening learning atmosphere, where learners write without feeling anxious.

Cinar's (2014) study supported the view that peer feedback training and practice can reduce anxiety levels of EFL learners by creating a more informal and collaborative learning atmosphere. In Cinar's (2014) study, 16 learners with pre-intermediate English level at a preparatory school in Turkey were the participants. In addition to Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory by Cheng (2004), researcher observation, researcher diary on her observations, and interviews with the participants were used as data collection tools. Observation and researcher diary aimed at revealing what impact peer feedback had on the participants. Interviews aimed at investigating the participants' thoughts on the impact of peer feedback on writing anxiety, self-confidence, and their feelings while getting peer feedback. In this 7-week study, the participants were trained on how to give peer feedback by using a checklist.

The results of the study indicated that cognitive anxiety, somatic anxiety, and avoidance behaviour levels of the participants decreased after peer feedback training and practice sessions. Another result of the study based on the interviews was that peer feedback practices created a more supportive, collaborative, interactive, educational, and less threatening learning environment.

As a conclusion, if students are trained well on how to provide constructive feedback to their peers, their writing anxiety levels may decrease (Min, 2005). Moreover, with the help of discussion during peer feedback, students might realize that their peers have similar worries (Susoy & Tanyer, 2013). Thus, a more positive, social, and less threatening learning environment where learners write comfortably can be established during peer feedback sessions (Cinar, 2014; Jahin, 2012; Zhang, 2011).

Although the aforementioned studies enriched the understanding of the impact of peer feedback, there is still a need for research exploring whether peer feedback can be used to reduce writing anxiety levels of language learners in an EFL context.

## 2. 5. Conclusion

This chapter has presented both the theoretical framework and empirical data on implementing peer feedback in EFL writing, specifically the advantages and disadvantages of peer reviewing, and the relation between peer-reviewing and writing anxiety. The present study has been conducted to investigate if peer reviewing could reduce EFL/ESL writing anxiety of prep school students in an EFL context at university

level. The next chapter will present the methodology, data collection procedure, methods, and analysis.

# CHAPTER 3

# METHODOLOGY

## 3. 1. Introduction

The aim of the current study is to investigate whether peer feedback has an impact on foreign language writing anxiety. To achieve this aim, the following research questions were posed to guide the study:

1. What impact does peer feedback have on foreign language writing anxiety level of Turkish prep school students studying EFL?
2. What are the opinions of Turkish prep school students studying EFL about peer feedback?

## 3. 2. The Setting

This study was conducted at the School of Foreign Languages of Anadolu University (AUSFL) in Eskisehir, Turkey. The school aims to help university students acquire upper-intermediate level of proficiency in English before attending their departments. At the beginning of each academic year, the students take a placement exam, according to which they are placed at, A level (upper intermediate), B level (intermediate), C level (lower intermediate), or D level (elementary).

The classes consist of integrated language skill courses; therefore, there are no writing courses where writing skill is taught separately from the other language skills. Instead, writing is an integral part of the courses. To improve students' writing skills, the writing sections in the course book are covered. These writing sections are extensions of the grammar topics and certain language functions covered in the course book. For example, if the grammar topic is "used to" in a particular class hour, students are required to write a short paragraph about their past habits using the target structure and upload their assignment tasks on Edmodo, which is a learning management system. The task requirements involve guiding questions to clarify the constituents of a particular task. Course teachers provide written feedback on Edmodo. The teacher feedback can be local,

teachers provide feedback on grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, or global, where teachers provide feedback on organization and coherence. Peer feedback is not implemented.

### 3. 3. The Participants of the Study

The participants of the current study were chosen through convenience sampling. The participants were EFL learners who were learning English at B level (intermediate) at AUSFL. The participants of the study were the students of six different B level classes. The reason why B level students of particular six classes were included is the course teachers' willingness to allocate time for the researcher to implement peer feedback in their classes. Another reason for why B level classes were the participants of the present study was their proficiency level in English. Rollinson (2005) suggests that peer feedback may not work well when students' English proficiency level is low. For Rollinson (2005), learners should have a certain proficiency level in English to be able to give feedback to their peers' papers. Thus, B level students were chosen to take part in the study because they were believed to be able to detect problematic parts in terms of both global and surface level errors in their peers' texts and provide feedback to their peers.

In the prep school where the study was conducted, there were about 440 students studying at B level and they had 22 hours face-to-face instruction weekly. The ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 20. The number of the overall participants of the present study was 120. The number of participants in both the control group and the experimental group was 60. The participants of the current study were chosen through convenience sampling. Three of the classes were control groups, who only received regular teacher feedback and no peer feedback for the writing tasks they wrote in class. The other three classes were experimental groups who received peer feedback training for four weeks and practised peer feedback for five weeks. The experimental group received only peer feedback, but no teacher feedback after the four-week training was completed.

### 3. 4. Data Collection Instruments

The current study was a mixed methods design study with an embedded design using both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis methods. The embedded design is a form of mix methods design. The aim of embedded design is to collect data by using both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods and to use one form of data to support the other one (Creswell, 2012). In the current study, for quantitative data collection, the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) was used and for qualitative data collection, structured interviews were used and qualitative data (by interviews) were collected after quantitative data to explain and support the findings of SLWAI.

#### 3. 4. 1. The second language writing anxiety inventory (SLWAI)

SLWAI (Appendix 1) was created by Cheng (2004) to measure anxiety levels of students while producing texts in ESL classes. SLWAI consists of 22 items related to cognitive anxiety, somatic anxiety, avoidance behaviour and has five-point likert-scale, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Seven items in SLWAI are reverse-coded (1, 4, 7, 17, 18, 21, and 22). While these items were being analyzed, reverse scoring was used. SLWAI has the reliability of .91 (Cheng, 2004), which was calculated by Cronbach alpha co-efficiency. Ozturk &Saydam (2014) translated SLWAI to Turkish (Appendix 2) and then back translated this inventory, and their translated version has the reliability of .89. In the present study, the Turkish version of SLWAI was used as the quantitative data collection instrument. In the first and twelfth week of the semester, all the participants were requested to respond to the Turkish version of SLWAI. The reliability of the inventory for this study was calculated as .86 and the validity of the inventory was evaluated by the advisor.

#### 3. 4. 2. Structured interviews

In order to investigate opinions of participants about peer feedback practice, whether peer feedback practice changed participants' ideas about writing, and whether

the changes in foreign language writing anxiety levels occurred as a result of peer feedback practice or not, 15 participants in the experimental group whose anxiety level categories changed after peer feedback practice were chosen through convenience sampling and their willingness. The participants were interviewed in the 13th week. The interviews consisted of 4 questions (Appendix 3) asking how they felt when they wrote something in English, when they provided and received peer feedback, and whether peer feedback practice had an impact on their opinions about writing. Before the questions were asked to the participants, each participant was shown the anxiety level change after peer feedback practice. The interviews were conducted in the participants' native language (Turkish) with the aim that participants could feel more comfortable when they expressed their feelings and ideas. To provide the content validity of the instrument, opinions (related to the interview questions) of four EFL instructors who were teaching EFL for more than 10 years were asked. As a result of their feedback, the final versions of the questions were decided. The following questions were used in the interviews (see App. C for the Turkish version of the interview questions):

1. How do you feel when you write something in English?
2. How was giving feedback to your peers?
3. How was receiving peer feedback for your writing?
4. Do you think peer feedback practice has affected your feelings and opinions about writing?

### 3. 5. Data Collection Procedure

In the first week of the semester, an experimental group including three B level classes and a control group including three B level classes were selected by using convenience sampling. The purpose of the study and the procedures that were determined by the researcher and the participants would go through were explained in Turkish to the participants by the researcher of the present study. All participants responded to SLWAI in the first week of the semester. Furthermore, the researcher informed the experimental group about the dates of the training sessions (Appendix 4) and explained what constitutes peer feedback, the types of peer feedback, and how they could give peer feedback in a class hour. The researcher then checked the understanding of the participants about peer feedback practice to be sure that all the participants clearly understood what peer

feedback was, how important it was, and how it could be implemented in an effective way.

In the second and third weeks, two sample writing papers of two students at B level (Appendix 5, 6) were given to the participants in the experimental group. They were required to write feedback to these sample papers individually in English. A 45 minute-class hour for each paper was given to the students as time limit. The sections of the sample writing papers consisted of writing task instructions, task requirements, checklists for the feedback givers, and boxes to write comments either in English or Turkish. The checklists were parallel to the task requirements. The participants were familiar with the checklists and the task formats, as they had already completed at least ten writing tasks when they were students at C level. In the second class hour, the researcher checked the papers and communicated with participants one by one to point out errors in corrections and missing parts in their feedback. This procedure continued for 2 weeks.

In the fourth week, the participants were asked to complete a writing task in the first class hour (Appendix 7). In the second class hour, they were asked to give feedback to their classmates' papers, read and complete the checklist on the paper which was related to the task, and write comments and feedback in the comment box in either English or Turkish.

In the fifth week, the writer of the original paper, the peer feedback provider, and the researcher came together and the peer explained her/his feedback orally. The researcher listened to each pair carefully and showed the errors if there were any. The reason why the researcher herself checked the papers and listened to all the students was to see if participants could provide peer feedback effectively and make sure that participants could focus on both global and local level errors. During that practice, both English and Turkish were used for communication between students and between the researcher and students. The participants were allowed to use their native language (Turkish) throughout the process so that they could feel relax and work in a positive and collaborative atmosphere where interaction is constituted. After the fifth week, peer feedback trainings were completed.

In the sixth week, peer feedback practice sessions started. For a class hour, the participants completed a writing task (Appendix 8). In the second class hour, they gave feedback to their peers' papers and communicated the written feedback. The researcher

just walked around and listened to their feedback communication without any comments or interference.

The participants in the experimental group completed four more tasks (Appendices 9-12), gave and received peer feedback in the seventh, ninth, tenth, and eleventh weeks following the same procedure as in the sixth week. The researcher met the participants in the experimental group for two class hours weekly throughout nine weeks for peer feedback practice. While the researcher helped, commented, and provided feedback to the experimental group on how to provide feedback during peer feedback trainings, she did not interfere or help them during peer feedback practices.

In the training and practice sessions, the participants in the experimental group were told that they could write any types of comments, including grammar use, task achievement, and vocabulary expectations in the comment box either in Turkish or English, or both. The checklists above the comment boxes were developed to help and guide the participants through providing peer feedback process. The researcher developed the checklists including the requirements of the tasks and the course syllabus. The statements in the checklists were to help the participants review their peers' texts in terms of content, organization, grammatical accuracy, lexical competence, and punctuation. Thus, the participants corrected not only grammatical errors but also wrote comments on global level errors such as coherence, organization, and task achievement. Furthermore, every week, the researcher made sure that the participants provided feedback to a different classmate. By this way, the participants had an opportunity to get feedback from different classmates, see different perspectives on their writing, and see both her/his own and others' strengths and weaknesses in writing.

During the present study, the participants in both control and experimental groups completed the same five tasks in practice sessions. The difference between these two groups was that while the control group received only teacher feedback, the experimental group gave and received peer feedback. Another difference between the two groups was that the experimental group wrote one more task from the control group, which was in the training week. All the tasks used in the training sessions for the experimental group and practice sessions for both control and experimental groups were similar to the tasks required by the course syllabus as they had the same task requirements and word limits, but with slightly different topics. To illustrate, the task in the course syllabus was writing

a paragraph about the first day of university and the topic of the first application task was writing a paragraph about the first month at university.

In the 12th week, SLWAI was administered again to all the participants in both control and experimental groups to see if foreign language writing anxiety levels of the participants changed and if peer feedback had an impact on the foreign language writing anxiety.

In the 13th week, structured interviews were conducted with 15 participants chosen from the experimental group regarding the change in their SLWAI scores and divided into 3 groups. The first group consisted of participants whose anxiety levels were regarded as high before peer feedback practice and medium after peer feedback practice. The second group consisted of participants whose anxiety levels were regarded as high before peer feedback practice and low after peer feedback practice. The last group consisted of participants whose anxiety levels were regarded as medium before peer feedback practice and low after peer feedback practice. Five participants from each group were chosen to be interviewed about their opinions regarding peer feedback practice and its impact on their EFL writing anxiety. The interviews were conducted in Turkish for participants to express their opinions easily and in order not to cause EFL speaking anxiety. The structured interviews were recorded and transcribed by the researcher.

### 3. 6. Data Analysis

For the analysis of quantitative data, the results of the SLWAI given in the 1st and 12th week to the control group (60 participants) and experimental group (60 participants) were analyzed in IBM SPSS Statistics 21.0 by using paired sample t-test to see what had changed in terms of anxiety levels. In order to measure the changes in the anxiety levels of the participants, standard deviation and mean scores were calculated both for pre- and post-tests for control and experimental groups. There are 22 items in SLWAI. The lowest score is 22. For 7 items in SLWAI, reverse scoring was used. For the pre-application of SLWAI, the highest score is 110. For the experimental group, to determine the range for moderate anxiety level, the standard deviation (8.18) is added to and subtracted from the mean score (68.08). Therefore, if the score of a participant is 77 or above, the anxiety level of the participant is high, if the score is between 60 and 76, the anxiety level is regarded as moderate and if the score is 59 or below, the anxiety level is low. The same

procedure was repeated to determine the mean scores and the number of the participants for high, moderate, and low anxiety levels for the post-application of SLWAI. To determine the range for moderate anxiety level, the standard deviation (11.47) is added to and subtracted from the mean score (59.24). Therefore, if the score of a participant is 72 or above, the anxiety level of the participant is high, if the score is between 48 and 71, the anxiety level is regarded as moderate and if the score is 47 or below, the anxiety level is low. To compare the pre- and post-application results of the control and experimental groups, independent sample t-test was applied.

