

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
(GRADUATE PROGRAMME)**

**THE EFFECTS OF PEER FEEDBACK ON THE EFL STUDENTS'
WRITING PERFORMANCE AND WRITING ANXIETY AT
ADAMA UNIVERSITY**

TEMESGEN CHIBSA

FEBRUARY 2008

**THE EFFECTS OF PEER FEEDBACK ON THE EFL STUDENTS'
WRITING PERFORMANCE AND WRITING ANXIETY AT
ADAMA UNIVERSITY**

BY TEMESGEN CHIBSA

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
AND LITERATURE (GRADUATE PROGRAMME) IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS (MA) IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS
A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TEFL)**

FEBRUARY 2008

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
(GRADUATE PROGRAMME)**

**THE EFFECTS OF PEER FEEDBACK ON THE EFL STUDENTS'
WRITING PERFORMANCE AND WRITING ANXIETY AT
ADAMA UNIVERSITY**

BY TEMESGEN CHIBSSA

Approved by Examining Board:

Advisor

Signature

Examiner

Examiner

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to forward my sincere appreciation and gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Mekasha Kassaye, for his inspiring comments which helped me to shape and reshape the paper. It is his skilful guidance and insights that enabled me to bring the study to its present form.

My thanks go to Dr. Yuh-Show Cheng for sending me an article related to this study. I am also thankful to my brothers Fekadu Chali and Damtew Chali for their encouragement throughout the study, Ato Teshome Emana and Ato Anteneh Tsegaye for the constructive comments they rendered me regarding the study. I would like to thank Ato Sileshi Kashahun for his moral and material support, and Ato Fikru Haddis for his assistance in the statistical aspect of the study.

I am equally grateful to language instructors and students at Adama University for their help in the study in one way or another. I would also like to thank the School of Graduate Studies, Addis Ababa University, for financial support, and ILS community in general for their support in times of my need.

Finally, I would like to thank W/t Haymanot Tekalign and W/t Rahel Tekalign for their careful typing and printing of the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements -----	i
List of Appendices -----	v
List of Tables -----	vi
List of Abbreviations -----	vii
Abstract-----	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION-----	1
1.1 Background to the Study -----	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem-----	3
1.3 Objective of the Study -----	5
1.4 Significance of the Study-----	5
1.5 Scope of the Study -----	6
1.6 Limitations-----	6
1.7 Definition of Important Terms -----	6
1.8 Organisation of the Study -----	7
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE-----	8
2.1 Collaboration in Language Learning -----	8
2.2 The Writing Skills -----	9
2.3 Writing Anxiety-----	10
2.3.1 Measuring Second Language Writing Anxiety-----	11
2.4 Approaches to Teaching Writing -----	12
2.4.1 The Product Approach -----	12
2.4.2 The Process Approach -----	12
2.4.2.1 Activities in the Process Approach-----	13
2.5 Feedback on EFL Students' Writing -----	14
2.5.1 Sources of Feedback on EFL Students' Writing -----	15
2.5.1.1 Teacher Feedback -----	15
2.5.1.2 Self-feedback-----	17
2.5.1.3 Peer Feedback-----	18

2.5.1.3.1 Advantages of Peer Feedback	19
2.5.1.3.2 Some Limitations to Peer Feedback	20
2.5.1.3.3 Training Students to Give and Receive Peer Feedback	21
2.6 Research on Peer Feedback	22
2.6.1 Foreign Research Works	22
2.6.2 Local Research Works	24
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODS	27
3.1 Design of the Study	27
3.1.1 Setting and Subjects	27
3.1.2 Instruments	28
3.1.2.1 Text Analysis	28
3.1.2.2 Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory	30
3.1.2.3 Questionnaire	30
3.1.2.4 Interview	31
3.2 Procedure	31
3.2.1 Rationale and Procedure of Categorizing Students into Experimental and Control Group	31
3.2.2 Training Students to Participate in Peer Feedback	32
3.2.3 The Peer Feedback Phase	33
3.2.4 Topic Selection and Text Production	33
3.2.5 Comparing the Writing Performance of the Control and the Experimental Group	34
3.2.6 Comparing the Writing Anxiety of the Control and the Experimental Group	34
3.2.7 Comparing the Writing Features Performance of the Control and the Experimental Group	34
3.2.8 The Writing Features Students Focused on in Peer Feedback	34
3.2.9 Amount of the Peer Comments Incorporated into the Rewritten Texts	35
3.2.10 Procedures of the Questionnaire Analysis	35
3.2.11 Procedures of the Interview Analysis	35

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSES, FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS -----	36
4.1 Analysis of Students' Writing Performance and Writing Anxiety at the Beginning of the Study -----	36
4.1.1 Students' Writing Performance at the Beginning of the Study -----	36
4.1.2 Students' Writing Features Performance at the Beginning of the Study -----	37
4.1.3 Students' Writing Anxiety at the Beginning of the Study -----	38
4.2 Analysis of Students' Writing Performance and Writing Anxiety after the Training-----	40
4.2.1 Nature of the Students in Giving and Receiving Peer Feedback-----	40
4.2.1.1 Writing Features Students Focused on in Giving and Receiving comments-----	40
4.2.1.2 Peer Comments Used in Writing the Final Text in Relation to the Comments Given-----	42
4.2.2 The Control and the Experimental Groups' Writing Features Performance after the Training -----	43
4.2.3 The Control and the Experimental Groups' Overall Writing Performance and Writing Anxiety after the Training -----	45
4.2.3.1 Students' Overall Writing Performance after the Training -----	45
4.2.3.2 Students' Writing Anxiety after the Training -----	46
4.3 Students' Perceptions towards the Practice of Peer Feedback on Writing -----	48
4.3.1 Analysis of the Questionnaire-----	48
4.3.1.1 Importance of Peer Feedback for Students' Writing in General -----	48
4.3.1.2 Quality and Type of Peer Comments Given and Used-----	49
4.3.1.3 Affective Benefits of Peer Feedback -----	50
4.3.2 Analysis of the Interview -----	52
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS -----	55
5.1 Summary-----	55
5.2 Conclusions -----	56
5.3 Recommendations -----	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY -----	59

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Guidelines for Peer Feedback Practice -----	65
Appendix B: Peer Evaluation Feedback Criteria -----	66
Appendix C: Peer Feedback Checklist -----	67
Appendix D: Topics for Paragraph Writing -----	68
Appendix E: Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory -----	69
Appendix F: Analytic Scale Marking -----	71
Appendix G: Pre-training Writing Results of the Two Groups -----	72
Appendix H: Pre-training Writing Anxiety Inventory Results of the Two Groups -----	76
Appendix I: Post-training Writing Results of the Two Groups -----	78
Appendix J: Post-training Writing Anxiety Inventory Results of the Two Groups -----	84
Appendix K: Questionnaire for the Experimental Group Students -----	86
Appendix L: Interview Questions for the Experimental Group Students -----	87
Appendix M: Transcription of the Interview -----	88
Appendix N: Sample Peer Comments -----	92
Appendix O: Sample Marked Text -----	93
Appendix P: Statistical t-table -----	94

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1: Comparison of Group 1 and Group 2 Students' Writing Performance Mean Scores at the Beginning of the Study-----	37
Table 4.2: Comparison of Group 1 and Group 2 Students' Writing Features Performance Mean Scores at the Beginning of the Study -----	38
Table 4.3: Comparison of Group 1 and Group 2 Students' Writing Anxiety Inventory Mean Scores at the Beginning of the Study. -----	39
Table 4.4: Writing Features Students Focused on when Giving Peer Feedback and the Amount of these Comments Used in Rewriting -----	41
Table 4.5: Comparison of the Total Number of Peer Comments Given and the Peer Comments Used on each Writing Feature -----	42
Table 4.6: Comparison of the Control and the Experimental Groups' Writing Features Performance after the Training -----	44
Table 4.7: Control and Experimental Group Students' Writing Performance Mean Scores after the Training -----	45
Table 4.8: Comparison of the Post-training Writing Mean Scores of the Control and the Experimental Group -----	46
Table 4.9: Comparison of the Post-training Writing Anxiety Inventory Mean Scores of the Control and the Experimental Group -----	47
Table 4.10: Students' Perceptions on the Importance of Peer Feedback to their Writing in General -----	48
Table 4.11: Students' Perceptions towards the Quality and Types of Comments Given and Used -----	49
Table 4.12: Students' Perceptions towards the Affective Benefits of Peer Feedback -----	51

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Con. =	Content
Org. =	Organisation
Coh. =	Cohesion
Voc. =	Vocabulary
Gr. =	Grammar
Mec. =	Mechanics
Sp. =	Spelling
L ₁ =	First language
L ₂ =	Second language
SLWAI =	Second language writing anxiety inventory
LOC =	Low order concerns
HOC =	High order concerns
SD =	Standard deviation
df =	Degrees of freedom
Contr. =	Control group
Exp. =	Experimental group

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study was to investigate whether peer feedback had any effect on the writing performance and writing anxiety of EFL students of Adama University. The writing features peer feedback could address and the perceptions of the students about peer feedback were also investigated.

The subjects of the study were divided into the control and the experimental group. At the beginning of the study, the students were made to write texts without any feedback. They also rated their writing anxiety using Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI). Then, the experimental group was given training in giving and receiving peer feedback for five weeks, and then, wrote three paragraphs within two weeks. The control group, on the other hand, wrote the same texts within the same period of time without peer feedback. Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory was used to investigate the difference in the level of writing anxiety between the two groups before and after the peer feedback training. To investigate students' perceptions towards peer feedback, questionnaire and interview were used with the experimental group.

The analysis of the students' written texts showed no significant difference in the overall writing performance between the experimental and control group students. However, there was a significant difference between these groups in the low order features of writing (mechanics, spelling and grammar). The SLWAI analysis showed that the experimental group students experienced significantly less writing anxiety than the control group. The results of the questionnaire and interview revealed that the students had positive attitude towards the practice of peer feedback.

Based on the findings, it was suggested that peer feedback should be used primarily to encourage students to rewrite their texts in learning writing. Writing teachers should also use peer feedback in helping students to improve their writing in the areas of spelling, mechanics and grammar. Teachers are also advised to use this feedback to deal with students' writing anxiety in writing. Finally, as this study is limited to one university and short period of time, it appears to be difficult to draw generalizations about the findings of the study. Hence, further research is highly recommended to further investigate the area.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Researchers in language learning have come up with different theories regarding how language is learnt. So far, there is no consensus among scholars on how a language particularly a second or foreign language is best learnt. Researchers in second language learning have differing views in learning a second or foreign language. Some view language as a social phenomena, and is learnt in social interactions. Yet, others hold the position that language learning is an individual process.

For social interactionists, as Williams and Burden (1997) state, children are born into a social world, and learning occurs through interaction with other people. This interactionist view of language learning goes with Vygotsky's theory, zone of proximal development. According to Vygotsky (1962), cited in Foley and Thompson (2003: 61), what a child can do in collaboration today, he/she can do alone tomorrow. Vygotsky's theory of zone of proximal development is not a stage confined to a child. The theory is evident at every stage of human development when a person is moving from not knowing through a learning phase with the support of external agencies, people or other learning supports (ibid). It could be applied in learning situations by encouraging those who take part in the learning to interact. This view of learning emphasizes the role played by adults, competent peers and experienced others in learning.