To gather qualitative data, 15 participants from the experimental group, regarding the changes in their anxiety level after peer feedback training and practices, were chosen through convenience sampling and interviewed in the 13$^{th}$ week. Transcriptions were content analyzed. To provide intra-rater reliability, three weeks later, the researcher analyzed 30% of the transcriptions again and compared the findings. For inter-rater reliability, two different raters who were also instructors teaching EFL and had experience in content analysis separately content analyzed the transcriptions independently from the researcher. Next, the findings of the researcher were compared to the ones of the two raters. After an agreement was reached between the researcher and the raters, all the data were content analyzed.

# CHAPTER 4

# RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## 4. 1. Results

The present study aims at researching what impact peer feedback has on foreign language writing anxiety experienced by Turkish prep school students studying EFL and what they think about peer feedback. To achieve these aims, the participants in the experimental group got training on peer feedback, and gave and received peer feedback for nine weeks. The control group, however, received only teacher feedback for five tasks. The participants in the control and experimental groups responded to Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) at the beginning and end of the study. Besides, fifteen participants from the experimental group whose anxiety levels changed after peer feedback practice were interviewed about their ideas regarding peer feedback and its impact on foreign language writing anxiety.

In this section, the findings on whether peer feedback had an impact on participants' foreign language writing anxiety levels were presented first. Then, the findings on participants' ideas regarding the impact of peer feedback were mentioned.

### 4. 1. 1. The results on the impact of peer feedback on foreign language writing anxiety levels of the participants

To reveal the impact of peer feedback on participants' foreign language writing anxiety levels, all the data from the pre- and post-application of SLWAI were entered to IBM SPSS Statistics 21.0 for statistical analysis. The mean scores of the participants in the control and the experimental group in the pre- and post-application of SLWAI were calculated. Then, the mean scores of the participants in the control group in the pre- and post-application of SLWAI were compared using paired sample t-test. The same procedure was applied for the experimental group. Table 1 presents the results of the control group in the pre- and post-application of SLWAI.

**Table 1.** *The Comparison of Pre- and Post-Application of SLWAI of the Control Group*

| | Application Name | Mean | SD | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Control | Pre | 67.84 | 11.63 | .017 |
| Control | Post | 63.47 | 9.87 | |

As can be seen from Table 1, there is a statistical difference (p=.017) between the mean scores of the participants in the control group in the pre- and post-application of SLWAI due to the paired sample t-test results. There is a significant decrease in the foreign language writing anxiety level in the post-application of SLWAI of the control group which did not get any training on peer feedback, and they were not provided peer feedback on their writings.

Table 2 shows the results of the pre- and post-application of SLWAI of the experimental group.

**Table 2.** *The Comparison of Pre- and Post-Application of SLWAI of the Experimental Group*

| | Application name | Mean | SD | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental | Pre | 68.08 | 8.18 | .008 |
| Experimental | Post | 59.24 | 11.47 | |

As can be seen from Table 2, the mean scores of the participants in the experimental group in the pre- and post-application of SLWAI were significantly different (p=.008). There is a significant decrease in the foreign language writing anxiety level of the experimental group in the post-application of SLWAI, which was applied after the peer feedback practices. That is, second language writing anxiety levels of participants in both the control and experimental groups have decreased significantly.

Table 3 shows the results of pre- and post-application of SLWAI for the control and experimental groups together. To compare the pre- and post-application results of the control and experimental groups, independent sample t-test was applied.

**Table 3.** *The Comparison of Pre- and Post-Application of SLWAI of Both Groups*

| Group | Application | Mean | SD | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Control | Pre | 67.84 | 11.63 | .958 |
| Experimental | Pre | 68.08 | 8.18 | |
| Control | Post | 63.47 | 9.87 | .016 |
| Experimental | Post | 59.24 | 11.47 | |

As can be seen from Table 3, there is no significant difference between control and experimental group in the pre-application of SLWAI (p=.958). This means the foreign language writing anxiety levels of the control and the experimental group were not significantly different before the feedback practices. However, after feedback practices, there is a significant difference between the control and experimental group (p=.016). In other words, although foreign language writing anxiety levels decreased in both groups, the decrease in the foreign language writing anxiety levels of the experimental group was more than the decrease in the foreign language writing anxiety levels of the control group.

In order to reveal what impact peer practices have on participants' writing anxiety, the anxiety levels of the participants in the experimental group before and after peer feedback practices were also determined.

**Table 4.** *The Mean Scores and Anxiety Categories for the Experimental Group in the Pre-Application of SLWAI*

| | **Number** | **Range** | **Mean** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 60 | 22-110 | 68.08 |
| High Anxious | 14 | 77-110 | 84.87 |
| Moderate Anxious | 46 | 60-76 | 68.18 |
| Low Anxious | 0 | 22-59 | 0 |

Cheng (2004) determined the foreign language writing anxiety level categories as high, moderate, and low. There are 22 items in SLWAI. The lowest score is 22. For 7 items in SLWAI reverse scoring was used. The highest score is 110. To determine the range for moderate anxiety level, the standard deviation (8.18) is added to and subtracted from the mean score (68.08). Therefore, if the score of a participant is 77 or above, the anxiety level of the participant is high, if the score is between 60 and 76, the anxiety level is regarded as moderate and if the score is 59 or below, the anxiety level is low. As can be seen from Table 4, out of 60 participants in the experimental group, there were 14 highly anxious, 46 moderate level anxious and no low anxious participants in the pre-application of SLWAI.

The same procedure was repeated to determine the mean scores and the number of the participants for high, moderate, and low anxiety levels for the post-application of

SLWAI. Table 5 presents the mean scores and the ranges for the anxiety level categories of the experimental group in the post-application of SLWAI in each anxiety level category.

**Table 5.** *The Mean Scores and Anxiety Level Categories for the Experimental Group in the Post-Application of SLWAI*

| | **Number** | **Range** | **Mean** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 60 | 22-110 | 59.24 |
| High Anxious | 0 | 72-110 | 0 |
| Moderate Anxious | 42 | 48-71 | 59.89 |
| Low Anxious | 18 | 22-47 | 42.96 |

To determine the range for moderate anxiety level, the standard deviation (11.47) is added to and subtracted from the mean score (59.24). Therefore, if the score of a participant is 72 or above, the anxiety level of the participant is high, if the score is between 48 and 71, the anxiety level is regarded as moderate and if the score is 47 or below, the anxiety level is low.

As can be seen from Table 5, out of 60 participants in the experimental group, there were no highly anxious, 42 moderate level anxious and 18 low anxious participants in the post-application of SLWAI.

Table 6 shows the number of participants in the experimental group in the pre- and post-application of SLWAI.

**Table 6.** *The Number of Participants in the Experimental Group in the Pre- and Post-Application of SLWAI*

| | **N Pre-Application of SLWAI** | **N Post-Application of SLWAI** |
|---|---|---|
| Total | 60 | 60 |
| High Anxious | 14 | 0 |
| Medium Anxious | 46 | 42 |
| Low Anxious | 0 | 18 |

As can be seen from Table 6, although there were 14 highly anxious participants in the pre-application of SLWAI, there were no participants whose anxiety is high in the post-application of SLWAI. Secondly, the number of medium anxious participants also

decreased from 46-42. Lastly, although there were no participants whose anxiety level was low in the pre-application of SLWAI, the number of low anxious participants increased after peer feedback practices. These results indicated that the peer feedback practices had a positive impact of decreasing the anxiety level of the participants.

### 4. 1. 2. The results on the opinions of the participants about peer feedback

The second research question raised in the present study aimed to find out the ideas of the participants studying EFL about peer feedback. To answer this question, 15 participants from the experimental group whose anxiety levels changed from high to medium, high to low, and medium to low were chosen through convenience sampling and their willingness and the participants were interviewed after peer feedback practice in the 13th week. Before the questions were asked to the participants, each participant was shown the anxiety level change after peer feedback practice.

Comparing the mean scores of the experimental group in the pre- and post-application of SLWAI, the anxiety levels of the participants were categorized into three groups; high to medium, high to low, medium to low. High to medium refers to the participants whose anxiety levels decreased from high level to medium level. High to low refers to the participants whose anxiety levels decreased from high level to low level when pre- and post-application of SWAI were compared. Medium to low refers to the participants whose anxiety levels decreased from medium level to low level when pre- and post-application of SWAI scores were compared.

There were 6 participants in the category of High to Medium, 8 participants in the High to Low, and 10 participants in the category of Medium to Low. From each category, 5 participants who were willing to be interviewed were selected for the structured interview. That is, 5 participants whose anxiety level decreased from high level to medium level, 5 participants whose anxiety level decreased from high to low, and 5 participants whose anxiety level decreased from medium to low were selected randomly. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed for analysis. Then, the transcriptions were content analyzed. In the following section, the results of the interviews are given.

There were four questions in the interview to reveal the feelings and the ideas of the experimental group participants who gave and received peer feedback for their writings. The results for each interview question are presented below.

**Interview question 1:** How do you feel when you write something in English?

The common tendency for the participants whose anxiety levels changed from medium to low was that they wanted to develop their writing abilities to pass the prep school. They said that although they did not like writing and found it boring before trainings, they wrote and submitted their writings to get high writing grades. When they were asked about how they feel about writing in English, they mostly used words like "nicer", "easier", "not boring". These answers point to the average interest to writing. The following quote illustrates this:

> Student 2: *Pek yazmak istemiyordum hocam geçen dönem ama artık ödevler hariç yazarken sıkılmıyorum pek. Bir de essay yazmayı öğrenmeyi çok istiyorum. Sonuçta finalde o çıkacak.*
>
> *[I did not want to write last semester but I do not feel bored when writing, I really want to learn how to write essay because there will be essay questions in the final exam.]*

When asked how they feel about writing in English, while some participants whose anxiety levels changed from high to medium stated they feel "better" and "calmer", and they feel that they can succeed in the writing exams, some of them said they do not like writing at all due to their limited vocabulary knowledge. The quote below illustrates this:

> Student 8: *Sevmiyorum hocam ya aklım karışıyor hala, kelime yetmiyor bana öğrenemedim kelimeleri bir türlü. Çeviremiyorum aklımdakileri. Kitap da okuyorum baya ama olmuyor.*
>
> *[I don't like it teacher. I still got confused. I do not have enough vocabulary. I couldn't learn vocabulary. I cannot translate the things in my mind. I read books but I still cannot achieve it.]*

The common tendency for participants in the high to low anxiety group was that they compared their writing performances and their ideas on writing in English and their writing performances before and after training on giving and receiving feedback. The participants in this group stated that while they had difficulty in finding ideas to write, found it boring to write, and considered their writing performances as "awful", they had a clearer idea on how to write, how to find ideas, and how to construct better sentences thanks to peer feedback practices. Besides, they mentioned that they became optimistic

about their writing performances as they learnt how to write to be successful in the writing exams. The quotation below illustrates these results:

Student 11:

*Donup kalıyordum hocam ya sayenizde nerden nasıl puan alacağımı öğrendim. Bir de o kriterdeki ilk iki bölümü hiç anlamamıştım o 10 puanı artık çözdüm, hocam sağ olun ya asıl önemli olan oralarmış, ben sadece sorulara cevap veriyordum, yanlış yapıyormuşum ya anladım neyse ki finalden önce.*

*[I used to be paralyzed teacher. Thanks to you, I learnt how to get better scores. I did not understand the first two sections of the writing evaluation criteria but now I understand that they were the most important parts. I used to answer only the questions but I realized that I was doing the wrong thing. Fortunately, I understood these before the final exam.]*

**Interview question 2:** How was giving feedback to your peers?

The participants in medium to low anxiety category mentioned that giving feedback to their peers was enjoyable. They asserted that they developed their grammar knowledge and learnt how to correct grammar mistakes in their writing. They added that while giving feedback to their peers they started to better understand what was expected from them to achieve in their writings. The quote below illustrates these points:

Student 3: *O dersler eğlenceliydi hocam hiç olmazsa ne beklediğinizi anladık sınavda nasıl puan alacağımızı falan, ama arkadaşımdan daha iyi İngilizcem olmadığı için çok göremedim ben hatalarını, çok bir şey yazamadım o yüzden de.*

*[Those classes were enjoyable. At least we have learnt what you expect and how to get scores in the exam but I couldn't see my friends' mistakes, as my English is not better than my friends. Therefore, I couldn't write enough.]*

The interview results revealed that although the participants in the high to medium anxiety group found giving feedback to peers as a positive practice on the whole, they were less positive about their experiences of giving feedback to their peers than the participants with a change in their anxiety from medium to low, especially when they had to provide feedback to their classmates whose writing performances and grammar were better than theirs. One of the participants in this group added that she sought the teacher's help while giving feedback. The quote below illustrates these results:

Student 6:

*Güzeldi ama bazen bazı arkadaşlar benden iyi yazıyor onlara bir şey bulamadım kaldım öyle size de soruyordum başta yardım ediyordunuz sonra ben burada yokum beni unutun diyordunuz o zaman iyi olmadı.*

*[It was good but some of my friends write better than me. I couldn't find anything to write for them. In the beginning, I was asking you and you were helping me. But then, you said we should behave as if you were not there. This was not good.]*

For the participants in the high to low anxiety group, giving feedback was a nice experience. They mentioned that their self-confidence increased when they realized that their peers' writing in English was as "bad" as theirs. The quotation below illustrates this:

Student 12: *"Süperdi bence herkes benim gibi sorun yaşıyormuş onu gördüm ya kendime güvenim geldi hocam. (It was super. Everybody was having problems like me. I realized this. I started to feel more self-confident.)"*

**Interview question 3:** How was receiving peer feedback for your writing?

While some of the participants in medium to low anxiety group stated that they were nervous at first, then they got used to the process and were looking forward to giving and getting feedback. The others stated that they learnt a lot, especially on grammar thanks to getting feedback. The quotes below illustrate these results:

Student 1: *Başta biraz rahatsız oldum ama sonra alıştım, 3. hafta falan olduğunda artık sizin uygulama saatiniz gelse diye bekliyorduk sınıfta.*

*[At first, I was anxious but then I got used to and on the 3rd week, we were waiting for your classes.]*

Student 3: *Bazı seferler çalışkan arkadaşlar denk geldi o zaman gramer konularını falan anlatıyorlardı bunu böyle yap falan diye, öyle güzel oldu baya çok şey öğrendim.*

*[Sometimes, hardworking friends were my peers. They were explaining the grammar topics and telling me "do this, do that". This was good and I learnt a lot.]*

From the participants in the high to medium anxiety group, 2 of the participants in this group stated that they developed their grammar knowledge thanks to getting peer feedback. 3 of them stated that they believed that they could pass the prep school after the feedback practices. They also mentioned that their peers mostly corrected their grammar and punctuation mistakes and it should not have been like that. Besides, one participant added that getting feedback was more helpful than giving feedback although

she was not positive about getting feedback at first as she felt unsuccessful while getting feedback. The quotes below illustrate these results:

> Student 6: *O daha güzeldi hocam ama sonraları, başta sinir oldum, ben bu işi yapamayacağım herhalde dedim, herkes güzel yazıyor benden dedim. Ama şimdi daha iyi sanırım geçerim hazırlığı.*
>
> *[Getting feedback was better but at first I got angry. I thought I was not able to do this because everybody was writing better than me. But now, it is better I guess. I can pass the prep school.]*
>
> Student 9: *Arkadaşlarım hep gramer düzeltiyorlar hocam ya da virgül falan, onlardan hocalar çok puan kırmıyor ki, onlara çok bakmasınlar bence.*
>
> *[My friends always correct grammar or punctuation but the teachers donot reduce points from these, so they should not be correcting these types of mistakes, too.]*

When they were asked how getting feedback from their peers on their writing was, the participants whose anxiety level is high to low were mostly positive about this process. Specifically, they mentioned that receiving peer feedback helped them improve their grammar, vocabulary, and writing skills. It was a positive experience for them to see their mistakes in writing. Besides, they said they started to feel more relaxed and self-confident as they realized that their peers have similar worries during writing.

> Student 11: *Alıştım hocam iyi geldi valla, hocalarımdan başka birinin kağıdımı görmesi daha iyi oldu çünkü onlarla konuşunca hatalarımı anlattılar, benim göremediğimi söylediler. Yeni kelimeler de öğrendim. Keşke böyle bir ders olsaydı hocam ya çok sakinledim artık yazarım yani inanıyorum kendime.*
>
> *[I got used to getting feedback from my peers. It was better for me to get feedback from my friends. When we talked, they explained me my mistakes and they showed me what I couldn't see. I also learnt new words. I wish we had a class like this. Teacher, I really calmed down. I believe I can write. I believe in myself.]*

**Interview question 4:** Do you think peer feedback practice has affected your feelings and opinions about writing?

The participants whose anxiety level decreased from medium to low mentioned that peer feedback activities affected their feelings towards writing positively and developed their writing skills. Besides, they mentioned that feedback activities increased their awareness and helped them to understand how to write. In relation to their feelings

towards writing, the participants in this group mentioned that they *"are not afraid of writing anymore", "started to have self-confidence", "started to like writing",* and *"do not hate writing anymore".* As the reasons for the change in their feelings towards writings, they stated that their "grammar improved", they *"became able to use the vocabulary"* they had learnt *"a lot of transition words", "learnt how to organize"* their writing, and *"understood the writing evaluation criteria"*. The quote below illustrates these results:

> Student 1: *Evet hocam etkiledi tabi ki, ilk dönem yazıyorduk, hoca hatamızı düzeltiyordu, notumuzu yazıyordu, o kadar. Birçok hatayı niye öyle düzelttiğini anlamıyordum. Ama bu dönem anladım, o yüzden artık writing den korkmuyorum çünkü nasıl yazılması gerek biliyorum yani. Gramerim de çok gelişti bence, bir sürü bağlaç da öğrendim sizden, essay yazarım bence kesin, güveniyorum artık kendime.*
>
> *[Yes, teacher. Of course it affected. In the first term, we were writing and the teacher was correcting our mistakes, grading our paper. That was it. I didn't use to understand why the teacher corrected my mistakes like that. But this term, I understood and that's why I am not afraid of writing anymore because I know how to write. I think my grammar developed, too. I learnt a lot of transitions from you. I am sure I can write essays. I am more self- confident.]*

As can be seen from the quote above, the participants believe that peer feedback was influential because it increased their awareness of how to write, their grammar, and vocabulary knowledge.

The participants in the high to medium anxiety group stated they continue to feel insecure about writing despite the peer feedback applications. When they were asked how they think peer feedback affected their feelings towards writing, they used expressions like *" still afraid", "not that much affected"* and *"a little bit affected".* As an indication of why they think peer feedback did not affect their feelings towards writing much, they mentioned the following;

> Student 6: *Hala ödevlerime yüksek vermiyor hocalarım.*
>
> *[The teachers still do not give my homework good grades.]*
>
> Student 7: *...cümleyi Türkçe kuruyorum ama çeviremiyorum, gramer çalışmam lazım benim.*
>
> *[I build the sentence in Turkish but I can't translate, I need to study grammar.]*

The answers of these two participants indicate that peer feedback did not positively affect their feelings towards writing because of not getting good grades and not being able to translate. Although all the participants in this group believed that peer feedback did not have much contribution to their opinions towards writing, some of them mentioned some positive contribution of peer feedback on their opinions towards writing such as having more positive attitudes towards writing. The response below illustrates these results:

> Student 8: *...artık writing e gıcık olmuyorum, bir de nerden puan kırdığınızı anladım ya ona göre yazıyorum, azıcık çalışsam geçerim yani inanıyorum.*
>
> *[I do not dislike writing anymore and I understood when the teachers reduce grades, and I write like that now. I believe if I study, I can pass.]*

The participants in the high to low anxiety group thought that peer feedback certainly affected their feelings towards writing. They mentioned their satisfaction on the peer feedback application. Besides, they mentioned they feel *"relaxed", "less afraid",* and *"more confident"* about writing. In addition to this, they stated that they are not afraid of writing and started to like writing in English; therefore, they feel they can benefit from peer feedback training and practices. The following quote exemplifies this:

> Student 12: *Tabi ki korkumu azalttı. Artık writing den geçeceğime inanıyorum. Bu uygulama çok iyi oldu hocam ya keşke bitmeseydi.*
>
> *[Of course, it decreased my fear. I believe I can pass the writing exam. This application was good. I wish it hadn't finished.]*

As it can be seen from the quotes above, peer feedback practices seem to have a positive effect on the participants. Peer feedback practices helped the participants believe more in themselves and develop a positive attitude towards writing in English.

### 4. 2. Discussion

In this section the results of the study were discussed with respect to the questions raised in the present study.

### 4. 2. 1. The impact of peer feedback on foreign language writing anxiety

**Research Question 1:** What impact does peer feedback have on foreign language writing anxiety level of Turkish prep school students studying EFL?

The anxiety levels of the control and the experimental group were not significantly different in the pre-application of SLWAI. This means their initial anxiety levels were similar before the feedback training and peer feedback giving and receiving practices. However, in the post-application of SLWAI, there was a significant decrease in the anxiety levels of both the control and the experimental group although the control group did not get any training on peer feedback, and they were not provided peer feedback on their writings. The decrease in the anxiety levels of the participants in the control group can be explained by the feedback they got from their teachers and as a result of 5-week writing process. However, the anxiety levels of the participants in the experimental group decreased significantly more than those of the participants in the control group. These results echo with the results of former studies which revealed that peer feedback training, peer feedback receiving and giving practices had an impact of reducing the writing anxiety levels of learners learning English as a foreign language (Efe, 2014; Kurt & Atay, 2007; Susoy & Tanyer 2013; Zhang, 2011). In this study, peer feedback contributed to reducing writing anxiety more than teacher feedback. Thus, it can be argued that peer feedback is more effective in reducing writing anxiety than teacher feedback. Furthermore, the present study highlighted the idea that peer feedback application is not alone an effective factor in reducing the L2 writing anxiety but it needs to be a well-planned implementation supported with a continuous learner training on how to give and implement peer feedback effectively and efficiently.

**Research Question 2:** What are the opinions of Turkish prep school students studying EFL about peer feedback?

To provide answers to this research question, the participants were asked four interview questions.

### 4. 2. 2. Opinions of Turkish prep school students studying EFL about peer feedback

The first interview question was "How do you feel when you write something in English?" and the fourth interview question was "Do you think peer feedback practice has affected your feelings and opinions about writing?". The participants' answers to these two questions provided insights on their feelings towards writing and how these feelings were affected after peer feedback training and practices.

The participants whose anxiety levels changed from medium to low mentioned that they write and want to develop their writing abilities just to pass the prep school and they found writing *"boring*" before the peer feedback trainings. Besides, they mentioned they feel *"relaxed", "less afraid",* and *"more confident"* about writing after trainings. In addition to this, they stated that they are "*not afraid of writing"* and started to "*like writing in English"*; therefore, they feel they can benefit from feedback training and practices.

The participants in high to low anxiety group stated that while it was highly difficult for them to find ideas to write especially because of lack of grammar and vocabulary knowledge and as they considered their writing performances "awful", they had a clearer idea on how to write, how to find ideas, and how to construct better sentences thanks to training and practices on giving and incorporating feedback. As the reasons for the change in their feelings towards writings, the participants stated that peer feedback training and practices improved their grammar and vocabulary, helped them to learn transition words and how to organize their writing, and understand the writing evaluation criteria. All these contributions helped them believe that they can be successful writers, especially in the proficiency exam.

Participants whose anxiety levels changed from high to medium expressed similar feelings and stated that after peer feedback training and applications, they started to feel more positive about their writing and started to believe that they can succeed in the writing exams. However, there are also some participants in the high to medium anxiety group who stated that they continue to "*feel insecure"* about writing despite the peer feedback applications. When they were asked how they think peer feedback affected their feelings towards writing, they used expressions like *" still afraid", "not that much affected"* and *"a little bit affected".* As the reason why they thought peer feedback did

not affect their feelings towards writing, they stated that they could not get good grades and were not able to translate from Turkish to English.

The problems mentioned by the participants above can be considered as the sources of their writing anxiety and low motivation to write. As Hassan (2001) also stated, poor knowledge and skill development of composing and lack of L2 linguistic knowledge are the sources of writing anxiety that impact L2 writing performance. In addition to these, learners' lack of belief in their writing ability was another reason for writing anxiety (Hertz-Lazarowitz & Bar-Natan, 2002). The results above showed that training on peer feedback helped them to be more motivated and increased their awareness on how to be successful. These results support Kurt and Atay (2007)'s study which found out the positive impact of peer feedback on lowering foreign language writing anxiety of students studying EFL, who also became more aware of their mistakes.

The second interview question was "How was giving feedback to your peers?" and this question aimed at focusing on the feelings and ideas of the participants on giving feedback. The participants in medium to low anxiety category mentioned that giving feedback to their peers was *"enjoyable"*. Similarly, the participants whose anxiety level decreased from high to low considered giving peer feedback as *"a nice"* experience. This result shows that giving peer feedback can lead to learners' positive ideas on peer feedback, which can increase positive atmosphere in the classroom. Similarly, Farrah (2012) concluded that giving peer feedback helped learners to develop positive attitudes towards learning, which also lead to a positive learning environment.