One area in which the social interactionist view can be applied in learning is through peer response in writing. Hansen and Liu (2005: 31), explain a more elaborative justification for the use of peer response relating to four theoretical stances: process writing, collaborative learning, Vygotskian learning theory and interactionist theories of L₂ acquisition. Zamel (1985) states that peer response is seen as an important support for the drafting and redrafting of process approaches to writing. Collaborative learning theory encourages students to 'pool' their resources to complete tasks they could not do on their own, learning through dialogue and interaction with their peers (Hirvela 1999 cited in Hyland and Hyland 2006: 90). Vygotskian approaches also underline the importance of social interaction with peers as the result of which writing skills can emerge with the mediation and help of others. The interactionist perspective offer an important theoretical foundation for peer feedback by suggesting how opportunities to negotiate meaning

through group work are a means of encouraging more effective acquisition of the language (Long and Porter 1985, cited in Hyland and Hyland 2006: 90).

The use of peer feedback is, thus, supported by the literature in improving the learning process of students. This suggests the need to encourage students to interact with their peers and others in language learning so that the learning process would continue effectively. Particularly, in teaching writing skills learners should not be left alone just to come up with the final product of their writing. Doing so, it could be argued, increases their writing anxiety.

It is obvious that language is meant for social interaction and it sounds logical if its learning and teaching is approached based on this premise. This can be applied to all language skills including writing, one of the important skills in our daily activities in this modern time. Particularly, it secures a significant position in all students' academic performances in higher level of education. It is through writing that students, in most cases, demonstrate how much they have learnt. That is why it is offered as a common course in Ethiopian higher education system. This again implies that students should practise this skill so that they would be able to portray their performance in academic and everyday lives through this medium. Above all, students majoring in English language are expected to have good skills of the language for they would be in a position of cultivating others to make them experts in the language.

Necessitated by the need of qualified technicians in different disciplines, the Ethiopian government established a technical college in 1993 by the name Nazareth Technical College. The major focus of the college was in technical fields. This time English was offered to students as a common course. The courses in English were aimed at developing students' English language skills particularly writing skills. The courses were Freshman English, Sophomore English and Technical Report Writing. Later, the college became teachers' college maintaining its focus in technical aspects and adding vocational education, but now producing technical and vocational teachers. Still English maintained its original status: common course.

With the advent of the new education and training policy in our country, freshman courses were supposed to be offered in preparatory classes. This reduced the number of freshman courses. The

policy also resulted in the expansion of education including higher education in the country. This opened a good opportunity to promote the college to the level of a university, and the college gave rise to the now Adama University in 2006. It was after this promotion that the university opened different faculties and departments. English Department is one of the departments under the Faculty of Social Science and Language Education. Fifty students were enrolled in this department in 2006/7 academic year to major in English. Sophomore English is one of the courses in writing offered to these students and to other students. The objectives of this course are to enable students to construct a variety of sentences effectively, compose well-organised paragraphs, write effective essays and edit written texts.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The ability to write well is one of the essential qualities in the world of academics and other concerns of life. Yet, writing is a difficult skill to master because of the different factors pertaining to it. Scholars raise these factors as linguistic, psychological and cognitive aspects (Byrne 1988 and Heaton 1988). All these have the potential of causing writing anxiety to students and resulting in their low performance in writing.

On top of these inherent factors, the practice of teaching and learning writing seems to be under question in our context. This could be well perceived from the low-level performance of students in writing as indicated by some studies in our country (Yonas 1996; Geremew 1999 and Solomon 2001). In this regard, students of Adama University are no different. The situation could not be better with these students, presumably, because the institution had been a technical college focusing mainly on training technical and vocational teachers rather than teaching English. So, the focus devoted to this subject has been limited and as a result, the methodology used in teaching writing seems to be questionable.

Though theoretically well established, the process approach to writing is not sufficiently practised in our context as the study by Yonas (1996) reveals. This in turn implies that the feedback students get on their writing is not adequate to encourage them to practice writing. Teacher feedback in a writing class appears to be the dominant one (Getnet 1993 and Tesfaye 1995), and even this feedback comes to students with marks and some comments after some delays. This

affects students' opportunity to improve their written work in at least three ways. First, after the mark is assigned, it is less likely that students would rewrite their work; second, since the papers are returned after some delays students cannot remember well what they have written. Thirdly, teachers' response to students' first drafts as if it were the final one may make students develop fear towards the skill.

This obviously results and has resulted in the low writing performance of students (Tesfaye 1995; Yonas 1996 and Italo 1999) as writing cannot be improved in a single draft. Arguably, the poor quality of students' written work could be attributed to, among many others, the way students' written work is treated. For instance, my experience in teaching at Adama University has also helped me to realise the fact that teachers tend to assign students with writing tasks and they do not seem to give comments that encourage students to rewrite their drafts. What is well established is responding to the first draft written by students just as the final one (usually coming back with some comments and marks assigned). This goes well with what Zamel (1985) criticizes teachers for responding to students' first draft as a final one. It can be argued that students are simply expected to receive the comments and the marks passively.

All these problems added up call for the need to explore other more interactive ways that encourage students to rewrite their first drafts so that they would improve their writing skills and lower their writing anxiety. It seems quite reasonable for scholars to suggest that students could be of much help to one another in improving their writing performance (Grabe and Kaplan 1996; Hess 2001; Rollinson 2005) and lowering their writing anxiety (Kurt and Atay 2007). In the process of writing, if students are given some form of training and guidance on how to give constructive comments on each other's written work, their writing performance could be enhanced and their writing anxiety could be lowered to an optimal level. Students can learn a lot from each other through interaction in the process of giving and receiving feedback on each other's writing. This technique does not seem to be in use in providing feedback on students' written work as one form of feedback in our context.

This study is, therefore, concerned with an investigation of the effects of using peer feedback on EFL students' writing performance and writing anxiety at Adama University as an attempt to fill

the stated gaps. To this end, the following null and alternative hypotheses for both writing performance and writing anxiety were formulated to be verified at the end of the study. These are:

H₀: There is no significant difference in the writing performance mean scores between students who write with peer feedback and those who write without such treatment.

H₁: There is a significant difference in the writing performance mean scores between students who write with peer feedback and those who write without getting such treatment.

H₀: There is no significant difference in the writing anxiety mean scores between students who write under peer feedback treatment and those who write without such treatment.

H₁: There is a significant difference in the writing anxiety mean scores between students who write under the treatment of peer feedback and those who write without such treatment.

1.3 Objective of the Study

The general objective of the study is to investigate the effects of using peer feedback on EFL students' writing performance and writing anxiety at Adama University. To meet this objective, the following research questions were set and answered in the study.

1. Is there any significant difference in the writing performance between students who are treated with peer feedback and those who are not provided with such feedback?
2. Is there any significant difference in the writing anxiety between students who are treated with peer feedback and those who are not provided with such treatment?
3. What writing feature(s) can be improved as a result of peer feedback?
4. What are the perceptions of students towards the practice of peer feedback in writing?

1.4 Significance of the Study

The study is concerned with the effects of peer feedback on students' writing performance and writing anxiety. The results of the study may benefit:

1. teachers to think of other ways of responding to students' writing including peer feedback, and to deal with students' writing anxiety using peer feedback,

2. teachers by lessening their work load by having students to give comments to each other's writing on the first drafts,
3. material writers to think of incorporating a room that allows the use of peer feedback in learning writing skills, and
4. other researchers who want to investigate more on the area.

1.5 Scope of the Study

This study attempts to see the role of using peer feedback in an EFL writing class at Adama University. It is delimited to written peer feedback on students writing and their writing anxiety. As peer feedback is thought to address students' writing performance and writing anxiety, the study is devoted to investigate the role of peer feedback on these constructs. The texts students produced were delimited to writing paragraphs. It is also restricted to thirty-five students of EFL students at Adama University.

1.6 Limitations

Time constraint was the major limitation of this study. By its nature, since the study required a lot of time, I had to add one more semester to finalize it. Since the sample and the time of the study are limited, it could be difficult to draw generalizations about the findings.

1.7 Definition of Important Terms

The following terms are used in the context of the research as defined below.

1. *Effect*: the change in writing performance and writing anxiety of students as a result of using peer feedback.
2. *Peer*: students of the same class level learning in the same classroom.
3. *Peer feedback*: the written comments given by peers, being in pairs or three, to one another in the process of writing.
4. *Writing performance*: the ability students portray in using the skills of writing in producing texts.
5. *Writing anxiety*: the fear of the writing process that overweighs the projected gain from the ability to write (Thompson 1980, cited in Kurt and Atay 2006).

1.8 Organisation of the Study

The thesis is organised into five chapters. The first chapter discusses the background, the problem, the objective and the significance of the study. In this chapter, delimitations and limitations of the study, definition of terms and organisation of the study are also incorporated. In the second chapter, important areas of related literature including foreign and local research works are reviewed.

The third chapter deals with the methodology of the study. In this part the subjects, the instruments, and the procedures employed are discussed. The fourth chapter is concerned with the data analyses, discussions and findings. The last chapter presents the summary, conclusions and recommendations. Finally, lists of bibliography and appendices are included.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter deals with the discussion of some of the related literature. The first section discusses the significance of collaboration and interaction in language learning as a premise for using peer feedback on writing. The second and the third sections deal with the brief overview of writing and writing anxiety. In the fourth section, the approaches to teaching writing are discussed. The fifth section presents feedback on EFL students' writing focusing on peer feedback. In the last section, related studies on peer feedback are reviewed.

2.1 Collaboration in Language Learning

Language is a social phenomena and it is learnt when there is interaction among learners. The social interactionist view of learning emphasizes the dynamic nature of the interplay between teachers, learners and tasks, and provides a view of learning arising from interactions with others (Williams and Burden 1997: 4). According to this view, learning never takes place in isolation. This necessitates the need to encourage interactions among the stakeholders of the learning process.

Noting the importance of co-operation in learning, Nunan (1992: 34) writes that co-operative learning can foster learner growth in terms of both academic achievement, personal growth and the development of social and learning skills. This approach of learning holds true for teaching and learning the writing skill. Learners should interact, negotiate and co-operate in the process of writing. Nunan (1992: 100) underlines that in the real world contexts, writing is not a solitary enterprise; it is a social act. Based on this fact, Nunan argues that the pedagogical activity of writing should be similar to that of the real world. He further explains that if we want to ensure our ESL writing classes prepare students for their life outside the classroom, we must give them opportunities to experience collaborative writing.

However, one could think that an individual produces a text by him/herself, without interacting with others. True indeed, writing is an independent activity; that is when seen in the light of professional writers. In learning to write, students produce their first draft independently, and then reading and commenting would facilitate the learning of the skill as the above scholars

claim. In line with this, learners can be of much help to one another in the improvement of their writing skills if they co-operate in the process of writing. One form in which students can co-operate is by reading each other's drafts and giving comments. Now, let us briefly deal with the nature of writing, writing anxiety and the different approaches to teaching the writing skills.

2.2 The Writing Skills

Writing is a process of encoding (putting messages into words) with a reader in mind (Byrne 1988: 183). Similarly, McDonough and Shaw (1993: 182) consider writing as primarily message-oriented, so a communicative view of language is a necessary foundation. These scholars indicate that writing is a meaning-laden process that should be addressed to readers. Writing is also a means of exploration and discovery, and today, more than ever, being able to write well is a vital skill: people all over the world communicate, exchange information, and conduct business instantaneously across cyberspace (Kelly and Lawton 1998). These are some of the reasons we want to master the skill of writing and help learners to master it.