The first reason why the participants thought giving peer feedback as a positive experience was that they thought they improved their grammar knowledge and learnt how to correct grammar mistakes in their own writing thanks to giving peer feedback. This result echoes with the results of previous studies that concluded that peer feedback could increase learners' awareness of their own writing performances (Efe, 2014; Jahin, 2012; Kurt & Atay, 2007; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Rankin-Brown, 2006). Learners' awareness of their own writing progress might lead learners to feel less anxious.

The participants added that while giving feedback to their peers, they started to better understand what was expected from them in their writings. Zhang (1995) states that teacher feedback is the most popular feedback type, especially it is more effective where teachers are providers of correct knowledge. Although this idea has been supported by many former studies, peer feedback practices with a well-organized training can increase

L2 learners' awareness on the writing process and their own mistakes before it becomes fossilized. As Sengupta (1998) concluded, the changes that students made were a result of peer feedback and peer feedback raised their awareness as real readers, which also helped them to be better self-evaluators. Through training, learners can learn how to give constructive feedback and unambiguous comments (Ozogul & Sullivan, 2009).

Second reason why the participants believed that peer feedback was a positive experience for them was that their self-confidence increased when they realized that their peers' writing in English was as *"bad"* as theirs. This sense of having similar worries can enhance the collaborative classroom environment. As peer feedback enhances collaboration and interaction among learners (Hansen & Liu, 2005), it can create a classroom environment where learners are active and more eager to learn from each other.

The present study also revealed that the participants in the high to medium anxiety group were less positive about their experiences of giving feedback to their peers than the participants with a change in their anxiety from medium to low, especially when they had to provide feedback to their classmates whose writing performances and grammar were better than theirs. These results support Abdel Latif (2007)'s study who asserts that learners' worrying about their own language knowledge and ability is an important reason for writing anxiety. However, Rankin-Brown state that "fear of how their peers will evaluate their writing (2006, p. 3)" can be a source of anxiety. In the present study, the participants also mentioned their fear of providing feedback instead of getting feedback. This situation can be interpreted as both giving and receiving feedback can be a source of anxiety if the learners are not equipped with enough language and writing knowledge.

The third interview question was "How was receiving peer feedback for your writing?" and the answers to this question provided insights on what the participants think about getting feedback from their peers. A few participants stated that they were nervous in the first application of giving feedback, they got used to the process quickly. Moreover, they stated that they were looking forward to giving and getting feedback. All the participants were positive about getting feedback as they learnt a lot, especially about grammar, vocabulary and organization skills. This result is compatible with the results of Efe (2014)'s study, which revealed that peer feedback is helpful in developing certain areas such as grammar, vocabulary, and organization. Another reason why the participants thought that getting peer feedback was helpful was that they started to feel more relaxed and self-confident as they realized that their peers do similar mistakes and

have similar worries during writing. Lastly, the majority of the participants stated that they started to believe that they could pass the prep school after the training on peer feedback and especially thanks to the feedback they received from their peers. This result is compatible with Farah (2012)'s study, which concluded that peer feedback increased students' motivation.

One negative point they mentioned was that their peers mostly corrected their grammar and punctuation mistakes. This result is supported by the previous research suggesting that learners tend to focus on surface level errors such as grammar, punctuation, and spelling more as such errors are easier to detect than global ones (Beason, 1993; Berger, 1990; Hall, 1990; Leki, 1990; Yagelski, 1995). This emphasizes the idea that a well-planned feedback training needs to continue throughout the learning process. Besides, as Cheng (2004)'s study also suggested, a checklist that can guide learners focus on global level aspects of writing while providing peer feedback can be an effective solution to learners' focusing only on surface level errors during peer feedback practice.

# CHAPTER 5

# CONCLUSION

## 5. 1. The Impact of Peer Feedback on EFL Writing Anxiety

The present study aimed at providing answers for two main research questions:

1. What impact does peer feedback have on foreign language writing anxiety level of Turkish prep school students studying EFL?

2. What are the opinions of Turkish prep school students studying EFL about peer feedback?

To provide answers to these questions, 120 Turkish prep school students studying EFL at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages responded to SLWAI. The participants in the experimental group got training on peer feedback, practised how to give and use peer feedback, and were interviewed on their ideas about peer feedback. Writing anxiety levels of the participants in both groups were calculated and it was seen that writing anxiety levels of the participants in both groups decreased regarding the post-application of SLWAI**.** The mean of the writing anxiety level of the participants in the control group who got only teacher feedback was 67.84 in the pre-application of SLWAI and 63.47 in the post-application of SLWAI, which means writing anxiety levels of the participants who received only teacher feedback decreased. The mean of the writing anxiety level of the participants in the experimental group who got training on peer feedback, received and provided peer feedback was 68.08 in the pre-application of SLWAI and 59.24 in the post-application of SLWAI, which means writing anxiety levels of the participants who received and provided peer feedback decreased significantly. Based on this result, the present study concluded that training on peer feedback, and practicing giving and receiving peer feedback can be considered as more influential in decreasing the foreign language writing anxiety levels of EFL learners than receiving only teacher feedback (Efe, 2014; Kurt & Atay, 2007). Considering all these, the first conclusion of the study is that a well-planned training program with appropriate tasks, time, and guidance can decrease the foreign language writing anxiety levels of EFL learners (Rollinson, 2005; Sengun (2002).

## 5. 2. The Opinions of the Participants about Peer Feedback

The results of SLWAI and the interviews with the participants showed that well-planned, long-term training, and practices on giving and receiving peer feedback have a salient impact on reducing EFL writing anxiety (Efe, 2014; Kurt & Atay, 2007; Susoy & Tanyer 2013; Zhang, 2011). Mainly, peer feedback training and practices helped the majority of the participants develop more positive attitudes towards EFL writing and towards their own writing development. For example, after trainings and practice sessions, the participants started to use phrases like *"feeling relaxed", "less afraid",* "*started to like writing in English", "enjoyable"* and *"more confident"*. As the reasons for the positive change in learners' feelings towards EFL writing, the study revealed that peer feedback training and practices increased learners' awareness on EFL writing. Specifically, peer feedback trainings helped learners learn transition words, how to organize writing, and understand writing evaluation criteria (Efe, 2014).

Moreover, recognizing that the other students have similar worries and problems in writing in English helped participants understand that writing is a process involving making mistakes as a part of learning (Farah, 2012). Additionally, peer feedback training and practices created a chance for learners to be aware of their own mistakes and to correct them before being fossilized (Efe, 2014; Jahin, 2012; Kurt & Atay, 2007; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Rankin-Brown, 2006).

The present study revealed that peer feedback training and practices developed learners' linguistic knowledge, especially grammar and vocabulary (Abdel Latif, 2012; Hassan, 2001; Rankin-Brown, 2006). Consequently, learners started to believe that they can be successful in writing in English and were motivated to write.

In the present study, giving and receiving peer feedback continuously created a less-threatening learning environment where learners collaborated and learnt from each other (Hansen & Liu, 2005). Recognizing that other learners had similar difficulties and worries helped learners feel relaxed.

However, there were differences in the thoughts of the participants depending on the degree of the decrease in their anxiety levels. The participants whose anxiety levels decreased from high to medium level stated that they continue to "*feel insecure"* about writing in spite of peer feedback training and practices. As the reason why they thought peer feedback did not have a positive impact on changing their feelings towards writing,

the participants mentioned that they were still getting low grades and had difficulty in translating from Turkish to English. Based on this result, the study concluded that too much emphasis on grades could diminish the positive impact of peer feedback training and practices on reducing EFL writing anxiety. As it is also mentioned in related literature, an exam-oriented environment that values learners' scoring high and passing is an important factor that impacts the value of peer feedback in decreasing writing anxiety (Harris, 1993; Sengupta, 1996; Tse, 1993) and leads to a preference of teacher feedback (Zhang, 1995).

Another negative aspect that the participants mentioned was learners' overemphasis on correcting grammar and punctuation mistakes. Some participants stated that they thought their friends should not be correcting only grammar, punctuation, and spelling mistakes and they added that these components are not enough to be successful in writing. These statements indicated the increased awareness of participants on what EFL writing really constitutes and how to give feedback effectively. From this result, the present study concluded that peer feedback training and practices have the potential to show learners that writing does not solely consist of correct grammar and punctuation.

On the other hand, as previous research also revealed, learners tend to focus on surface level errors such as grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors more as such errors are easier to detect than global ones (Beason, 1993; Berger, 1990; Hall, 1990; Leki, 1990; Yagelski, 1995). To overcome this, learners can be given a checklist to guide them not to overemphasize surface level errors (Cheng, 2004). Besides, a curriculum that views writing as a process, but not as writing the correct grammatical forms, can lead learners to view writing as involving global levels aspects like coherence, organization, and unity (Rollinson, 2005).

### 5. 3. Implications

The results of the present study supported the idea that peer feedback can be influential in reducing the learners' L2 writing anxiety with a well-planned training on feedback (Efe, 2014; Ozogul & Sullivan, 2009; Zhang, 2011). Besides, training on how to give and incorporate feedback is essential because it increases learners' awareness of writing process and diminishes the possibility of vague feedback, which can be a source of anxiety for L2 learners developing their writing skills (Cinar, 2014; Tsui & Ng, 2000).

Therefore, the teacher's role is highly important in implementing peer feedback to develop writing skills and reduce L2 writing anxiety (Ciftci, 2011; Sengun, 2002). As Efe also stated, "The assistance of teachers for feedback strategies is very essential (2014, p. 40)" for learners to become better feedback givers and evaluators of their own writing performances. In a collaborative classroom atmosphere where interaction between learners is established through providing to and receiving feedback from peers, students have the opportunity to take responsibility in their own and other students' learning process. Such a positive, collaborative, and interactive learning environment may create more autonomous and responsible learners who feel more comfortable not only as writers but also as readers of others' work (Bilen, 2014; Farrah, 2012; Hansen & Liu, 2005; Thompson, 2011). As Jahin (2012) adds, teachers should approach writing as a multiple-draft process that needs to include revision incorporating meaningful peer and teacher feedback. In this type of learning process, teachers need to be "analyzing not only what kinds of changes students are making to their work, but what effect these changes might have on the overall improvement of their essays (Jahin, 2012, p. 74)".

Considering all these, the role of a teacher needs to be reconsidered in implementing peer feedback especially because the teacher's approach and attitudes towards peer feedback can be highly influential in maximizing the positive impact of peer feedback training and implementation.

The present study revealed that the participants developed their grammar knowledge and learnt how to correct grammar mistakes in their own writing thanks to giving peer feedback. As Efe stated, "Peer feedback helps improve certain areas in writing like grammar, vocabulary, organization (2014, p.40)". Considering this in mind, peer feedback training and practices can be used with a careful training and practice considering the specific needs of a particular group of learners.

### 5. 4. Suggestions for Further Research

The present study was interested in researching the effects of peer feedback on foreign language writing anxiety and revealing what Turkish prep school students studying EFL think about the impact of getting training on peer feedback, giving and receiving peer feedback on their writing. The English language proficiency level of the participants in this study was intermediate. A further study can compare the data coming

from participants with different levels of English language learners and might yield valuable data on the relationship between language proficiency level and impact of peer feedback on reducing writing anxiety. The number of the participants were 60 in this study and other researchers may include more participants from different proficiency levels. Furthermore, the impact of peer feedback practice on writing scores of the participants was not investigated in the current study. Thus, further studies can research the impact of peer feedback on writing scores of language learners.

The present study interviewed the participants on their ideas of peer feedback training and applications before the proficiency exam that they need to take to pass the prep school. The study showed that the participants mentioned their anxiety about the mid-term, final, and proficiency exams. Another study can research how they relate their ideas to their actual writing development after the prep school proficiency exams and another follow-up interview can be administered to see the changes in their ideas and feelings towards writing.

The present study lasted 13 weeks. Longitudinal case studies that can delve into what exactly L2 learners experience during peer feedback training and practices can be conducted. Further studies may also investigate how peer feedback affects content, organisation, grammar, vocabulary, or spelling in the texts of the participants and which component is affected more.

## REFERENCES


Abdel Latif, M. M. (2012). Sources of L2 writing apprehension: a study of Egyptian university students. *Journal of Research in Reading, 38*(2), 194-212.

Allaei, S. K. & Connor, U. M. (1990). Exploring the dynamics of cross-cultural collaboration in writing classrooms. *The Writing Instructor, 10,* 19-28.

Amores, M. J. (1997). A new perspective on peer editing. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*(4), 513-523.

Arndt, V. (1993). Response to writing: using feedback to inform the writing process. In M. N. Brock and L. Walters (Eds.), *Teaching Composition around the Pacific Rim: Politics and Pedagogy* (pp. 90-116). UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*(3), 227 – 257.

Al Asmari, A. (2013). Investigation of writing strategies, writing apprehension, and writing achievement among Saudi EFL-major students. *International Education Studies*, *6*(11), p130.

Beason, L. (1993). Feedback and revision in writing across the curriculum classes. *Research in the Teaching of English, 27,* 395-421.

Beaven, M. (1977). Individualized Goal Setting, Self-Evaluation, and Peer Evaluation. In C. Cooper and L. Odell (Eds.), *Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging* (pp. 135-156). Urbana: NCTE, 135-56.

Berg, E. C. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(3), 215–241.

Berger, V. (1990). The effects of peer and self-feedback. *CATESOL Journal*, *3*, 21-35.

Bilen, M. V. (2014). *The Influence of Peer Feedback on Students' Writing Performance and Their Attitudes towards Writing* (Unpublished master's thesis). Adana, Turkey: Çağ University.

Boughey, C. (1997). Learning to write by writing to learn: A group-work approach. *ELT Journal*, *51*(2), 126–137.

Carson, J. G. & Nelson, G. L. (1994). Writing groups: Cross-cultural issues. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *3*(1), 17–30.

Carson, J. G. & Nelson, G.L. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *5*, 1-19.

Caulk, N. (1994). Comparing teacher and student responses to written work. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*, 181-188.

Chaudron, C. (1984). The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. *RELC Journal*, *15*, 1-15.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classroom research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cheng, Y. S. (2002). Factors associated with foreign language writing anxiety. *Foreign language annals*, *35*(6), 647-656.

Cheng, Y. S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*(4), 313-335.

Chou, M. C. (1999). How peer negotiations shape revisions. In J. Katchen, & Y. N. Leung (Eds.), *The Proceedings of the Seventh International Symposium on English Teaching* (pp. 349-359). Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co.

Cinar, G. (2014). *The Effect of Peer Feedback on Writing Anxiety in English as a Foreign Language Students* (Unpublished master's thesis). Çağ University, Adana, Turkey.

Connor, U. & Asenavage, K. (l994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: how much impact on revision?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *3*(3), 257-276.

Connor, U. & Kaplan, R. B. (1987). *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Cooper, M. M. (1986). The Ecology of Writing. *College English*, *48*(4), 364-373.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage.

DeDeyn, R. (2011). *Student Identity, Writing Anxiety, and Writing Performance: a Correlational Study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Colorado: Colorado State University.

DeGuerrero, M. C. M. & Villamil, O. S. (1994). Social-cognitive dimensions of interaction in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 484-496.

Dheram, P. K. (1995). Feedback as a two bullock cart. *ELT Journal*, *49*(2), 225-232.

DiPardo, A. & S. W. Freedman (1988). Peer response groups in the writing classroom: Theoretic foundations and new directions. *Review of educational research*. *58*(2), 119-149.

Dyson, A. H. (1981). Oral language: the rooting system for learning to write. *Language Arts, 58,* 776-784.

Ede, L. (1989). Writing as a Social Process: A Theoretical Foundation for Writing Centers?. *Writing Center Journal*, *9*(2), 3-13.

Efe, B. (2014). *The Effects of Peer Feedback on Students' Overall Writing Performance and Their Attitudes toward Peer Feedback* (Unpublished master's thesis). Adana, Turkey: Çağ University.

Erkan, D. Y. & Saban, A. I. (2011). Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in writing, and attitudes towards writing: A correlational study in Turkish tertiary-level EFL. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, *13*(1), 163-191.

Faigley, L. (1986). Competing theories of process: A critique and a proposal. *College English*, *48*, 527–542.

Fallahi, C. R., Wood, R. M., Austad, C. S., Fallahi, H. (2006). A program for improving undergraduate psychology students' basic writing skills. *Teaching of Psychology*, *33*(3), 171-175.

Farrah, M. (2012). The impact of peer feedback on improving the writing skills among Hebron University students. *An-Najah University Journal for Research*, *26*(1), 179-210.

Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(2), 315–339.

Flower, L. (1979). Writer-based prose: a cognitive basis for problems in writing. *College English*, *41*(1). 19-37.

Flynn, E. (1982). *Effects of peer critiquing and model analysis on the quality of biology student laboratory reports*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English. Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 234403).

Freedman, S. W. (1984). *The evaluation of and response to student writing: A review*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

George, D. (1984). Working with peer groups in the composition classroom. *College Composition and Communication*, *35*, 320-326.

Gere, A. R. & Abbott, R. D. (1985). Talking about writing: The language of writing groups. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *19*(4), 362-380.

Gielen, S., Tops, L., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., Smeets, S. (2010). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback and of various peer feedback forms in a secondary school writing curriculum. *British Educational Research Journal*, *36*(1), 143-162.

Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. London: Longman.

Grimm, N. (1986). Improving students' responses to their peers' essays. *College Composition and Communication*, 91-94.

Hall, C. (1990). Managing the complexity of revising across languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, *24*, 43-60.

Hansen, J. G. & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding Principles for Effective Peer Response. *ELT Journal*, Volume 59/1 Jan 2005, Oxford University Press.

Harris, J. (1993). I see what I mean! Exploring the relationships between writing and learning and learning to write. In N. Bird, J. Harris, & M. Ingham (eds.). *Language and Content*. Hong Kong: Institute of Languages in Education.

Hassan, B. A. (2001). The relationship between writing apprehension and self-esteem to the writing quality and quantity of EFL university students, (ED 459 671). *US Department of Education.*

Hedgcock, J. & Leftkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *1*(3), 255-276.

Hendrickson, J. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern Language Journal*, *62*, 387–398.

Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. & Bar-Natan, I. (2002). Writing development of Arab and Jewish students using cooperative learning (CL) and computer-mediated communication (CMC). *Computers & Education*, *39*(1), 19-36.

Hirvela, A. (1999). Collaborative writing instruction and communities of readers and writers. *TESOL Journal*, *8*(2), 7-12.

Hu, G. (2002). Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports: The case of communicative language teaching in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *15*(2), 93–105.

Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research*, *4*(1), 33-54.

Hyland, K. (2002). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*(8), 1091-1112.

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System, 31,* 217-230. doi:10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00021-6, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00021-6

Ihde, T. W. (1993). *Error Correction in L1 and L2 Language Learning*. Revised version of a paper presented at the World Congress of Applied Linguistics (10th, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, August 12, 1993). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED374678).

Jacobs, G., Curtis, A., Braine, G., Huang, S. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(3), 307-317.

Jahin, J. H. (2012). The Effect of Peer Reviewing on Writing Apprehension and Essay Writing Ability of Prospective EFL Teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(11), 60-84.

Jordan, R. (2002). The growth of EAP in Britain. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes 1*(1), 69-78.

Kastra, J. (1987). Effects of peer evaluation on attitudes toward writing fluency of ninth graders. *Journal of Educational Research 80*, 168-172.

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: a model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 294-304

Kepner, G.G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second language writing skills. *Modern Language Journal, 75*(3), 305-313.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kroll, B. (2001). Considerations for teaching an ESL/EFL writing course. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp.219-232). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Kroll, B. &Vann, R. (1981). *Exploring Speaking-Writing Relationships: Connections and Contrasts*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Kurt, G. & Atay, D. (2007). The Effects of Peer Feedback on the Writing Anxiety of Prospective Turkish Teachers of EFL. *Online Submission, 3*(1), 12-23.

Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for college level teaching. *System, 25*, 465–477.

Leki, I. (1990). Potential problems with peer responding in ESL writing classes. *CATESOL Journal, 3*, 5-17.

Leki, I. (1991). Preferences of ESL students for error correction in college level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals, 24*(3), 203–218.

Leki, I. & Carson, J.G. (1994). Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*, 81-101.

Liu, N. F. & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: the learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher education*, *11*(3), 279-290.

Lockhart, C. & Ng, P. (1993). How useful is peer response? Perspectives: Working papers of the Department of English, *City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, 5*(1), 17-29.

Lockhart, C. & Ng, P. (1995). Analyzing talk in ESL peer response groups: Stances, functions and content. *Language Learning, 45*(4), 605–655.

Lundstrom, K. & W. Baker (2008). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of second language writing 18*(1): 30-43.

Magno, C. (2008). Reading strategy, amount of writing, metacognition, metamemory, and apprehension as predictors of English written proficiency. *Asian EFL Journal*, Professional Teaching Articles, July 2008.

Mangelsdorf, K. (1989). Parallels between speaking and writing in second language acquisition. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 134-145). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: what do the students think?. *ELT Journal, 46*(3), 274-284.

Mangelsdorf, K. & Schlumberger, A. (1992). ESL student response stances in a peer-review task. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*, 235-254.

McLoughlin, C. & Luca, J. (2004). An investigation of the motivational aspects of peer and self-assessment tasks to enhance teamwork outcomes. *Edith Cowan University Research Online ECU Publications Pre*. 2011 629-636.

Mendonca, C. O. & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: review activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*, 745-768.

Min, H.-T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System, 33*(2), 293–308.

Mittan, R. (1989). The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.) *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL*.

Muncie, J. (2000). Using written teacher feedback in EFL composition classes. *ELT Journal, 54*(1), 47-53.

Murray, A. (1978). Internal Revision: A Process of Discovery. In Cooper, C. R., & Odell, L. , (Eds), *Research on Composition* (pp. 85-104). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Negari, G. M. & Rezaabadi, O. T. (2012). Too nervous to write? The relationship between anxiety and EFL writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(12), 2578-2586.

Nelson, G. & Murphy, J. (1992). An L2 writing group: Task and social dimensions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *1*, 171-193.

Nelson, G. L. & Murphy, J. (1993). Peer response groups: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts?. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*, 135-142.

Nelson, G. L. & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Second Language Journal of Writing, 7*(2), 113-131.

Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL quarterly 25*(2): 279-295.

Ozogul, G. & Sullivan, H. (2009). Student performance and attitudes under formative evaluation by teacher, self and peer evaluators. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 57*(3), 393-410.

Ozturk, G. & Saydam, D. (2014). Anxiety and self-efficacy in foreign language writing: The case in Turkey. *Başkent University Journal of Education, 1*(2), 10-21.

Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8,* 265-289.

Peterson, S. (2003). Peer response and students' revisions of their narrative writing. *L1 Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 3,* 239–272.

Pienemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? Psycholinguistic experiments and hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics, 10,* 52–79.

Porto, M. (2001). Cooperative writing response groups and self-evaluation. *ELT Journal, 55*(1), 38-46.

Rankin-Brown, M. S. (2006). Addressing writing apprehension in adult English language learners. In *Proceedings of the CATESOL State Conference* (pp. 1-7).

Ransdell, M. (2001). *Local fourth and fifth grade teachers' conceptions and practices of cooperative learning in science* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Kentucky.

Richards, J. C. (1990). *The Language Teaching Matrix*. Cambridge: C.U.P.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 23–30.

Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal, 2,* 46–70.

Saito, H. & Fujita, T. (2004). Characteristics and user acceptance of peer rating in EFL writing classrooms. *Language Teaching Research, 8*(1), 31–54.

Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Columbia. *The Modern Language Journal, 85,* 244-258.

Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals, 17,* 195–202.

Sengun, D. (2002). *The Impact of Training on Peer Feedback in Process Approach Implemented EFL Writing Classes: A Case Study* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara, Turkey: METU

Sengupta, S. (1996). *A Study of the Effects of the Systematic Teaching of Revision on the L2 Learners in a Secondary School in Hong Kong* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Department of Curriculum Studies, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

Sengupta, S. (1998). Peer evaluation: I am not the teacher. *ELT Journal*, *52*(1), 19-28.

Shaw, V. N. (2002). Peer review as a motivating device in the training of writing skills for college students. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, *33*(1), 68-77.

Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal*, *23*, 103–110.

Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: Developments, issues and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11-23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*, 657-677.

Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be more effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *1*, 217-233.

Susoy, Z. & Tanyer, S. (2013). A closer look at the foreign language writing anxiety of Turkish EFL pre-service teachers. *Paper presented at the International Academic Conference on Education, Teaching and E-learning.* Prague, Czech Republic.

Swain, M., Brooks, L. & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). 9. Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *22*, 171-185.

Tang, G. M. & Tithecott, J. (1999). Peer response in ESL writing. *TESL Canada Journal*, *16(*2), 20–38.

Thomas, G., Martin, D. & Pleasants, K. (2011). Using self-and peer-assessment to enhance students' future-learning in higher education. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *8*(1), 5.

Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in academic writing: learning to argue with the reader. *Applied Linguistics*, *22*(1), 58-78.

Topping, K. J. (2005). Trends in peer learning. *Educational psychology, 25*(6), 631-645.

Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tse, S.K. (1993). The Composing Process of Hong Kong Children in Primary Schools. PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.

Tsui, A. B. M. & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*(2), 147-170.

Villamil, O. S. & De Guerrero, M. C. M. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Social cognitive activities, mediating strategies and aspects of social behavior. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 51-75.

Villamil, O. S. & De Guerrero M. C. M. (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics 19*(4): 491-514.

Wiener, H. (1986). Collaborative Learning in the Classroom. *College English*, *48*, 52-61.

Widdowson, H. G. (1984). *Explorations in Applied Linguistics 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yagelski, R. P. (1995). The role of classroom context in the revision strategies of student writers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *2*, 216-38.

Yang, M., Badger, R. & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *15*, 179–200.

Youngs, B. L. & Green, A. (2001). A successful peer writing assistant program. *Foreign Language Annals*, *34*(6), 550-558.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, *17*(2), 165-187.

Zhang, S. (1995). Re-examining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *4*(3), 209-222.