Nevertheless, its mastery is not as easy as we might think because of its nature and different factors pertaining to it. As Grabe and Kaplan (1996: 5) contend, unlike that of speaking, writing is only learnt. From this, we recognise that learning to write is subject to formal instruction as opposed to speaking which has more chance than writing out of the formal learning situation. Writing is also technology, a set of skills which must be practised through experience (Ibid).

Other scholars (Byrne 1988; Hedge 1988 and Heaton 1988) attribute the difficult nature of writing to three factors: cognitive, linguistic and psychological. With regard to the cognitive aspect, writers are expected to think and process what they want to put down on paper because writing requires much more care and thinking than speaking as the audience is not present at the time of writing like that of speaking. The linguistic factor is related to the need to consider the accuracy of the linguistic elements in the writing activity. The psychological factor is concerned with the production of writing solitarily which may cause anxiety. Thus, compared to speaking, writing requires much more care, patience, skill and co-operation in its learning. Hedge (1988: 5), for instance, explains that effective writing requires a number of things: a high degree of organisation in the development of ideas, a high degree of accuracy to avoid ambiguity, the use

of complex grammatical devices for focus and emphasis, a careful choice of vocabulary, etc. It is in addressing these problems that scholars are much concerned with the need for much practice in its learning.

2.3 Writing Anxiety

Anxiety is a psychological effect that causes fear or stress thereby hindering the performance of individuals in different activities. Among the different types of anxiety, writing anxiety is defined by scholars like Thompson (1980), cited in Kurt and Atay (2006), as a fear of the writing process that overweighs the projected gain from the ability to write. They further explain, quoting Tusi (1996), that learning to write in the foreign language involves as much anxiety as learning the other skills because writing is predominantly product-oriented, and it requires individual work, i.e., students feel that they are deprived of help, support and encouragement. Hence, writing anxiety is considered as one of the factors that affect students writing performance. This debilitating effect of anxiety has to be overcome in order for EFL students to be successful in their writing achievement. The argument behind making writing interactive is, therefore, to minimize the debilitating effect of writing anxiety.

There are considerable literatures on the effect of peer feedback on EFL students writing anxiety. For example, Mendonca and Johnson (1994) state that peer feedback has social, cognitive, affective and methodological benefits. Kurt and Atay (2006) indicate that peer feedback increases motivation and self-confidence. They also argue that since student reviewers soon perceive that other students experience the same difficulties in writing that they do, peer feedback also leads to a reduction in writer apprehension and an increase in writer confidence (Kurt and Atay 2007: 14). In support of the above arguments, Norrish (1992: 21) writes that peer comment is less threatening than teacher feedback. Hence, peer feedback has an affective benefit in addition to the other benefits in the process of writing.

As stated by these scholars, peer feedback has a potential effect to reduce writing anxiety, it follows that there is a relationship between writing performance and writing anxiety. Cheng (2004: 314) writes, citing Aida (1994) and Horwitz (1986), that there is a consistent negative association of second language anxiety with students' academic achievement. Nevertheless, some

scholars argue that anxiety is not always negative (Scovel 1978; MacyIntyre and Gardner 1989). For instance, MacyIntyre and Gardner refer to anxiety as facilitating and debilitating. According to them, facilitating anxiety aids learners' performance, while debilitating anxiety limits it. A sound argument is still the fact that anxiety results in negative performance when it overwhelms the person. So, it should be kept to the level that produces positive results in students' performance.

2.3.1 Measuring Second Language Writing Anxiety

Different scholars at different times have attempted to measure students' writing anxiety level. Nonetheless, as anxiety is a complex construct, there appears to be barely an accurate measure for it, particularly in the context of foreign language like English. Yet, the work of Cheng (2004) is worth mentioning. In her study to develop a scale of second language writing anxiety, she attempted to put the context of second or foreign language context into consideration that was ignored in earlier similar works.

As Cheng (2004) reports, the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Test (WAT) (Daly and Miller 1975) was the most commonly used measurement instrument of second language writing anxiety. Discovering the fact that Daly-Miller WAT was originally developed with reference to first language learners, particularly English native speakers, Cheng developed writing anxiety measure that takes into account the context of second or foreign language students. In this second language writing anxiety measure, students self-report about their anxiety in writing on a five-point-Likert scale. This scale is known as Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI), and this scale is employed in this study to measure students' writing anxiety.

In studying about anxiety, Cheng (ibid) explains anxiety as a multidimensional construct. She has adopted Lang's (1971) tripartite framework into her development of Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory. Anxiety in the tripartite model is understood as consisting of three different and relatively independent components: cognitive anxiety (worry preoccupation and negative expectation), somatic anxiety (upset stomach, pounding heart, excessive sweating and numbness) and behavioural anxiety (procrastination, withdrawal and avoidance). Based on the tripartite view of anxiety, Cheng (2004) defines second or foreign language writing anxiety as a relatively stable

anxiety disposition associated with second language writing, which involves a variety of dysfunctional thoughts, increased physiological arousal and maladaptive behaviours.

2.4 Approaches to Teaching Writing

There are different approaches to teaching writing in the literature. For the purpose of the present study, the two major approaches, the focus being on the process approach, are reviewed below.

2.4.1 The Product Approach

It is obvious that we write to produce a text for a given purpose. The concern of the product-oriented approach is this final outcome. As Raimes (1983), Hedge (1988), Kaplan and Grabe (1996) and Jordan (1997) state, this approach to writing is to look at instances of writing and to analyse the features of written texts; the focus is the text that the students produce and it is expected to be correct in the needed skills of writing. Relating to this, Leki (1994: 170) notes that traditionally, when students write in a second language, the purpose of the writing activity is to catch grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.

This approach focuses on the end result of the composition process, the product of writing. Viewed in this way, writing is assumed an activity that starts at one point and ends up at a certain point in a linear fashion. What students produce is much appreciated disguising the ups and downs in the writing process. This approach to writing appears to simplify the nature of writing ignoring the needed practice in writing. As a result, the approach has not helped students in developing the writing skills because, as Leki (1994: 171) observes, it makes students much obsessed to avoid errors and write very cautiously and conservatively. These arguments have challenged the product approach and necessitated the change of view towards the process-oriented approach. Hedge (1988: 19) characterizes this change as the shift from students' writing to the student writer, preferring the process-oriented approach.

2.4.2 The Process Approach

Nowadays, there is a relative consensus among writing scholars that writing is by its nature a process in which a number of operations go on simultaneously (Hedge 1988; White and Arndt 1991; McDonough and Shaw 1993; Hedge 2000). White and Arndt (1991: 89) explain the

process approach to writing as one that takes apprentice writers through the various stages when producing a piece of written work. McDonough and Shaw (1993: 189) remark the usefulness of intervention at all stages of writing, not just at the end in the process of writing.

From these, it is possible to see that the focus is on the means in the process of writing, not just to be obsessed with the final product. The argument for the process approach is that if the stages that are considered in the writing process are well addressed, the product will take care of itself. Regarding this, Rivers (1981: 89) states that in the process approach, you look at how to generate ideas, how to organise them, how to express them, how to draft, etc.

2.4.2.1 Activities in the Process Approach

The process approach to writing is composed of a number of activities beginning with the planning to the end of the writing activity. Yet, the process of composing is not in a linear fashion which moves from planning to the final editing. It would be more appropriate to characterize writing as a recursive activity in which the writer moves backwards and forwards between drafting and revising, with stages of re-planning in between (Hedge 1988; Byrne 1988; White and Arndt 1991). In general, drafting and revising are indispensable stages in the production of a piece of written work as Hyland (1990: 279) contends.

Hedge (1988: 21) describes the process of writing as consisting of three major activities or group of activities. These are pre-writing, writing, rewriting and editing. In the pre-writing phase, the writer considers two important issues: determining the purpose of writing (function) and deciding for who the writing is for (audience). In the writing phase, the first draft is made after some brainstorming activities. Good writers tend to concentrate on getting the content right first, and leave details like correcting spelling, punctuation, and grammar until later. In the rewriting phase, revision is done to assess what has already been written and decide on clarity, completeness of information, coherence, etc. The editing stage is the final activity and consists of reading through and trying to make the final readjustments.

In the writing process, as stated earlier, there are many activities in a recursive manner. In spite of this, writing scholars make a distinction between revising and editing and argue for giving

priority to revision relegating editing to the final process (Raimes 1983; Hedge 1988; Celce-Murcia 1991; Murray 1995). Celce-Murcia (1991: 260) poses an argument that editing should be an activity that is probably best attended to when a text is considered complete in terms of having been shaped by content, organisation, attention to the needs of the reader, and a consideration of its purpose. A further argument comes from Murray (1995: 183) who remarks the importance of dealing with revision first and putting the editing process last. He explains:

At each stage of the revision process, the evolving draft reveals the meaning in increasing dimension. We write to discover what we have to say. At the last stage of the process, we edit to refine what we have to say. We edit more to communicate than to explore.

Feedback on writing is not as fruitful as the theory underscores because of the focus and nature of the feedback. Teacher feedback, for example, is challenged for focusing on surface features than content (Zamel 1985).

All these arguments emphasize the necessity of dealing with, to use Keh's (1990: 296) terms, higher order concerns (HOCs) such as the development of ideas, organisation first, and finally dealing with 'low order concerns' (LOCs), i.e. surface errors (grammar, punctuation, capitalization and spelling). It is, thus, argued that students should be first helped with addressing the higher order concerns and finally the low order concerns in learning the writing skills.

2.5 Feedback on EFL Students' Writing

Feedback is an expected and an important activity in a given performance. Particularly, in language teaching and learning it is used to facilitate the process (Hyland 1990; Richards and Lockhart 1994; Ur 1996). Ur (1996: 242) defines feedback in the context of teaching in general as information that is given to the learner about his or her performance of learning task, usually with the objective of improving this performance. As Keh (1990: 294) also asserts, feedback is a fundamental element of a process approach to writing. She defines feedback in the context of writing as an input from a reader with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision.

Explaining the role of feedback in language teaching, Richards and Lockhart (1994: 188) write:

Providing feedback to learners on their performance is an important aspect of teaching. Feedback may serve not only to let learners know how well they have performed but also to increase motivation and build a supportive classroom climate.

Similarly, Hyland and Hyland (2006: 83) explain the role of feedback in writing in relation to the process approach to writing. They write that feedback has long been regarded as essential for the development of second language writing skills, both for its potential for learning and for student motivation. As part of the writing process, there is a shift of view in feedback. Explaining this, Hyland and Hyland (ibid) state that over the past twenty years, changes in writing pedagogy and insights gained from research studies have transformed feedback practices, with teacher comments now often combined with peer feedback, writing workshops, oral conferences, or computer-delivered feedback. As these scholars note, this has led to the replacement of summative feedback (product focus) by formative feedback which points forward to the students' future writing and the development of his or her writing process.

2.5.1 Sources of Feedback on EFL Students' Writing

Feedback is widely seen as crucial for encouraging and consolidating learning. Writing scholars agree that feedback to students' writing could come from three main sources: the teacher, the peers and the student writer (Harmer 1991; Celce-Murcia 1991; McDonough and Shaw 1993; Jordan 1997). Keh (1990: 295), on the other hand, writes that there are three areas of feedback: peer feedback, conferencing as feedback and teacher's comments as feedback. The self-correction is just looking again at one's written work and correcting errors; it is not considered as giving information to others. Now, let us briefly revise the three most common types of sources of information for treating students' writing: Teacher feedback, Self-feedback and Peer feedback.