Zhang, H. (2011). A study on ESL writing anxiety among Chinese English majors: Causes, effects and coping strategies for ESL writing anxiety (Doctoral dissertation, Kristianstad University).

Zhu, W. (1995). Effects of training for peer response on students' comments and interaction. *Written Communication*, *12*(4), 492-528.

# APPENDICES

## Appendix 1: Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) (Cheng, 2004)

**SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, U = Undecided, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree**

| | | SD | D | U | A | SA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | While writing in English, I am not nervous at all. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 2. | I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under time constraint. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 3. | While writing English compositions, I feel worried and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 4. | I often choose to write down my thoughts in English. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 5. | I usually do my best to avoid writing English compositions. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 6. | My mind often goes blank when I start to work on an English composition. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 7. | I don't worry that my English compositions are a lot worse than others. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 8. | I tremble or perspire when I write English compositions under time pressure. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 9. | If my English composition is to be evaluated, I would worry about getting a very poor grade. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 10. | I do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 11. | My thoughts become jumbled when I write English compositions under time constraint. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 12. | Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write compositions. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 13. | I often feel fear when I write English compositions under time constraint. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 14. | I am afraid that the other students would laugh at my English composition if they read it. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 15. | I freeze up when unexpectedly asked to write English compositions | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 16. | I would do my best to excuse myself if asked to write English compositions. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 17. | I don't worry at all about what other people would think of my English compositions. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 18. | I usually seek every possible chance to write English compositions outside of class. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 19. | I usually feel my whole body rigid and tense when write English compositions. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 20. | I am afraid of my English composition being chosen as a sample for discussion in class. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 21. | I am not afraid at all that my English compositions would be rated as very poor. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |
| 22. | Whenever possible, I would use English to write compositions. | ① | ② | ③ | ④ | ⑤ |

**Appendix 2: The inventory used in the study (translated into Turkish and used by Ozturk & Saydam, 2014)**

*Aşağıda yabancı dilde yazma kaygısı ile ilgili bazı ifadeler yer almaktadır. Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyup size uygun olan seçeneğin altına **X** işareti koyunuz. Doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur ve cevaplarınız gizli tutulacaktır. Bu çalışmadan elde edilecek veriler sadece yüksek lisans tezim için kullanılacaktır. Bu nedenle soruları samimi cevaplamanız çok önemlidir. Katılımınız için çok teşekkür ederim.*

*Mihri KOÇAK*

| Adınız/soyadınız:<br>Cinsiyetiniz:<br>Seviyeniz:<br>Okuyacağınız fakülte: | | **Kesinlikle katılmıyorum** | **Katılmıyorum** | **Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum** | **Katılıyorum** | **Kesinlikle katılıyorum** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | İngilizce yazım yaparken hiç heyecanlanmam | | | | | |
| 2. | Belirli bir zaman içerisinde İngilizce yazım yaparken kalbim hızla çarpar | | | | | |
| 3. | İngilizce yazım yaparken bu yazımların değerlendirileceğini bilmek beni endişelendirir | | | | | |
| 4. | Yazım yaparken düşündüklerimi genellikle İngilizce yazarım | | | | | |
| 5. | İngilizce yazmaktan elimden geldiği kadar uzak dururum | | | | | |
| 6. | İngilizce yazmaya başladığımda kafam bomboşmuş hissine kapılırım | | | | | |
| 7. | İngilizce yazımlarımın diğerlerininkinden kötü olması beni üzmez | | | | | |
| 8. | Zaman baskısı altında İngilizce yazım yaparken çok heyecanlanırım | | | | | |
| 9. | Yazdığım paragraf ya da kompozisyon değerlendirilecek ise düşük not almaktan korkarım | | | | | |
| 10. | İngilizce yazmam gereken durumlardan olabildiğince kaçınırım | | | | | |

| | | Kesinlikle katılmıyorum | Katılmıyorum | Ne katılıyorum ne katılmıyorum | Katılıyorum | Kesinlikle katılıyorum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. | Kısıtlı bir zamanda yazım yaparken düşüncelerim birbirine girer | | | | | |
| 12. | Mecbur kalmadıkça İngilizce yazılar yazmam | | | | | |
| 13. | Kısıtlı bir zamanda İngilizce yazım yaparken paniklerim | | | | | |
| 14. | Başka öğrencilerin İngilizce yazdıklarımı okuduklarında dalga geçmelerinden korkarım | | | | | |
| 15. | Aniden İngilizce yazmam istendiğinde donup kalırım | | | | | |
| 16. | İngilizce yazmam istendiğinde çeşitli bahaneler uydururum | | | | | |
| 17. | İnsanların İngilizce yazdıklarımla ilgili düşüncelerini önemsemem | | | | | |
| 18. | Sınıf dışında İngilizce yazım yapabileceğim her şansı değerlendiririm | | | | | |
| 19. | İngilizce yazım yaparken tüm vücudum kaskatı kesilir | | | | | |
| 20. | Yazımlarımın sınıf ortamında tartışılmasından korkarım | | | | | |
| 21. | Yazımlarımın kötü puan almasından korkmam | | | | | |
| 22. | Mümkün olduğu her zaman İngilizce yazımlar yaparım | | | | | |

**Appendix 3: Structured interview questions for the experimental group**

1. İngilizce birşey yazarken nasıl hissediyorsun?

How do you feel when you write something in English?

2. Arkadaşının yazdıklarına dönüt vermek ve yorum yapmak nasıldı?

How was giving feedback to your peers?

3. Arkadaşından yazdıkların için dönüt ve yorum almak nasıldı?

How was receiving peer feedback for your writing?

4. Sence akran dönütü uygulaması yazmaya olan duygu ve düşüncelerini etkiledi mi?
Do you think peer feedback practice has affected your feelings and opinions about writing?

**Appendix 4: Schedule**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 16-20 February | WEEK 1 | informing participants about the study (both groups)<br>SLWAI pre-application (both groups)<br>informing participants about how to provide peer feedback (experimental group only) |
| 23-27 February | WEEK 2 | training session 1 (experimental group only) |
| 2-6 March | WEEK 3 | training session 2 (experimental group only) |
| 9-13 March | WEEK 4 | sample application task (experimental group only) |
| 16-20 March | WEEK 5 | feedback about the sample application task and discussion with the writer and peer feedback giver (experimental group only) |
| 23-27 March | WEEK 6 | real application task 1 (both groups) |
| 30-3 April | WEEK 7 | real application task 2 (both groups) |
| 6-10 April | WEEK 8 | MIDTERM WEEK |
| 13-17 April | WEEK 9 | real application task 3 (both groups) |
| 20-24 April | WEEK 10 | real application task 4 (both groups) |
| 27-1 May | WEEK 11 | real application task 5 (both groups) |
| 4-8 May | WEEK 12 | SLWAI post-application (both groups) |
| 11-15 May | WEEK 13 | structured interviews (experimental group only) |

## Appendix 5: Peer feedback training task 1

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Sample task 1 | Writing |
| Description | Write a text about someone important for you. Answer the following questions;<br>1. Who is this person?<br>2. What is his/her relationship to you?<br>3. How did you meet?<br>4. How often do you see him/her?<br>5. What kinds of things do you do together?<br>6. Why is this person important to you?<br><br>Use 80-100 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a text express opinions and attitudes in a simple way |
| Task requirements | Relationship vocabulary<br>Simple Present tense<br>Simple Past Tense<br>Linkers ( and, but, so, because) |

Mustafa is my cousin, my younger uncle's son and he is very important person to me. Because he is my cousin not only. We always laugh together. I love his jokes. I talk about everything with him. I can borrow money. We can have a good time together. We play computer game, listen music... The only problem with Mustafa is anything. I don't remember a problem with him.

I was in Muğla with him two months ago for holiday. It was very fun. We are living different cities thus I miss him very much we have not seen very often, only a few times a year, but we can speak by phone. When my phone ringing, I say: "That probably my cousin." He will join army a month later so I won't speak with him very often. It is very sad but it is necessary also I love military uniforms.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer answered the questions above in detail | yes | no |
| My peer used relationship vocabulary | yes | no |
| My peer used simple present tense in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used simple past tense in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used linkers in an appropriate way | yes | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

Name of the feedback giver:

B level group: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Sample task 1 | Writing |
| Description | Write a text about someone important for you. Answer the following questions;<br>1. Who is this person?<br>2. What is his/her relationship to you?<br>3. How did you meet?<br>4. How often do you see him/her?<br>5. What kinds of things do you do together?<br>6. Why is this person important to you?<br><br>Use 80-100 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a text express opinions and attitudes in a simple way |
| Task requirements | Relationship vocabulary<br>Simple Present tense<br>Simple Past Tense<br>Linkers ( and, but, so, because) |

Mustafa is my cousin, my younger uncle's son and he is very important person to me. Because he is my cousin not only. We always laugh together. I love his jokes. I talk about everything with him. I can borrow money. We can have a good time together. We play computer game, listen music... The only problem with Mustafa is anything. I don't remember a problem with him.

I was in Muğla with him two months ago for holiday. It was very fun. We are living different cities thus I miss him very much we have not seen very often, only a few times a year, but we can speak by phone. When my phone ringing, I say: "That probably my cousin." He will join army a month later so I won't speak with him very often. It is very sad but it is necessary also I love military uniforms.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer answered the questions above in detail | yes ✓ | no |
| My peer used relationship vocabulary | yes | no ✓ |
| My peer used simple present tense in an appropriate way | yes ✓ | no |
| My peer used simple past tense in an appropriate way | yes | no ✓ |
| My peer used linkers in an appropriate way | yes ✓ | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

Sıklık zarflarının yeri dikkat edilmeli ve B kuruna uygun zorlukta kelimeler kullanmalı. Cümlelerin arasında bağlantılar olmalı keskin bir geçiş olmamalı.

Name of the feedback giver:

## Appendix 6: Peer feedback training task 2

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Sample task 2 | Writing |
| Description | Write an email to invite someone. Include the details below:<br>1. Start your e mail with an appropriate greeting<br>2. Where do you invite your friend? (i.e. cinema, concert, party, restaurant etc...)<br>3. When is the event? (date)<br>4. What time is the event? (time)<br>5. Suggest a meeting place and time.<br>6. End your e mail with an appropriate closure remark.<br><br>Use 50-70 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a basic informal email/letter of invitation with simple, key details |
| Task requirements | Appropriate structures / phrases while starting and ending an e mail<br>Present Continuous Tense, be going to<br>Structures used in invitations |

Hi Aydın,

What do you do?I am very good because I am going to celebrate my birthday on saturday .We are going to go dancing and drink very different things and eat very much cake .You don't have to bring anything.All my friend will be in frond of the Acıktım cafe at 10:00 pm and we can hang around one hour.Then we are going to the Dedepark hotel at 11:00 pm because real party is starting in there. You can bring your friends. You can come in frond of Acıktım cafe or directly Dedepark hotel. It will be super party i think. On my party you can drink many different cocktails. I will be glad if you are there. Look forward to seeing you soon.

Best wishes,

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer answered the questions above in detail | yes | no |
| My peer used appropriate structures/phrases while starting and ending an e mail | yes | no |
| My peer used present continuous tense in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used be going to in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used appropriate structures for invitations | yes | no |
| My peer is careful about punctuation | yes | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

Name of the feedback giver:

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| Sample task 2 | Writing |
|---|---|
| Description | Write an email to invite someone. Include the details below:<br>1. Start your e mail with an appropriate greeting<br>2. Where do you invite your friend? (i.e. cinema, concert, party, restaurant etc...)<br>3. When is the event? (date)<br>4. What time is the event? (time)<br>5. Suggest a meeting place and time.<br>6. End your e mail with an appropriate closure remark.<br><br>Use 50-70 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a basic informal email/letter of invitation with simple, key details |
| Task requirements | Appropriate structures / phrases while starting and ending an e mail<br>Present Continuous Tense, be going to<br>Structures used in invitations |

Hi Aydın,

What do you do?I am very good because I am going to celebrate my birthday on saturday .We are going to go dancing and drink very different things and eat very much cake .You don't have to bring anything.All my friend will be in front of the Acıktım cafe at 10:00 pm and we can hang around one hour.Then we are going to the Dedepark hotel at 11:00 pm because real party is starting in there. You can bring your friends. You can come in front of Acıktım Cafe or directly Dedepark hotel.It will be super party I think. On my party you can drink many different cocktails. I will be glad if you are there. Look forward to seeing you soon.

Best wishes,

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer answered the questions above in detail | yes ✓ | no |
| My peer used appropriate structures/phrases while starting and ending an e mail | yes | no ✓ |
| My peer used present continuous tense in an appropriate way | yes | no ✓ |
| My peer used be going to in an appropriate way | yes | no ✓ |
| My peer used appropriate structures for invitations | yes | no ✓ |
| My peer is careful about punctuation | yes ✓ | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

İlk giriş cümlesi yanlış kullanılmış.
Partinin detayını anlatırken bir anda buluşmaya geçmiş ordadda da yanlış kullanımlar ve sonra tekrar parti detayına girmiş. Tense'lerde hatalı kullanımlar yapmış.
spelling (-)

Name of the feedback giver:

## Appendix 7: Peer feedback training task 3

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| Sample application task | Writing |
|---|---|
| Description | Write a text about your best friend. Answer the following questions;<br>1. Who is this person?<br>2. What is his/her relationship to you?<br>3. How did you meet?<br>4. How often do you see him/her?<br>5. What kinds of things do you do together?<br>6. Why is this person important to you?<br><br>Use 50-80 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a text express opinions and attitudes in a simple way |
| Task requirements | Relationship vocabulary<br>Simple Present tense<br>Simple Past Tense<br>Linkers ( and, but, so, because) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer answered the questions in detail | yes | no |
| My peer used relationship vocabulary | yes | no |
| My peer used simple present tense in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used simple past tense in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used linkers in an appropriate way | Yes | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

Name of the feedback giver:

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| Sample application task | Writing |
|---|---|
| Description | Write a text about your best friend. Answer the following questions;<br>1. Who is this person?<br>2. What is his/her relationship to you?<br>3. How did you meet?<br>4. How often do you see him/her?<br>5. What kinds of things do you do together?<br>6. Why is this person important to you?<br><br>Use 50-80 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a text express opinions and attitudes in a simple way |
| Task requirements | Relationship vocabulary<br>Simple Present tense<br>Simple Past Tense<br>Linkers ( and, but, so, because) |

My best friend is Mustafa. I met him in the class. I saw him and talked to him. Later we began close. We usually talk about science or games. Also he is like my little brother because he is not adult like me. Mustafa is important for me because as I want as person, so we can talk about anything and we can do anything. I love him so much.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer answered the questions in detail | yes | no |
| My peer used relationship vocabulary | yes | no |
| My peer used simple present tense in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used simple past tense in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used linkers in an appropriate way | Yes | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

(-) Soruları gözden geçirerek yazıya başlarsan ve acele etmeyip kontrol edersen

(-) konuya yönelik bölüme dönüp, yaparken bakarsan

(-) Zenginleştirmek adına daha fazla bağlaç kullanırsan başarabilirsin.

Name of the feedback giver:

## Appendix 8: Real application task 1

## For the experimental group:

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Application task 1 | Writing |
| Description | Write a paragraph about your first month at university. Answer the following questions:<br>1. Where were you?<br>2. What did you experience?<br>3. How did you feel?<br>4. Did you have any problems? What did you do about them?<br>5. Whom did you meet?<br>6. How do you feel now?<br>Write 80-100 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a narrative paragraph about a new experience |
| Task Requirements | Narrative tenses<br>School related vocabulary<br>Linkers; "so, because, so that"<br>Paragraph organization |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer answered the questions above in detail | yes | no |
| My peer used school related vocabulary | | |
| My peer used simple past tense in an appropriate way | | |
| My peer used past progressive tense in an appropriate way | | |
| My peer used linkers in an appropriate way | | |
| This paragraph has a good organization | | |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

Name of the feedback giver:

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| Application task 1 | Writing |
|---|---|
| Description | Write a paragraph about your first month at university. Answer the following questions:<br>1. Where were you? ✓<br>2. What did you experience? ✗<br>3. How did you feel? ✓<br>4. Did you have any problems? What did you do about them? ✗<br>5. Whom did you meet? ✓<br>6. How do you feel now? ✓<br>Write 80-100 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a narrative paragraph about a new experience |
| Task Requirements | Narrative tenses ✓<br>School related vocabulary ✗<br>Linkers; "so, because, so that" ✓<br>Paragraph organization ✓ |

I felt very excited in the first month at university. I was at c-ig. I wasn't alone because semcur and I were at the sone class. we met at cafeteria then we went to class together. The class was empty when we went ~~to~~ there. Merve teacher came to class and she introduced ~~to we~~ vs to a another. The ~~first~~, I met ~~with~~ Kübra. First day finished well. ~~In the begining~~, Then, so that, we were having party, we were joking with each other. Everybody was friendly. I didn't have any problems. Now, we aren't at the sone class so I'm sad but sometimes we meet (each other). This makes ~~happy~~ (me)

P. rev

| My peer answered the questions above in detail | yes | no |
|---|---|---|
| My peer used school related vocabulary | | ✓ |
| My peer used simple past tense in an appropriate way | ✓ | |
| My peer used past progressive tense in an appropriate way | ✓ | |
| My peer used linkers in an appropriate way | ✓ | |
| This paragraph has a good organization | ✓ | |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

Paragrafta genellikle ilk gününden bahsetmişsin. Biraz daha bir aya yayarak bazı kesitler aktarabilirdin. Paragraf organizasyonu genellikle güzel. Fakat bir insan hiçbir problemle karşılaşmaz mı? Detaylı olarak bir problemi anlatabilirdin.

→ School related vocabulary eksik

Name of the feedback giver:

**For the control group:**

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Application task 1 | Writing |
| Description | Write a paragraph about your first month at university. Answer the following questions:<br>1. Where were you?<br>2. What did you experience?<br>3. How did you feel?<br>4. Did you have any problems? What did you do about them?<br>5. Whom did you meet?<br>6. How do you feel now?<br>Write 80-100 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a narrative paragraph about a new experience |
| Task Requirements | Narrative tenses<br>School related vocabulary<br>Linkers; "so, because, so that"<br>Paragraph organization |

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Application task 1 | Writing |
| Description | Write a paragraph about your first month at university. Answer the following questions:<br>1. Where were you?<br>2. What did you experience?<br>3. How did you feel?<br>4. Did you have any problems? What did you do about them?<br>5. Whom did you meet?<br>6. How do you feel now?<br>Write 80-100 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a narrative paragraph about a new experience |
| Task Requirements | Narrative tenses<br>School related vocabulary<br>Linkers; "so, because, so that"<br>Paragraph organization |

My first month at university was a different experience for me. ~~At~~ On my first day, I was late, so I began to worry. I had too many problems. I missed my family and I felt very alone. I have stayed in dormitory ~~for~~ the first time in my life. The dormitory wasn't comfortable like my home. I imagined ~~differently~~ the university differently but Prep school was like high school. There wasn't English class in my high school, so I didn't understand my teacher ~~the~~ during the first week. Then, I got used to. I had made an effort by the time my English improved. I haven't spoken English up to the present. I practised for my English improved, but still I have got some problems for speaking. I met ~~with~~ people who have got different opinions at the university. I ~~won~~ made beautiful friends. If I were choosing chance, I would choose ~~at~~ Anadolu University again.

what do you mean?

Very good job !!

## Appendix 9: Real application task 2

## For the experimental group:

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Application task 2 | Writing |
| Description | Write a paragraph about your best birthday party. Answer the following questions:<br>1. Where were you?<br>2. What did you experience?<br>3. How did you feel?<br>4. Did you get any gifts? What were they?<br>5. Who were there (with you)?<br>6. What makes this party important for you?<br>Write 80-100 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a narrative paragraph about a positive experience |
| Task Requirements | Narrative tenses<br>Emotions related vocabulary<br>Comparatives/superlatives<br>Linkers<br>Paragraph organization |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer answered the questions above in detail | yes | no |
| My peer used school related vocabulary | yes | no |
| My peer used simple past tense in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used past progressive tense in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used comparatives/superlatives in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used linkers in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| This paragraph has a good organization | yes | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

Name of the feedback giver:

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Application task 2 | Writing |
| Description | Write a paragraph about your best birthday party. Answer the following questions:<br>1. Where were you?<br>2. What did you experience?<br>3. How did you feel?<br>4. Did you get any gifts? What were they?<br>5. Who were there (with you)?<br>6. What makes this party important for you?<br>Write 80-100 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a narrative paragraph about a positive experience |
| Task Requirements | Narrative tenses<br>Emotions related vocabulary<br>Comparatives/superlatives<br>Linkers<br>Paragraph organization |

My best birthday party was prepared by my best friends 1 years ago, because I became 18 years old. My best friends took me by surprise. I went to my home and there were everyone. I was amazed. There were gifts and balloons everywhere. This situations makes me happy. My mother made a big cake and it was great. We had fun. I love everybody in that place. I felt very happy. If This birthday didn't become, I would felt unhappy. This party important for me because everybody was with me. My birthday party is the best, in my life.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer answered the questions above in detail | yes | no |
| My peer used school related vocabulary | yes | no |
| My peer used simple past tense in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used past progressive tense in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used comparatives/superlatives in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used linkers in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| This paragraph has a good organization | yes | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

→ ø gereksiz
by ↗

→ comparative yok.
→ kısa cümlelerde linker kullanılabilirdi.
→ Bütün sorulara düzeni bozmayacak şekilde cevap verilmiş.
→ If'den sonra büyük harf gelmez.

Name of the feedback giver:

**For the control group:**

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Application task 2 | Writing |
| Description | Write a paragraph about your best birthday party. Answer the following questions:<br>1. Where were you?<br>2. What did you experience?<br>3. How did you feel?<br>4. Did you get any gifts? What were they?<br>5. Who were there (with you)?<br>6. What makes this party important for you?<br>Write 80-100 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a narrative paragraph about a positive experience |
| Task Requirements | Narrative tenses<br>Emotions related vocabulary<br>Comparatives/superlatives<br>Linkers<br>Paragraph organization |

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| Application task 2 | Writing |
|---|---|
| Description | Write a paragraph about your best birthday party. Answer the following questions:<br>1. Where were you?<br>2. What did you experience?<br>3. How did you feel?<br>4. Did you get any gifts? What were they?<br>5. Who were there (with you)?<br>6. What makes this party important for you?<br>Write 80-100 words. |
| Outcomes | Can write a narrative paragraph about a positive experience |
| Task Requirements | Narrative tenses<br>Emotions related vocabulary<br>Comparatives/superlatives<br>Linkers<br>Paragraph organization |

My best birthday party was my fifteenth birtday. My friends and I I and friends were at the cafe. That's was a wonderful party. I felt very happy berause all friends came the my party. We sang ~~x~~ songs and danced. My friends took me beatiful sifts. I liked all of them. Then I and friends took photos taken. We had a good time. After that, We went to fun fair. I got on ferris amusement park wheel. My friends got on gondola. I'm afraid of gondola so I didn't get on gondola. We got on crazy dance together. It was funny. Finally, we left fun fair and we wat to home. This party is important for me berause it was funny and wonderful. I never forget this party. I always remember.

## Appendix 10: Real application task 3

## For the experimental group:

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Application task 3 | Writing |
| Description | Write an email about a problem at prep school to the manager of the school.<br>• Explain the reason of your email<br>• Describe the problem by answering the questions in detail<br>o What is the problem?<br>o Where is the problem?<br>o Why is it a problem? What has caused it?<br>o Why do you think this is an important problem?<br>• Suggest possible solution<br>o What do you think the manager should do to change the situation?<br>Write about 100 words |
| Outcomes | Can write a formal email about a problem and suggest solutions |
| Task Requirements | Relative clauses<br>Present/past passive voice<br>Formal email layout (address, opening- closing remarks)<br>Formal expressions; *I'm writing ..., in addition to this..., I look forward to hearing..., Yours faithfully* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer answered the questions above in detail | yes | no |
| My peer used relative clauses in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used present/past passive voice in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| This email has a formal layout | yes | no |
| My peer used formal expressions | yes | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

Name of the feedback giver:

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| Application task 3 | Writing |
|---|---|
| Description | Write an email about a problem at prep school to the manager of the school.<br>• Explain the reason of your email<br>• Describe the problem by answering the questions in detail<br>o What is the problem? ✓<br>o Where is the problem? ✓<br>o Why is it a problem? What has caused it?<br>o Why do you think this is an important problem?<br>• Suggest possible solution<br>o What do you think the manager should do to change the situation?<br>Write about 100 words |
| Outcomes | Can write a formal email about a problem and suggest solutions |
| Task Requirements | Relative clauses<br>Present/past passive voice<br>Formal email layout (address, opening- closing remarks)<br>Formal expressions; *I'm writing ..., in addition to this..., I look forward to hearing..., Yours faithfully* |

Dear Madam,

We have got a big problem at this prep school. Our english exams are so difficult, Why is this like this! You should change this situation because we fail the exams. Nobody passes his/her exams. For example, in the last listening exam we didn't hear anything, the listening system was broken when we were listening to something, so we failed the exam. I don't want to repeat the exam again. Please solve this problem.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

subject

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer answered the questions above in detail | yes | no ✓ |
| My peer used relative clauses in an appropriate way | yes | no ✓ |
| My peer used present/past passive voice in an appropriate way | yes | no ✓ |
| This email has a formal layout | yes ✓ | no |
| My peer used formal expressions | yes ✓ | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

"when" diğerinde relative var

Ali soruya net cevap yorumlamış.