2.5.1.1 Teacher Feedback

Teacher feedback on students' written work appears to be the most common and the most predominant one. Studies also show that students incline towards teacher feedback as a reliable source of information on their writing. Zhang's (1995) study shows that students prefer teacher feedback to peer feedback. In spite of this, according to Grabe and Kaplan (1996: 358), teacher

feedback is often seen as a more traditional overall format. They proceed to contend that until the emergence of the process movement in writing instruction, much feedback to students on their writing appears in the form of a final grade on a paper, often accompanied by much red ink throughout the essay (Grabe and Kaplan 1996: 388). A more strong criticism on the traditional form of teacher feedback comes from Berkow (2002: 195). He argues that in a common model of teaching the students give an essay to the instructor, the instructor puts red marks on it; the essay is handed back, and nobody ever reads it again. The student does not develop much a sense of audience.

As Keh (1990: 301) also puts, most teachers of writing will agree that making comments on students' papers causes the most frustration and usually takes the most time. She adds that teachers worry whether their comments will be understood, produce the desired results, or even be read. In addressing the ineffective and inefficient comments by the teacher, Keh suggests first to respond as a concerned reader to a writer— as a person, not as grammarian or grade giver. She also suggests that limiting comments according to fundamental problems is much helpful rather than commenting on all areas of problems in the students' writing. Dheram (1995) also reflects a similar argument regarding how teacher feedback should be used. He remarks that the teacher has to step out of evaluating the learner's first draft as if it were the final product and assume the role of a consultant facilitating the learner's step-by-step creation of a text.

Owing to the drawbacks, the view towards teacher feedback is now assuming a different position from what it used to be. Hedge (2000: 313) observes that many teachers now hold the view that the traditional procedure of taking work in, marking it and returning it to students when the writing experience is no longer fresh in their minds has serious disadvantages. She suggests alternative methods such as conferencing, and reformulating to give comments. This shows us that a more immediate and active involvement of learners in the revising process is much valued.

According to Celce-Murcia (1991: 256) teachers must make concerns of the number of drafts for any given text that they want students to produce. This assertion is supported by Ur (1996: 172) who writes that teachers in a process approach to writing are not supposed to go for correcting students' errors, but rather help students to write and rewrite their drafts using feedback from

different sources. This can be done by other students complementing the teacher feedback, as Leki (1994: 177) notes. She explains that very often the teacher is not the only one to respond or evaluate students' texts; now students are also involved in responding to writing.

In general, as Ur (1996: 257) suggests, teachers need to develop or adopt responding methodologies which can foster improvement in students writing. This can address, as Zamel (1985) argues, the traditional, undoubtedly time consuming, surface level- focused and untimely method of responding to students writing.

2.5.1.2 Self-feedback

There is an argument that the writer himself/herself can provide information to improve his or her writing. Reflecting on the role of self-evaluation in which students can make their own revisions and improve their writing significantly, Hyland and Hyland (2006: 92) write that it is not appropriate to overlook the writers as critical readers and reviewers of their own texts. They also contend, quoting Brinko (1993), that feedback is more effective when information is gathered from the subjects themselves as well as others. Yet, other scholars do not rely on self-evaluation claiming the need to have feedback from other sources. In either way, any form of feedback should be in such a way that it moves the students to a more independent role where they can critically evaluate and correct their own writing.

Edge (1989: 51) underlining the need to give the first chance to the student to self-correct, points out that for self-correction to work, we have to give a little time at the beginning of a lesson for students to look at their marked work and try to correct any mistakes. What she emphasises here is that feedback from other sources should promote self-correction. Makino (1993: 338) also argues saying, "In the process of language learning, learners sometimes notice some of their errors by themselves, through the strategy of monitoring, and they can also correct some of their errors when other people such as teachers or peers, give them cues or hints about them".

The point being underlined is that other feedback types should be given to the student writer in a way that promotes self-correction. This feedback can be from the writer, the teacher and/or other students.

2.5.1.3 Peer Feedback

The other source of feedback which is now seen as the state of the art on students' writing is the feedback that comes from other students. Hansen and Liu (2002: 1) define peer feedback as the use of learners as sources of information and interactants for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities in commenting and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing.

Many writing scholars are in favour using peer feedback in students' writing (Keh 1990; Celce-Murcia 1991; Richards and Lockhart 1994; Tudor 1996; Ur 1996; Berkow 2002; Rollinson 2005). Richards and Lockhart (1994: 165), for instance, suggest that in a writing lesson, after completing a first draft, students may work in pairs to read each other's assignments and provide suggestions for improvement. They argue that this feedback may address content, organisation or clarity of expression, and serves to provide information that may be useful to the student when revising the piece of writing. In justifying the use of peer feedback, Tudor (1996: 182) writes:

The rationale for peer evaluation is that by reflecting critically on the abilities of other learners with respect to a shared goal, learners are involved in the assessment of those linguistic or communicative parameters which are relevant to their own performance. Peer evaluation is, thus, a practical form of learner training which develops learners' understanding of language usage and the type of difficulties which they are likely to experience in their own language production, which can then be used to inform their self-assessment skills.

This informs us that peer feedback has got a dual purpose. The writer is benefited from the comments given to him/her by his/her peers and this minimizes the distance between the writer and the evaluator. The writer also assumes additional audience for his/her writing. The reader gets the advantage of reading others written work and evaluates his or her own ability of writing with respect to his/her peers.

In the current tendency of writing towards the process approach, peer feedback plays an important role in drafting and redrafting before coming to the final product. Regarding this, Mangelsdorf (1992: 274) notes that a common activity in a process-oriented curriculum is a peer review session, during which students read each other's drafts and make suggestions for revision. Hansen and Liu (2005: 31), quoting Elbow (1973) and Emig (1971), further confirm that peer response is considered a necessary component in the process writing approach that emerged in

1970's. It is, thus, possible to argue that peer feedback is one aspect of the process approach to writing. Why is peer feedback much preferred? What advantages does it give? Are there any drawbacks in using it?

2.5.1.3.1 Advantages of Peer Feedback

Peer feedback plays a significant role in the process of writing. Zeng (2006: 1) summarises the benefits of peer feedback into cognitive, linguistic and social. Zeng, quoting Mittan (1989), explains the cognitive benefit of peer feedback saying that the peer response activities in teaching L₂ writing can force students to exercise their thinking rather than to receive passively information from the teacher. Regarding the linguistic benefits, students experience through collaborative group production valuable opportunities to improve their ability to read and write because the on going community orientation of this approach enables them to draw on the strengths and resources of their peers while sorting through their own growing knowledge of L₂ writing (Hirvela 1999, quoted in Zeng 2006: 2). Peer response activities give students more ways to discover and explore ideas, to find the right words to express their ideas, and to negotiate with their readers about their ideas.

Regarding the social benefit of peer feedback Mendonca and Johnson (1994), write that students' communicative power can be enhanced by encouraging them to express and negotiate their ideas. Peer feedback also helps students to gain confidence and reduce apprehension by allowing them to see peers' strengths and weaknesses in writing (Leki 1990). Peer feedback is, thus, an important technique in helping students to be communicative, thereby building their confidence in the process of learning.

Bartels (2003: 35-36) describes similar benefits of written peer response as summarised below. Written peer feedback creates an interested audience for students writing resulting in an opportunity for communicative writing. It also provides instant feedback and negotiation of meaning. In doing so, students get the chance to request for clarification, ask questions, and even argue about the response instantly. This again leads to more language learning process. Written peer feedback is also preferable as it is easy to monitor what each student says, which helps the teacher to spot areas where students need practice and improvement. By using written peer

response, assessing students' writing is easier. When writing assignments are turned in accompanied by the previous draft(s), and the peers comments, it is easier for the teacher to ascertain which ideas originated with the student author and how well the student was able to respond to and incorporate the feedback from peers, something that would not even be possible with oral responses. As the teachers often do not have enough time to write thorough comments on each student's paper, written peer response provide students with thorough feedback.

Grabe and Kaplan (1996: 379) point out the motivations for using peer response groups from a practical perspective as follows.

Writing process teachers and researchers recognize the need for audience other than the teacher and for alternative feedback on student writing. Responding to peer work will also involve students in each other's writing; in that process students can learn the language of, and uses for responding to texts. From this experience, students would then begin to see similar problems and weaknesses in their own writing as well as use innovative and creative ideas to which they are exposed.

2.5.1.3.2 Some Limitations to Peer Feedback

Peer feedback is well supported by the literature in treating students' writing drafts. Nevertheless, as any technique, it is not free from facing some criticisms (Leki 1990; Nelson and Murphy 1993). Leki, for instance, identified several problems with peer comments: students tend to give advice that does not facilitate revision; and they have difficulties deciding whether their peer's comments are valid. Likewise, Nelson and Murphy reveal that L₂ students may not trust their peers' responses to their writing because they are not native speakers of English. Besides this, L₂ students from cultures that see the teacher as the only source of authority may consider their peers not knowledgeable enough to make sensible comments, and ultimately not incorporate the comments into their writing. That is why students tend to attach much more value to teacher feedback than peer feedback.

These cited problems might emanate from the long tradition of considering the teacher as a knowledgeable figure, and thus, the only source of knowledge to give comments to students' writing. In fact, as peer feedback is a relatively recent phenomenon and not well established in its practice compared to the teacher feedback, it happens to be normal for students to doubt about the efficiency of their peers' feedback. The problems identified by research works in using peer

feedback could also partly be because of the framing of research questions (Hyland and Hyland 2006: 91). For instance, studies which ask students to make a choice between teacher and peer feedback are misleading because peer and teacher comments do not have to be mutually exclusive. The other negative outcome of using peer feedback could be attributed to the quality of training given to students in dealing with peer feedback. This is well recognized by Celce-Murcia (1991: 259) who writes that embracing the philosophy without understanding how to translate peer feedback to the L₂ environment can often lead to rather disappointing results.

2.5.1.3.3 Training Students to Give and Receive Peer Feedback

In order to attain an effective peer feedback results, students should get training on how to give and receive peer feedback in writing. Many writing researchers recommend that proper training can make the feedback process more valuable. Relating to this, Celce-Murcia (1991: 259) states that since ESL students lack the language competence of native speakers, who can often react intuitively to their classmates' papers, peer responding in the ESL classroom must be modeled, taught and controlled in order for it to be a valuable activity.

Celce-Murcia (ibid) gives a detailed procedure for practicing peer feedback as follows. In giving and receiving feedback, students cannot exactly know what to include in the feedback. This can be addressed by providing a short list of directed questions which students work with as they read their own and other students' paper. The first exercise of this type can involve giving students a short checklist of attributes to look for in their own papers. Training helps students to read and respond to other students' papers by reviewing an essay written by a student. It also helps them to work through a peer-editing sheet that asks a few specific questions that would elicit both a general reaction to the paper and suggestions for improvement.

She also goes further to explain the procedures suggesting some typical questions to begin with as: *What is the main purpose of this paper? What have you found particularly effective in the paper?* etc. It is also important to write responses, incidentally providing practice in the valuable skill of text analysis for the student commentator, in order to maximize the value of the feedback to the ESL student. These written responses can be given to the student writer with or without the

anonymity of the student writer with or without the basis for oral discussion between reader(s) and writer.

Hess (2001: 81–82) gives the following procedural guides to conduct peer feedback.

1. In groups of three, students give each group member a copy of their composition.
2. Each group takes review and edit sheets.
3. The teacher explains the difference between being a Review (who reads for content) and an Editor (who reads for structure).
4. The first student in each group reads the composition out loud while his/her group mates follow along. They can ask questions or make comments during the reading.
5. At the completion of the reading, each student fills out the review and edit form.
6. The process is repeated with each student.
7. Students receive their peer review and edit forms and read the comments of classmates. They may wish to ask questions for clarification.
8. Students rewrite compositions making appropriate additions and changes.
9. The compositions are filed in the cumulative folder.

2.6 Research on Peer Feedback

Peer feedback is getting much popularity with the advent of the process approach to writing. Research works related to this type of feedback is becoming the state of the art both in L₁ and in L₂ contexts. In the following subsections, some of the related studies conducted abroad and in our country around the theme of peer feedback are reviewed, and then the major concern of the present study is justified.

2.6.1 Foreign Research Works

There are some studies conducted on different aspects of peer feedback. Some of these show positive results while others indicate some problems with peer feedback (Villamil and de Guerrero 1998; Tusi and Ng 2000; Mendoca and Johnson 1994 and Zhang 1995).

Villamil and de Guerrero (1998) investigated the impact of peer revision on L₂ writers' final drafts in two rhetorical modes, narration and persuasion, among fourteen Spanish speaking ESL

college students. In their research, they addressed two questions, *how were revisions made in peer sessions incorporated by writers in their final revisions?*, and *how was trouble sources revised according to different language aspects (content, organisation, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics)?* Their study reveals that peer assistance can help L₂ learners to realize their potential for effective revision to the extent their linguistic abilities permit. They then suggest that peer feedback could be an important complementary source of feedback in an ESL classroom.

A related study to the above is the work of Tsui and Ng (2000) on whether secondary school L₂ writers benefit from peer comments. Their study is concerned with the roles of teacher and peer comments in revisions in writing among secondary L₂ learners in Hong Kong. The results of their study show that some learners incorporate high percentages of both teacher and peer comments; some incorporated higher percentages of teacher comments than peer comments; others incorporated very low percentages of peer comments. The study also reveals that no matter whether the students incorporate high or low percentages, peer comment has some other roles to play: it enhances a sense of audience, raises learners' awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses and encourages collaborative learning. Other studies indicate that students and teachers have doubts about the use of peer feedback, and therefore, use little or no peer feedback. Mendoca and Johnson (1994), for instance, found out that students were very selective in using peer comments.

Students have also been observed preferring their teacher's comments rather than their peers (Zhang 1995; Tsui and Ng 2000). Zhang's (1995) study on eighty-one college freshmen reveals that 75% of the students preferred teacher feedback to all other forms. This implies that students perceive their teachers as the trustworthy source of knowledge. This is also supported by Tsui and Ng's (2000) work which reveals that students consider their teachers as an authority that guaranteed quality and were reluctant to trust their peers. There are also studies that question the quality of peer comments to improve students' writing. Some researchers (Leki 1990; Lockhart and Ng 1993) have found out that students have problems detecting errors and providing quality feedback.

Despite these issues, peer feedback is still popular as an alternative source of information to improve students' writing, and many teachers and course designers continue to incorporate it in

their courses and report positive experiences from students (Hyland and Hyland 2006: 91). In addressing the above problems, other studies resort to first training students in giving and receiving peer feedback to make the process more effective. In line with this, Berg's (1999) study reveals that training promotes more meaning-based suggestions resulting in higher quality revisions.

The other study by Kurt and Atay (2007) is concerned with the effect of peer feedback on the writing anxiety of prospective Turkish teachers of EFL. In this study, they categorised their subjects into control and experimental group. The control group was treated with teacher feedback while the experimental group was treated with peer feedback; the subjects were made to rate their level of writing anxiety using SLWAI before and after the experiment. Their study discloses that peer feedback group experienced significantly less writing anxiety than the teacher feedback group.

In this review, we have seen that peer feedback has both advantages and some limitations in improving students' writing, and the limitations could be minimized, to some extent, through training students before involving them in the process. In the following subsections, some related studies in our country focusing on written feedback, and particularly studies conducted on peer feedback on writing are reviewed.

2.6.2 Local Research Works

There are different studies carried out on feedback in writing in our country. Some of these are the works of Getnet (1993), Tesfaye (1995), Italo (1999), Dawit (2003), Mesfin (2004), and Taye (2005).

Getnet's (1993) study is on the responding behavior of EFL teachers to their students' written works at Addis Ababa University. The study shows that teachers mainly focus on low order levels (grammar, spelling, vocabulary, punctuation). He suggested that teachers should also help their learners in high order levels (content and organisation). Tesfaye's (1995) work is concerned with the effectiveness of students' self-correction in writing. This study shows that self-correction was more effective in helping students learn than where teacher gives direct correction. His argument is that students develop their skills if they discover by themselves the error in their

writing rather than the direct correction teachers give. These two studies also reveal that teacher correction is the dominant type of feedback in dealing with students' writing.

Italo's (1999) study is concerned with comparing the effectiveness of teacher and peer feedback on Addis Ababa University, first year students' writing revisions. The result of his study shows that both are equally effective in improving students' writing revisions. He justifies that the improvement of students' writing was due to the rewriting of the revisions students did after getting feedback from these sources. This again shows that students writing would improve through rewriting after getting feedback from the teacher or the peers.

The other comparative study on written feedback is Mesfin's (2004) work which looks into the level of effectiveness of peer-correction versus self-correction on Menilik II Secondary School students' writing improvement. The results of the study found to be different depending on the tools used. The data generated through the essay writing indicate that both peer and self-correction are, by and large, equally important in improving students' writing. On the other hand, the data obtained from the teacher questionnaire indicate that peer correction was the best in correcting errors, while the data from student questionnaire reveal that students preferred teacher correction of all the other techniques, and they preferred peer correction to self-correction.

The study conducted by Taye (2005) is on the effect of written feedback in promoting first year preparatory students' writing skills at Kellem Comprehensive Secondary School. This study reveals the presence of gap between what is theoretically stated and what is practically done with regard to the role of written feedback. The fact that students did not show any interest to make any revision on their first drafts shows that feedback to students' writing was not properly handled at the school.

There has been no study so far that focus on the effect of peer feedback on writing anxiety, but the study by Abate (1996) on the English language classroom anxiety is worth mentioning. Abate looks into the strength and direction of association between English language classroom anxiety of Ethiopian Civil Service College first year students and their performance in tests and on speaking and

writing tasks. The results of his study show that students' anxiety was negatively and significantly correlates with their language performance.

The study bearing more relevance to the present study is the work of Dawit (2003). In his study, Dawit investigates the effect of training students in giving and receiving peer feedback on learner's revision types and their writing quality. His study is on the case of ten-second year students of Defense University College. Using four essays of the students (with two drafts each), he gathered data to evaluate the changes in the revision types and writing quality. He also employed questionnaires for teachers and students to identify the customs of feedback practices on students' writing and to check the perceptions the students had before and after the training. The study reveals that some sign of improvement were observed in the types of revision made and in the qualities of the essays as the result of the training.

The present study sets out to investigate the effect of peer feedback on EFL students' writing performance and writing anxiety. Its primary concern is to find out if this feedback type has a role to play in improving students' writing performance and lessening students' anxiety in writing. It differs from earlier studies in the following ways. First, by way of investigating the effects of peer feedback, it attempts to find out if there is a difference in writing performance and writing anxiety between the group treated with peer feedback and the one without such treatment. It tries to find out the areas of writing that peer feedback can address, the proportion of peer comments incorporated into students' revision in relation to the feedback given and the perceptions of students regarding the benefits of peer feedback. Secondly, the setting of the study is Adama University, Department of English. Very few studies targeted this university in general, and none of them focused on writing and feedback to students' writing. Thus, in this regard the present study appears timely to raise issues related to responding to students' writing.

It was with these considerations that this study was designed. It is hoped that this study could contribute to the practice of responding to students' first draft using peer feedback as a complement to other feedback types to encourage learners to rewrite their drafts. To this end, the following chapter discusses the methodology employed for the study.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODS

The concern of this study was to investigate the effects of peer feedback on EFL students' writing performance and writing anxiety. To that end, this chapter discusses the design and procedures of the study. In the first part, the subjects and instruments used are discussed, followed by the second part in which the procedures for data gathering, discussion and analysis are presented.

3.1 Design of the Study

3.1.1 Setting and Subjects

The study was conducted at Adama University. The university was selected purposely which can be justified on two grounds. First, as the university is newly established, there is little research that targeted this institution in the area of language. Thus, with the promotion of the institution to a university level, English Department has started training EFL students as one of its missions, and it is hoped that this study could help in contributing a little to the process of teaching English in general, and that of the writing skill in particular in the university.

Secondly, having been working in the institution and realizing the dominant way of teacher feedback to students' writing and the fear that students display during the writing classes, I thought of targeting the research to the university to try out if peer feedback can contribute to students' writing improvement and confidence. Sophomore English, the writing course, which has been offered to all students of the institution since it started functioning in 1993, has not been supported by research when there is a clear problem students have in dealing with the course. Now, as Adama University as a whole and English Department in particular are newly established, it appears sound to conduct such research so as to add a little insight into the process of responding to students' writing using peer feedback as one form of feedback.

The subjects of the study are first year EFL students of the English Department. Fifty students were enrolled into the department to major in English for the first time in the academic year 2006/7. Among these, there were 38 students attending their education in the department. These students were divided into two sections, Section A and Section B, before they began their class

for the academic year. There were 19 students in each section when this study was conducted. Since their number was small, all of these students were included in the study. However, two students from the first group and one student from the second group did not attend classes regularly, and thus, were not included in the study. Thus, seventeen students in the first group, and eighteen students in the second group made up the subjects of the study.

These students were in their second semester and had taken courses in Communicative English, Reading Skills and Spoken English during the first semester. The students were selected by taking into account the fact that they are the-would-be English teachers and, therefore, are more interested to take part in the study. The other reason for taking them as subjects is that they were taking Sophomore English course when the study was going on. The study was conducted while the normal class was going on i.e., the students were learning their Sophomore English course.

This study is experimental and it generally lasted for nine weeks. The first two weeks was for pre-training writing activities, the next five weeks was used for peer feedback training and exercises. The last two weeks was used for post-training writing. The subjects were categorised into experimental group (students treated with peer feedback) and control group (students with the *modus operandi*).

3.1.2 Instruments

The following instruments were employed for generating the information that could address the purpose of the study. These were text analysis, and Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) developed by Cheng (2004). To supplement the data obtained by these instruments, questionnaire and interview were also used with the experimental group students.

3.1.2.1 Text Analysis

Written texts produced by the students in both groups were used to find out the difference in writing performance between the two groups. Students were made to write different texts on different topics before and after the training. Two teachers marked the written texts produced by students in both groups using Alderson et al.'s (1995) analytic scale marking (Appendix F). This marking scale was used as it helps to address how a student performs on seven writing features:

content, organisation, cohesion, vocabulary, grammar, mechanics and spelling. Each writing feature has got three marks, on which a given written text is evaluated. (Please refer to Appendix O for Sample Marked text.) Using this scale, each text was marked out of twenty-one, and in order to see the reliability of the two raters, correlation test was conducted.

Two pre-training writing activities were used to check if the two groups were at the same level of writing performance at the beginning of the study. The pre-training writing activities were writing two paragraphs based on the Sophomore English course on two given topics within twenty-five minutes each. The writing scores of the two groups were averaged out and compared. (Please see Appendix G for the results of pre-training writing.)

Post-training writing activities were conducted after the experimental group students were given training on peer feedback for five weeks. Then, the groups wrote three writing activities based on the contents of the Sophomore English course within two weeks but with different treatments. After the training, the experimental students wrote the paragraphs, gave and received peer comments to rewrite their first drafts. The control group students did not get such treatment, but wrote the paragraphs with the same orientation (pre-writing activities, instructions and time) with that of the experimental group students. Both groups were instructed to produce the texts within 25 minutes, and the experimental group students were given 20 minutes to read and give comments. Then, they were given another 15 minutes to rewrite their texts after the peer comments.

The written texts of both groups were used for analyses. For the experimental group, the first drafts on which peers commented, and the final drafts which were written after the peer feedback were used for analyses. Besides, the writing features students focused on, and the proportion of the comments students incorporated into their rewriting were also assessed. For the control group, the texts produced by the students without any feedback were collected directly for analyses. The purpose of these activities was to see if peer feedback brings any change in the students writing performance. (Please see Appendix I for the post-training writing results.)

3.1.2.2 Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory

In order to find out the status of the two groups writing anxiety before and after the experiment, Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI), developed by Cheng (2004), was used. It has got 22 items, which are answered on a five-point- Likert scale (1= strongly agree; 2= agree; 3= no strong feeling either way; 4= disagree; 5= strongly disagree). Among the 22 items, seven (1, 4, 7, 17, 18, 21 and 22) are negatively worded in terms of writing anxiety and require reverse scoring before being summed up to yield total scores. Thus, higher score show higher level of writing anxiety. (Please refer to Appendix E for the SLWAI.) It was reported that the inventory had a reliability of 0.91 when it was developed. For this study it was calculated to be 0.71. This was done by taking the rating results the students made before and after the training and testing the reliability using Chronbach alpha's reliability test.

3.1.2.3 Questionnaire

A set of questionnaire consisting of sixteen items was designed to support the data obtained from the text analysis and the SLWAI. It was meant to assess the experimental group students' general reflection on the peer feedback practice they had been taking part in. The questionnaire was designed in such a way that the students rate the extent to which they agree or disagree on a given peer feedback-related statement, and express their feelings and perceptions about the peer feedback activities. Items 1–15 are answered on a five-point-Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. (Please see Appendix K.)

Items 1–5 raise issues of the importance of peer feedback for the students in a general way. Items 6–10 deal with students' perceptions about the use of peer feedback in improving form, content and both, and the degree to which the students accept peer comments, and the usefulness of peer feedback from the students' point of view. Items 11–15 deal with students' perceptions towards the use of peer feedback in making students active, confident, anxiety-free, and their general feelings towards peer feedback. The last item of the questionnaire is an open-ended type which was prepared to let students write freely what they felt and perceived about the peer feedback. It was also to have ideas not included in items 1–15.

3.1.2.4 Interview

A structured interview was used with the experimental group students at the end of the study to find out what they felt during the practice of the peer feedback. Five students for this interview were selected randomly by a lot system out of the eighteen students. The interview had seven questions dealing with students' general attitudes towards the peer feedback they had been giving and receiving. It was also to assess the role of this feedback in improving students writing and lessening their writing anxiety from the students' point of view. (Please refer to Appendix L for the interview questions.)

3.2 Procedure

In order to obtain data from the subjects using the instruments mentioned, and to analyse the data the following procedures were used.

3.2.1 Rationale and Procedure of Categorizing Students into Experimental and Control Group

To conduct the study, it was required to have two groups to be treated in the control and experimental group. This was done to determine how well the students performed and how anxious they felt in writing under peer feedback treatment compared to those who did not get such treatment. It was found out from the students' prewriting activities and from the prewriting anxiety inventory that the two groups were at nearly the same level of writing performance and writing anxiety at the beginning. Then, by a lot system, Group 1 became Control Group, and Group 2 became Experimental Group.

The Control Group students, in the course of attending their lesson, were made to write two paragraphs during the pre-training writing phase on the same topics and orientations with that of the experimental group as stated earlier. This time, there was no difference in treatment between the two groups. They were also provided with brainstorming activities to help them have ideas to write on each topic. In the post-training writing phase, however, after they wrote the first drafts, their papers were directly collected for marking without treating them with any feedback. This was to see how well these students write without peer feedback. At the same time, second

language writing anxiety inventory was given to students to rate their anxiety level using SLWAI before and after the experiment.

The experimental group students were also made to write two paragraphs during the pre-training writing phase in the same way as the control group. They were also made to rate their anxiety level using the same instrument as that of the control group. In the post-training writing phase, these students were made to produce three paragraphs while dealing with the course. Similarly, they were made to rate their anxiety level after the experiment. After producing each text, they underwent peer feedback treatment. This was done for the three paragraphs. First, they were made to get a brief training and guidelines on how to give and receive peer feedback. Then, they participated in the peer feedback practice. The procedure used is discussed below.

3.2.2 Training Students to Participate in Peer Feedback

Prior to getting the experimental group students to write the texts in the post-training writing phase, I gave them training along with some guidelines like identifying content, organization, cohesion, grammar, etc. for five weeks to help them deal with these during the process of peer feedback. (Please see Appendix A for the guidelines.) Doing this was thought to help the students know how to give and receive feedback on their writing. This was carried out based on what scholars like Celce-Murcia (1991) and Hess (2001) suggest. Students were briefed with the advantages of peer feedback based on the literature and were encouraged to take part in it.

They were briefed with peer feedback evaluation criteria (Appendix B) and checklist (prepared based on Hess's (2001) guidelines) for giving comments (Appendix C). They also practiced giving comments to each other's writing using these tools during the training. They were told to read for meaning (content, organisation, cohesion, vocabulary) first, and then go for correcting grammar, spelling and mechanics. In the same way, they were advised to use commenting symbols like Con. (for content), Org. (for organisation), Coh. (for cohesion), Voc. (for vocabulary), Sp. (for spelling), Gr. (for grammar), Pun. (for punctuation) and Cap. (for capitalisation). The students were made to indicate the errors using the symbols and then to give corrections if they could. Sample activities on how to give and receive peer feedback were also given to these students during the training. The procedure for the peer feedback was modified

from Hess (2001) as shown in chapter 2, and this framework was used in this study to involve the students in peer feedback.

3.2.3 The Peer Feedback Phase

While producing the first drafts the experimental group students were informed to write their identification numbers (ID. No.), not their names, so that the students do not know who wrote the texts while they gave comments on each other's first drafts. (Please see Appendix N for sample peer comment.)

Based on the training and guidelines given, the students gave comments on each other's texts being in three as suggested by Hess (2001: 81). They discussed and wrote their comments on the papers using the evaluation criteria and checklist given to each group. The students were grouped into six and each group would comment on three texts for twenty minutes in a session. Then, the texts on which peer feedback was given were collected and given to the writers for rewriting. The rewritten texts and the text on which peer feedback was given were collected for analysis. The same procedure was repeated for the rest of the texts.

3.2.4 Topic Selection and Text Production

The students in both groups were made to write on the same topic in the class to avoid the suspicion that they might copy or let others write for them. Each writing activity was preceded by brainstorming activities to help learners have points to express during individual writing.

The topics for the writing activities were based on the Sophomore English course handout being in use. The Sophomore English course is mainly designed to help learners produce paragraphs and essays of different types: expository, descriptive, narrative and argumentative. The topics for the pre-training writing texts were *How to Get Good Results in All Subjects* which was suggested by the course teachers, and *How to Prepare Instant Coffee* which was taken from the course handout. For the post-training writing, the topics were *How to Get to Adama University from Adama Bus Station*, *Writing any paragraph on any incident or story they remember* (both modified from the course handout). The last topic was *The Use of Water*. For this, four topics

were suggested by the students, and the topic which secured the highest vote was selected as the third topic for text production. (Please See Appendix D.)

3.2.5 Comparing the Writing Performance of the Control and the Experimental Group

After the control group students had produced their first drafts, and the experimental group students their revised drafts, marking was conducted. Then, the results of the texts of both groups before and after the training were summed up and averaged out for further analyses. The analyses were made using t-test. The t-test was mainly employed to check if there was any significant difference in writing performance between the two groups.

3.2.6 Comparing the Writing Anxiety of the Control and the Experimental Group

The writing anxiety level of the control and the experimental group students before and after the experiment was compared. This was to find out if peer feedback had any influence in affecting the students' writing anxiety in either way. For this purpose, the results of the writing anxiety inventory before and after the experiment were summed up and averaged out. The t-test was used to see if the difference in writing anxiety between the two groups was significant, and to arrive at a conclusion on the effects of peer feedback on students' writing anxiety.

3.2.7 Comparing the Writing Features Performance of the Control and the Experimental Group

To find out what the performance of each group looked like before and after the experiment, a comparison was made between the mean scores of the individual writing feature of both groups. This was also meant to find out the writing features that brought a difference in writing performance if any. For this purpose, the scores each group obtained in the writing features were identified and analysed. The analysis was also conducted using t-test.

3.2.8 The Writing Features Students Focused on in Peer Feedback

Writing performance is evaluated in terms of the ability of the students in addressing the writing features. Hence, during the peer feedback the writing features (content, organisation, cohesion, grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, and spelling) students focus on have a strong implication for

the improvement of students' writing. In order to find out what the students mainly focused on, the comments given by peers were counted and identified into high order levels (content, organisation, unity, and cohesion) and low order levels (grammar, spelling, and mechanics) following Keh's (1990) suggestion. Then, the focus of the students in giving and receiving peer feedback was investigated by comparing the number of the comments given and used.

3.2.9 Amount of the Peer Comments Incorporated into the Rewritten Texts

Some studies indicate that students doubt the effectiveness of their peers' comments and incorporate little or none of the comments into their writing (Tsui and Ng 2000). To check out this, the number of the comments given by the peers was compared to the number and type of the comments used by the writers in rewriting their papers. Percentage was used to indicate the proportion of the comments used during the second writing in relation to the comments given.

3.2.10 Procedures of the Questionnaire Analysis

The questionnaire was used with the experimental group students at the end of the study to substantiate the other instruments. Since almost all of the items are answered on a five-point-Likert scale, except the last item, the students were first briefed how to show their agreement or disagreement using the scales given. Then, the data were analysed after counting the number of the students who rated their ideas similarly. For the open-ended item, all the responses given by the students were read and categorised according to the similarity of the ideas. Then, they were interpreted qualitatively.

3.2.11 Procedures of the Interview Analysis

The interview was also made with the five experimental group students right at the end of the study to substantiate the data obtained through the text analyses, the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) and the questionnaire. It was also used to find out the direct feelings of the students towards the practice of peer feedback in the writing instruction. The recorded data from each interviewee were transcribed and categorised according to the similarity of the ideas. Then, the data was interpreted qualitatively. (Please see Appendix M for the transcribed data.)

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSES, FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of peer feedback on students' writing performance and writing anxiety. To that end, this chapter attempts to answer the following research questions raised at the beginning.

1. Is there a significant difference in the writing performance between the students who are treated with peer feedback and those who are not provided with such treatment?
2. Is there a significant difference in the writing anxiety between the students who are treated with peer feedback and those who are not provided with such treatment?
3. What feature(s) of writing can be improved as a result of peer feedback?
4. What are the perceptions of the students towards the peer feedback practice?

4.1 Analyses of Students' Writing Performance and Writing Anxiety at the Beginning of the Study

It was important to find out the level of writing performance and writing anxiety of the two groups at the beginning of the study. This was to see if the two groups had similar writing performance and writing anxiety before the intervention of peer feedback in the process of writing

4.1.1 Students' Writing Performance at the Beginning of the Study

The students in both groups produced two paragraphs during this phase of the study. (The full information about the results the students obtained is presented in Appendix G.) In the following Table, the summary of the results of both groups is given. In order to find out if there was a significant difference in writing performance between the two groups a comparison was made using t-test.

Table 4.1: Comparison of Group 1 (17 students) and Group 2 (18 Students)' Writing Performance Scores at the Beginning of the study

Group	Writing 1 (21%)	Writing 2 (21%)	Total (42%)	Mean	SD	df	t	p
Group 1	8.6	10.5	19.1	9.6	3.34	33	-0.230	0.819
Group 2	9.1	10.4	19.5	9.8	2.84			

At 0.05 level of significance

Note: SD= Standard deviation

df= degrees of freedom (n_1+n_2-2), where n is the number of subjects in each group

t= the calculated t-value

p= the calculated p-value

To claim a significant difference between two means the observed t-value must be greater than the table value of t (critical value), or the observed p-value must be less than 0.05. This principle is applied to determine significant differences between the groups in this study. (Please see Appendix P for the critical values of t.)

The mean score of Group 1 (17 students) writing performance is 9.6 and that of Group 2 (18 students) is 9.8 in the two writing activities. Here, it is possible to see that the mean score of the writing performance of the two groups is nearer. The calculated t-value was found to be -0.230, and the critical t-value set at 0.05 level of significance is 2.042 (df = 33). Here, the observed t-value is less than the table value of t. As stated earlier, to be significant the t-value must be greater than the critical table value of t. In this analysis, as the calculated t-value is less than the table value of t, it is possible to conclude that there was no significant difference in writing performance mean scores between the two groups at the beginning of the study. Hence, this could be evident to claim that the students were nearly at the same level of writing performance.

4.1.2 Students' Writing Features Performance at the Beginning of the Study

The performance in each writing feature has a relation with the overall writing performance. This is because writing performance is seen in terms of the ability to use the different writing skills. To find out the level of difference in performance between the groups in the seven writing features, a comparison was made using the t-test analyses as follows.

Table 4.2: Comparison of Group 1 (17 students) and Group 2 (18 students)' Writing Features Performance Scores at the Beginning of the Study

Writing feature	Group	Writing 1 (3%)	Writing 2 (3%)	Total (6%)	Mean	SD	df	t	p
Content	1	1.3	1.8	3.1	1.55	0.49	33	0.448	0.071
	2	1.3	1.7	3.0	1.50	0.44			
Organisation	1	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.00	0.68	33	-0.975	0.337
	2	1.2	1.2	2.4	1.20	0.48			
Cohesion	1	1.1	1.6	2.7	1.35	0.64	33	-0.705	0.486
	2	1.3	1.7	3.0	1.50	0.43			
Vocabulary	1	1.3	1.8	3.1	1.55	0.49	33	0.149	0.883
	2	1.3	1.7	3.0	1.50	0.53			
Grammar	1	1.2	1.5	2.7	1.35	0.44	33	-0.320	0.751
	2	1.3	1.5	2.8	1.40	0.43			
Mechanics	1	1.2	1.4	2.6	1.30	0.57	33	-0.354	0.726
	2	1.3	1.4	2.7	1.35	0.53			
Spelling	1	1.4	1.5	2.9	1.45	0.49	33	0.219	0.828
	2	1.4	1.4	2.8	1.40	0.46			

At 0.05 level of significance

As shown in the above Table, there appeared to be no significant difference between the groups in the seven writing features indicated. The t-values for content was 0.0448, organisation -0.975, cohesion -0.705, vocabulary 0.149), grammar -0.320, mechanics -0.354 and spelling 0.219 all of which are less than the critical t-value (2.042, df = 33) set at 0.05 level of significance. Thus, there was no significant difference between the groups in writing features performance at the beginning of the study. The groups were relatively at a similar level of performance in each writing feature.

4.1.3 Students' Writing Anxiety at the Beginning of the Study

After the students in both groups produced two paragraphs, they were made to rate their level of writing anxiety using Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI). The full data gathered from the inventory are presented in Appendix H.

In order to see the difference in writing anxiety between the groups, the total score of each student was added up and averaged out. Then, a comparison between the mean scores of the two groups was done.

Table 4.3: Comparison of Group 1 (17 students) and Group 2 (18 Students)' Writing Anxiety Inventory Mean Scores at the Beginning of the Study.

Group	SLWAI Mean Score (110%)	SD	df	t	p
Group 1	86.2	6.85	33	-0.481	0.634
Group 2	87.3	5.95			

At 0.05 level of significance

As indicated in the Table, the mean score of Group 1 students' writing anxiety inventory mean score at the beginning of the study was 86.2 and that of Group 2 was 87.3. The calculated t-value was -0.481 which is less than the critical t-value (2.042, df = 33) set at 0.05 level of significance. This result shows that the difference in writing anxiety between the groups is not significant. Thus, they were fairly at the same level of writing anxiety at the beginning of the study.

In this section, we have seen that there was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of writing performance and writing anxiety. It was after finding out this that the two groups were assigned into the control and experimental groups.

Right after the above pre-training writing activities and writing anxiety self-rating, the training was given for the experimental group to get them prepared for employing peer feedback in their writing. Then, the writing activities using peer feedback was conducted. Observations of the students' behaviour during the peer feedback training and practice showed that the students appeared to get confused and lose interest to take part in the training and discussion at the beginning. However, through repetitive guidance and clarifications, the students began to make sense of the practice gradually. It was also observed that the students were enjoying the practice towards the end of the study which could be recognized from their own words from the interview held with the students.

The writing performance and writing anxiety level of both groups were then compared to see if there appeared a considerable difference between the groups as a result of the new intervention.

4.2 Analysis of Students' Writing Performance and Writing Anxiety after the Training

As stated earlier, in order to see if peer feedback had an effect on the students' writing performance and writing anxiety, the experimental group produced three paragraphs under the treatment of peer feedback. On the other hand, the control group produced the three paragraphs without peer feedback treatment. In this section, how the experimental group students were giving and receiving peer comments is presented based on the data from the peer comments the students made. Next, the students writing performance in relation to each writing feature is presented. Finally, the overall writing performance and writing anxiety of the students after the experiment are provided basically to verify the hypotheses formulated at the beginning of the study.

4.2.1 Nature of the Students in Giving and Receiving Peer Feedback

It is important to find out to what extent the students were able to give peer feedback and how many of the comments they received to rewrite their final drafts. To this effect, the comments the students gave, and the proportion of the comments used in rewriting in relation to the comments given were analysed.

4.2.1.1 Writing Features Students Focused on in Giving and Receiving Comments

In order to claim the effect of peer feedback on writing performance, it was important to investigate the writing features students can address in giving peer feedback. In the meantime, the amount of comments given the students used to rewrite their final texts needs to be investigated. For these purposes, the comments given by the peers on the first drafts, and the amount of these comments incorporated into the final writing were counted for each writing feature. This helped to see whether the students could address the surface level features, the higher level features or both. The data to investigate the above concerns were generated from the writing tasks (both the commented on drafts and the rewritten texts) of the experimental group students after the training.

Table 4.4: Writing Features Students Focused on when Giving Peer Feedback and the Amount of these Comments Used in Rewriting

Writing Activity	Writing Features									
	Comments	Con.	Org.	Coh.	Voc.	Gr.	Pun.	Cap.	Sp.	Total
1	Given	1	2	3	2	12	14	10	11	55
	Used	-	1	1	1	1	9	7	5	25
2	Given	1	1	2	4	18	9	9	5	49
	Used	-	1	1	2	9	3	3	3	22
3	Given	2	5	-	3	13	12	6	8	49
	Used	1	2	-	1	6	6	4	3	23
Total	Given	4	8	5	9	43	35	25	24	153
	Used	1	4	2	4	16	18	14	11	70

As indicated in the Table, the students focused mainly on grammar (43 comments), punctuation (35 comments), capitalization (25 comments), and spelling (24 comments) in giving comments during the three writing tasks. When punctuation and capitalization, as usually referred to as mechanics, are taken together, they accounted for the maximum number of the comments (60 comments). The writing features which were given less attention by the students in giving comments were content (4 comments), cohesion (5 comments), organisation (8 comments) and vocabulary (9 comments). It is possible to discern that students mainly focused on the lower order level features of writing disregarding the higher order levels in giving comments.

Table 4.4 shows that students incorporated the writing features focusing on the lower order levels. Thus, they incorporated 16 comments on Grammar, 18 comments on punctuation, 14 comments on capitalization and 11 comments on spelling. The writing features least incorporated were content (only one comment), cohesion (2 comments), organisation (4 comments), and vocabulary (4 comments). It is possible to observe that in using the peer comments there is a high tendency by the students to incorporate the lower order levels more than the higher order concerns (content, organisation, cohesion and vocabulary) very easily.

One reason for this could be that students might easily notice these comments rather than the higher order levels. The high order level features require high degree of understanding which

appear to be absent at this level of the students. However, through long practice students can be trained to address these features to some extent so that they can comment on their peers' writing by addressing content, organisation and cohesion as writing needs much more priority in these concerns.

The finding from the students' peer commented papers analyses showed that the lower order writing features were the focus of the students in giving and using in rewriting. Thus, one can argue that students could be of much help to one another in these areas of writing.

4.2.1.2 Analysis of the Peer Comments Used in Writing the Final Text in Relation to the Comments Given

To see the type and amount of the comments used by the students in relation to the comments given, the given comments and the incorporated comments were counted from the peer commented papers and compared as follows.

Table 4.5: Comparison of the Total Number of Peer Comments Given and Peer Comment Used on each Writing Feature

Writing Feature	Total No. of Comments Given		Total No. of Comments Used in Relation to Comments Given	
	No. of comments	%	No. of comments	%
Content	4	100	1	25
Organisation	8	100	4	50
Cohesion	5	100	2	40
Vocabulary	9	100	4	44.4
Grammar	43	100	16	37.2
Punctuation	35	100	18	51.4
Capitalization	25	100	14	56
Spelling	24	100	11	45.8
Total	153	100	70	45.8

As indicated in the Table, students used 14 comments (56%) of the total comments given on capitalization, 18 comments (51.4%) of the comments given on punctuation, and 4 comments (50%) of the comments given on organisation. The comments which were used below half of the

given comments include: spelling 11 comments (45.8%), vocabulary 4 comments (44.4%), grammar 16 comments (37.2%) and content 1 comment (25%) of the comments given. In general, the students appear to incorporate less than half (45.8) of the comments given to them.

Some implications could be drawn from these analyses. First, students seem receptive of their peers' comments to improve their writing as they used a good proportion of the comments given on capitalization, punctuation, organisation and spelling. Secondly, the fact that students used fewer comments from the many grammar comments made shows that students are very serious about grammar, but are not sure whether the comments provided to them are correct. In other words, students appeared to have serious problems in grammar and they were not much receptive of their peers' comments in this regard. This goes well with the finding of Tusi and Ng (2000) which reveals that students doubt the accuracy of their peers' comments. One can see that although students used their peers' comments, this did not help them to improve their writing owing to the quality and the quantity of the comments. However, an important aspect of peer feedback is that the students attempted to address all the writing features in giving and using comments whatever the quality of the comment was.

4.2.2 The Control and the Experimental Groups' Writing Features Performance after the Training

To find out how the groups were performing in the seven writing features, each group was compared by taking each writing feature into account. Then, t-test was calculated to find out the level of difference between the groups in each feature. (Please refer to Appendix I for the post-training writing results of the two groups.)

Table 4.6: Comparison of the Control (17 students) and Experimental Group (18 students)' Writing Features Performance after the Training

Writing feature	Group	Writing 1 (3%)	Writing 2 (3%)	Writing 3 (3%)	Total (9%)	Mean	SD	df	t	p
Content	Contr.	1.6	1.7	1.6	4.9	1.63	0.43	33	1.500	0.143
	Exp.	1.6	1.4	1.3	4.3	1.43	0.46			
Organisation	Contr.	1.3	1.5	1.2	4	1.33	0.46	33	0.408	0.686
	Exp.	1.3	1.2	1.3	3.8	1.27	0.47			
Cohesion	Contr.	1.3	1.3	1.3	3.9	1.30	0.46	33	-0.781	0.440
	Exp.	1.4	1.5	1.4	4.3	1.43	0.51			
Vocabulary	Contr.	1.4	1.5	1.5	4.4	1.47	0.32	33	0.089	0.930
	Exp.	1.4	1.4	1.5	4.3	1.43	0.31			
Grammar	Contr.	1.5	1.4	1.2	4.1	1.37	0.34	33	-2.939*	0.006
	Exp.	1.6	1.7	1.8	5.1	1.70	0.46			
Mechanics	Contr.	1.2	1.3	1.5	4	1.33	0.34	33	-3.285*	0.002
	Exp.	1.7	1.9	1.8	5.4	1.80	0.46			
Spelling	Contr.	1.3	1.4	1.4	4.1	1.37	0.41	33	-3.067*	0.004
	Exp.	1.7	1.9	1.9	5.5	1.83	0.47			

At 0.05 level of significance

As indicated in the Table, the writing features which were significantly improved were that of the experimental group. Nevertheless, the improvement was not in all the writing features. The writing features which showed significant improvement were only that of mechanics (-3.285), spelling (-3.067), grammar (-2.939) as the observed t-values are greater than the table value of t (2.042, df = 33) set at 0.05 level of significance. On the other had, the t-test shows that there was no significant difference observed between the control group and the experimental group in terms of content (1.500), organisation (0.408), vocabulary (0.089) and cohesion (-0.781) all of which are less than the critical t-value indicated.

These analyses revealed that peer feedback treatment had a significant effect on the writing performance in the writing features: mechanics, spelling and grammar. It was found out that peer feedback does not have a significant effect on content, organisation, vocabulary and cohesion. This finding confirms the result obtained from the analyses of students' peer comments and

rewritten texts given in section 4.2.1. Strangely enough, the control group appeared to perform better, though not significant, than the experimental group in content, organization, and vocabulary. This could be due to the fact that the students did not know how to make sense of the comments given to them in these areas. This also suggests the need to have longer period of time to help the students to deal with the higher level features of writing.

Hence, peer feedback brought a writing performance difference between the groups by enabling the experimental group to improve the spelling, grammar and mechanics of their writing. That means, attributing the changes in the writing performance to these writing features, it is possible to say that peer feedback has a direct relationship with writing features like grammar, mechanics and spelling (surface level features).

4.2.3 Students' Overall Writing Performance and Writing Anxiety after the Training

This section presents the writing performance (writing features all together) and writing anxiety of the control and the experimental group after the training. The mean scores of the post-training writing texts of the two groups were compared to test the hypotheses formulated at the beginning. Similarly, the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory mean scores of the two groups were compared to see if there was a difference between the groups after the training.

4.2.3.1 Students' Overall Writing Performance after the Training

The two groups' overall writing performance is the sum total of the writing features. The mean scores of both groups writing performance were summarised as follows (please refer to Appendix I).

Table 4.7: Control and Experimental Group Students' Writing Performance Scores after the Training

Group	Writing 1 (21%)	Writing 2 (21%)	Writing 3 (21%)	Sum (63%)	Mean
Control	9.6	9.9	9.8	29.3	9.8
Experimental	10.6	10.9	11.1	32.6	10.9

To find out if the two groups were performing differently or in the same way, a comparison was made using t-test.

Now, let us revise the hypotheses raised at the beginning of this study and verify them.

H₀: There is no significant difference in the writing performance mean scores between the students who write with peer feedback treatment and those who do not get such treatment.

H₁: There is a significant difference in the writing performance mean scores between the students who write with peer feedback treatment and those who do not get such treatment.

To test the above hypotheses, the post-training writing performance mean scores of the control and the experimental group were compared.

Table 4.8: Comparison of the Post-training Writing Mean Scores of the Control (17 students) and the Experimental Group (18 students)

Group	Writing Mean Score	SD	df	t
Control	9.8	2.62	33	-1.206
Experimental	10.9	3.85		

At 0.05 level of significance

For this analysis, the critical t-value (df= 33) at 0.05 level of significance is 2.042, and the calculated t-value was found to be -1.206. When the calculated t-value is less than the critical table value of t, then there is no significant difference between the two means. Here, the observed t-value is less than the critical t-value showing the absence of a significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. From this, it is possible to say that there was not a significant difference in writing performance between the two groups.

4.2.3.2 Students' Writing Anxiety after the Training

A comparison was made between the SLWAI mean scores between the two groups (please refer to Appendix J for post-training writing anxiety inventory results). For this purpose t-test was also computed to see the level of their difference in writing anxiety. The hypotheses formulated concerning writing anxiety were as follows.

H₀: There is no significant difference in the writing anxiety mean scores between the students who write with peer feedback treatment and those who do not get such treatment.

H₁: There is a significant difference in the writing anxiety mean scores between the students who write with peer feedback treatment and those who do not get such treatment.

To test the above hypotheses, the writing anxiety inventory mean scores of the control and the experimental groups were compared.

Table 4.9: Comparison of the Post-training Writing Anxiety Inventory Mean Scores of the Control (17 students) and the Experimental Group (18 students)

Group	Post-training Writing Anxiety Mean Score	SD	df	t
Control	85.2	7.12	33	2.07
Experimental	80.1	7.54		

At 0.05 level of significance

The mean score of the control group students' writing anxiety inventory was 85.2 and that of the experimental group was 80.1. The mean scores depict that there was a difference in writing anxiety between the group treated with peer feedback and the one that did not get such treatment. The experimental group's mean score showed a decrease in writing anxiety, but how significant is the difference? This is verified as follows. For this analysis too, the critical t value set at 0.05 level of significance (df= 33) shows 2.042. The calculated t-value was 2.07. This value is higher than the table value of t indicating that there was a significant difference between the two groups in their writing anxiety mean scores. Here, the null hypothesis is rejected. Based on this, it is possible to assert that there was a significant difference in writing anxiety between the two groups.

Based on the above analyses, it is possible to assert that the group that was writing under the treatment of peer feedback showed no significant difference in the overall writing performance. Yet, they significantly displayed less writing anxiety than the group that did not write under such treatment.

4.3 Students' Perceptions towards the Practice of Peer Feedback on Writing

How the students perceive and react towards peer feedback process has a strong bearing on its effectiveness in contributing to students' writing skills development. It is when students develop awareness about the use of peer feedback that they can take part in the teaching and learning of writing using peer feedback. Having this in mind, data regarding the students' perceptions were gathered from the experimental group students using a questionnaire and an interview right at the end of the study.

4.3.1 Analysis of the Questionnaire

Analysis of the questionnaire was done first for the items in the Likert-scale. For simplicity the responses with 'strongly agree' and 'agree' were considered together and 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree' together. Note that 'F' stands for the number of subjects. Next, the analysis of the open-ended question was done.

4.3.1.1 Importance of Peer Feedback for Students' Writing in General

Data regarding the reflections of students on the importance of peer feedback in general terms are presented and analyzed as follows.

Table 4.10: Students' Perceptions towards the Importance of Peer Feedback to their Writing in General

No.	Item	Responses					
		Strongly agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
		F	F	F	F	F	F
1	Classmates' comments helped me to rewrite my first draft.	13	4	0	0	1	18
2	Classmate comments were important as they were not for marking (grading).	7	8	1	2	0	18
3	Comments from classmates helped me to improve my writing.	12	4	0	1	1	18
4	Knowing what to do during the peer feedback helped me a lot in peer commenting.	4	12	1	1	0	18
5	Peer commenting increased the number of people who read my texts.	8	7	0	3	0	18

According to Table 4.10, almost all of the students have a positive attitude towards the peer feedback they practiced. Among the 18 students, 17 said that they agree to the fact that their classmates' comments helped them to rewrite their first drafts. Only one student said he/she disagrees. Most of the students (15) agreed to the idea that peer comments are not for marking but for practice. Two students expressed their disagreement, while one student refrained from commenting in either way.

The majority of the students (16) believed that exchanging comments helped them to improve their writing skill while two students disagreed to this. Regarding the importance of peer feedback training (knowing what to do during peer feedback process), 16 students said that training is important. Only one student disagreed and one did not comment in either way. With respect to the importance of peer feedback in increasing the audience that reads the students draft, most of the students (15) said that peer feedback increases the number of people who read their drafts. Three students expressed their disagreement in this regard.

4.3.1.2 Quality and Type of Peer Comments Given and Used

The type and quality of the comments can influence the improvement of students' writing performance. In order to find out what the students thought about the quality and types of the comments given and used the perceptions of students were assessed.

Table 4.11: Students' Perceptions towards the Quality and Types of Comments Given and Used

No.	Item	Responses					
		Strongly agree	Agree	No Idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
		F	F	F	F	F	F
6	My classmates gave me useful comments on content.	4	10	1	2	1	18
7	My classmates gave useful comments on form.	6	9	2	1	0	18
8	My classmates gave useful comments on both content and form.	3	11	1	2	1	18
9	I incorporated most of my classmates' comments in rewriting.	6	9	1	1	1	18
10	Students' comments were misleading and useless, so I had not used them.	2	1	3	7	5	18

As depicted in Table 4.11, most of the students appeared to have a positive attitude towards the usefulness of peer comments in general. Regarding the students' ability to comment on content, 14 students expressed their agreement. Three students stated their disagreement and only one student refrained from giving idea in either way.

With respect to the students' ability to comment on form (grammar, punctuation and capitalization), 15 students showed their agreement, and only one student disagreed to the students' ability to comment on form. The rest of the students (two students) declined to comment. Regarding the students' ability to comment on form and content together, 14 of them agreed that they could. Three students disagreed to the idea that students could comment on both form and content. One student abstained from making comment. Thus, quite a good proportion of the students agreed to the fact that students could comment on form, which is also supported by the finding from the students' text analyses in the previous section.

Concerning how students incorporated their peer comments, 15 students stated that they incorporated most of their peers' comments, while only one student refrained from giving idea. Two students disagreed to the fact that they incorporated most of their peers' comments. This goes contrary to what the peer commented text analysis revealed. The students were also asked to comment on whether the peer comments were misleading and, therefore, did not use them; most of the students (12 students) disagreed to the belief that peer comments are misleading. Only three students stated that peer comments were misleading and did not use them. Three students did not comment on this idea.

4.3.1.3 Affective Benefits of peer Feedback

Students' awareness of the affective benefits of peer feedback has a significant implication