Name of the feedback giver:

## For the control group:

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Application task 3 | Writing |
| Description | Write an email about a problem at prep school to the manager of the school.<br>• Explain the reason of your email<br>• Describe the problem by answering the questions in detail<br>  ○ What is the problem?<br>  ○ Where is the problem?<br>  ○ Why is it a problem? What has caused it?<br>  ○ Why do you think this is an important problem?<br>• Suggest possible solution<br>  ○ What do you think the manager should do to change the situation?<br>Write about 100 words |
| Outcomes | Can write a formal email about a problem and suggest solutions |
| Task Requirements | Relative clauses<br>Present/past passive voice<br>Formal email layout (address, opening- closing remarks)<br>Formal expressions; *I'm writing ..., in addition to this..., I look forward to hearing..., Yours faithfully* |

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Application task 3 | Writing |
| Description | Write an email about a problem at prep school to the manager of the school.<br>• Explain the reason of your email<br>• Describe the problem by answering the questions in detail<br>○ What is the problem?<br>○ Where is the problem?<br>○ Why is it a problem? What has caused it?<br>○ Why do you think this is an important problem?<br>• Suggest possible solution<br>○ What do you think the manager should do to change the situation?<br>Write about 100 words |
| Outcomes | Can write a formal email about a problem and suggest solutions |
| Task Requirements | Relative clauses<br>Present/past passive voice<br>Formal email layout (address, opening- closing remarks)<br>Formal expressions; *I'm writing ..., in addition to this..., I look forward to hearing..., Yours faithfully* |

Dear Sir,

First of all I am at Anadolu University. My problem is proficiency exam. Proficiency exam is very difficult. Especially, many students complain about this situation and many students ~~had been failing~~ have failed proficiency exam. This situation ~~that~~ makes us really angry. ~~This~~ The problem is that everybody says something. My friend and I ~~fear with~~ are afraid of proficiency exam. Also, many universities exams ~~is~~ are easy. Even, ~~it hasn't got~~ they don't have any proficiency exams, ~~it has got~~ they just have one final exam, so these students pass their exams. However, The case isn't same at Anadolu University. I think, there shouldn't be a proficiency exam. I strongly believe that my problem is solved. If this problem is solved, all students will feel comfortable and happy.

I look forwad ~~to~~ forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours ~~faithfully~~

very very good :)

## Appendix 11: Real application task 4

## For the experimental group:

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Application task 4 | Writing |
| Description | If you could be a famous and rich person, what kind of a person would you be?<br>Talk about your personality, appearance, lifestyle, possessions, house, car, family life, places to hang out, and hobbies. You can add details. Be careful this is an imaginary situation; so try to use would and if type 2. |
| Outcomes | Can describe a real or imagined character<br>Can write straightforward, detailed descriptions on a range of familiar topics. |
| Task Requirements | Second conditional<br>Would/wouldn't + base verb<br>Descriptive Vocabulary<br>Verb Tenses (if necessary)<br>word limit: minimum 100 words |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer described the imaginary character and his/her life in detail | yes | no |
| My peer used if type 2 in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used would/wouldn't in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used descriptive vocabulary | yes | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

Name of the feedback giver:

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Application task 4 | Writing |
| Description | If you could be a famous and rich person, what kind of a person would you be?<br>Talk about your personality, appearance, lifestyle, possessions, house, car, family life, places to hang out, and hobbies. You can add details. Be careful this is an imaginary situation; so try to use would and if type 2. |
| Outcomes | Can describe a real or imagined character<br>Can write straightforward, detailed descriptions on a range of familiar topics. |
| Task Requirements | Second conditional<br>Would/wouldn't + base verb<br>Descriptive Vocabulary<br>Verb Tenses (if necessary)<br>word limit: minimum 100 words |

If I were the richest person in the world, I would buy all guns in the world. If I could found a new organization, I could reach everybody. I wouldn't change. If I talked to enough people, I could help what they want to do to change the system. If my organization had scientists, artists, teachers, I could change this system and I could discovered new materials and I could do my project so people could be easy-going with nature. If I were the richest person in the world, anybody couldn't be poor. If I were the richest person in the world, people and the inventions that people make to improve themselves wouldn't destroy our nature,

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer described the imaginary character and his/her life in detail | yes | (no) |
| My peer used if type 2 in an appropriate way good | (yes) | no |
| My peer used would/wouldn't in an appropriate way ✓ | (yes) | no |
| My peer used descriptive vocabulary | yes | (no) |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

They are good ideas.
You didn't describe your character and life in detail.

Name of the feedback giver:

**For the control group:**

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| | |
|---|---|
| Application task 4 | Writing |
| Description | If you could be a famous and rich person, what kind of a person would you be?<br>Talk about your personality, appearance, lifestyle, possessions, house, car, family life, places to hang out, and hobbies. You can add details. Be careful this is an imaginary situation; so try to use would and if type 2. |
| Outcomes | Can describe a real or imagined character<br>Can write straightforward, detailed descriptions on a range of familiar topics. |
| Task Requirements | Second conditional<br>Would/wouldn't + base verb<br>Descriptive Vocabulary<br>Verb Tenses (if necessary)<br>word limit: minimum 100 words |

Name of the writer: Class: Date:

| Application task 4 | Writing |
|---|---|
| Description | If you could be a famous and rich person, what kind of a person would you be? Talk about your personality, appearance, lifestyle, possessions, house, car, family life, places to hang out, and hobbies. You can add details. Be careful this is an imaginary situation; so try to use would and if type 2. |
| Outcomes | Can describe a real or imagined character<br>Can write straightforward, detailed descriptions on a range of familiar topics. |
| Task Requirements | Second conditional<br>Would/wouldn't + base verb<br>Descriptive Vocabulary<br>Verb Tenses (if necessary)<br>word limit: minimum 100 words |

If I could be a rich man, my life would change. ~~somethings~~
I would live in a bigger and more comfortable hase. ~~in a house~~. I would buy the best car in the world such as Ferrari. I wouldn't have to work hard because I would have a lot of money. So, I would have enough time with my family and I would hang out with them. Life ~~was~~ would be better than now for me.

But only one thing wouldn't change for me. That's my character. I don't think that money ~~doesn't reason~~ would change ~~changing~~ my mind and character. I'm always a helpful and kind person. If I ~~would~~ were a rich person, I ~~helped~~ would help desperate people. Such as homeless or orphan children. When they would become happy, I would become happy, too.

perfect conclusion

In addition to this, I would interest in more hobbies. Now, I'm not interested in all of them because I don't have time and money. If I were a rich man, I could do everything what I want. It would make me happy.

Perfect Job
:)

## Appendix 12: Real application task 5

## For the experimental group:

Name: Class: Date:

# THE DAILY NEWS

YOUR DAILY FAVOURITE

**Burglar in Eskişehir**

lorem ipsum dol... tetur adipisci... elit. O...

**Ali Ağaoğlu becomes poor**

lorem ipsum dol... tetur adipisci... elit. O...

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Application task 5 | Writing | |
| Description | Choose **one** of the newspaper headlines above and write a news report considering the following below:<br>• Write an introductory statement which explains what happened in one sentence<br>• Write more information about the background of the story<br>1. Who / what is the story about?<br>2. What happened?<br>3. Why did it happen?<br>4. Where did it happen?<br>5. When did it happen?<br>• Write a quote to give someone's opinion.<br>• Write a concluding statement which gives information about the current situation<br><br>Write about 120 words. | |
| Outcomes | Can recognize significant points in straightforward newspaper articles on familiar topics<br>Can narrate a story demonstrating a range of language within a simple linear sequence | |
| Task Requirements | narrative tenses<br>collocations with say and tell | linkers, *as soon as, while, during, until, by the time*<br>organization |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer organized his/her news report well | yes | no |
| My peer used narrative tenses an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used collocations with say and tell in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used linkers in an appropriate way | yes | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

Name of the feedback giver:

Name: Class: Date:

# THE DAILY NEWS

YOUR DAILY FAVOURITE

## Burglar in Eskişehir

HIRSIZ

## Ali Ağaoğlu becomes poor

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Application task 5 | Writing | |
| Description | Choose **one** of the newspaper headlines above and write a news report considering the following below:<br>• Write an introductory statement which explains what happened in one sentence<br>• Write more information about the background of the story<br>1. Who / what is the story about?<br>2. What happened?<br>3. Why did it happen?<br>4. Where did it happen?<br>5. When did it happen?<br>• Write a quote to give someone's opinion.<br>• Write a concluding statement which gives information about the current situation<br><br>Write about 120 words. | |
| Outcomes | Can recognize significant points in straightforward newspaper articles on familiar topics<br>Can narrate a story demonstrating a range of language within a simple linear sequence | |
| Task Requirements | narrative tenses<br>collocations with say and tell | linkers, *as soon as, while, during, until, by the time*<br>organization |

Mad relative's burglar

A woman who was mad a burglar. She wasn't working so she hadn't no money. She decided to do theft which found a short way for earn money. She would steal a lot of money her the richest person. She invited his Social Pub in Eskişehir at midnight.

He drank beer and got drunk. She knew to opportunity this situation. She took his key of home. Immediately, she went to his home. Therefore he lived alone at home where was nobody. She entered the house and stole a lot of money from his safe. After a long time, his relative realised this situation and he was really angry her. However, he couldn't soy her crime to the police.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| My peer organized his/her news report well | yes | no |
| My peer used narrative tenses an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used collocations with say and tell in an appropriate way | yes | no |
| My peer used linkers in an appropriate way | yes | no |

My comments/feedback (can be in Turkish):

① Anlam bütünlüğü var ama haber yazısı gibi olmamış, hikaye gibi anlatılmış. Birçok yazım hatası var, anlatım bozuklukları var. Relative Clause kullanımı yanlış olmuş. As soon as, by the time gibi bağlaçlar hiç kullanılmamış. Reported Speech yok.

② Gramer gramer abla böyle gramer görmedi. Sen okuma!! You gotta go car repair service. You gotta learn job. Or

③ Anlıyorsun ama kurmada sıkıntı var. Ciddi gramer eksiği var.

Name of the feedback giver:

**For the control group:**

Name: Class: Date:

# THE DAILY NEWS

YOUR DAILY FAVOURITE

## Burglar in Eskişehir

lorem ipsum dolor ... tetur adipisci ... elit. ...

## Ali Ağaoğlu becomes poor

lorem ipsum dolor ... tetur adipisci ... elit. ...

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Application task 5 | Writing | |
| Description | Choose **one** of the newspaper headlines above and write a news report considering the following below:<br>• Write an introductory statement which explains what happened in one sentence<br>• Write more information about the background of the story<br>1. Who / what is the story about?<br>2. What happened?<br>3. Why did it happen?<br>4. Where did it happen?<br>5. When did it happen?<br>• Write a quote to give someone's opinion.<br>• Write a concluding statement which gives information about the current situation<br>Write about 120 words. | |
| Outcomes | Can recognize significant points in straightforward newspaper articles on familiar topics<br>Can narrate a story demonstrating a range of language within a simple linear sequence | |
| Task Requirements | narrative tenses<br>collocations with say and tell | linkers, *as soon as, while, during, until, by the time*<br>organization |
| | | |

Ali Ağaoğlu become poor!

Ali Ağaoğlu had got a lot of companies but Huge earthquake ~~was~~ destroyed Ali Ağaoğlu's companies Everybody got damaged in this event Earthquake have just become ~~fact~~ in his companies because This event is a conspiracy theory. Authorities are still researching this event. Now, Ali Ağaoğlu went bankrupting and. Ali Ağaoğlu is very poor. Therefore, Ali Ağaoğlu's fans are helping him. Ali Ağaoğlu is staying in an old house. His children are very hungry. Because of this, Ali Ağaoğlu is working full day. He knows ~~that~~ other poor people's life.

Ali Ağaoğlu spoke to the magazine and He said that "This life is very difficult. I am very sad. I don't know that I live in there" ~~the~~ most people was sad of this event. People want to authoritys to help him.

# ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Adı-Soyadı : MİHRİ KAYNAK

Yabancı Dil : İNGİLİZCE

Doğum Yeri ve Yılı : MERSİN/1986

E-Posta : mihrikaynakmk@gmail.com

Eğitim ve Mesleki Geçmişi:

- 2008-2017, Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi, Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı
- 2004-2008, Gazi Üniversitesi, İngilizce Öğretmenliği Lisans Programı
- 13.03.2017-halen çalışmakta, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Okutman
- 02.01.2009-09.03.2017, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Okutman

Yayınları ve Bilimsel/Sanatsal Faaliyetleri:

- 2015, Yazılı Bildiri ve Sözlü Sunum, Dinleme ve Okuma Becerilerini Geliştirmek için Edmodo Platformunun İngilizce Laboratuvar Derslerinde ve Sınıflarda Kullanılması, Madrid, İspanya
- 2014, Yazılı Bildiri ve Sözlü Sunum, Dünya Çapında Ağ (www), Bir Yaşam Boyu Öğrenme Aracı Olarak Kullanılabilir mi, Oxford, Birleşik Krallık
- 2012, Yazılı Bildiri ve Sözlü Sunum, Nezaket Okulda mı Öğrenilir Yoksa Sosyal Çevrede mi Şekillenir? Türkiye' de Nezaket(sizlik) Üzerine Bir Araştırma, Londra, Birleşik Krallık
- 2010, Yazili Bildiri ve Sözlü Sunum, İngilizce Konuşma Dersi Esnasında Öğrencilerinin Yaşadığı Kaygı Sorununu Çözmeye Yönelik Bir Eylem Araştırması, Gazimagosa, Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti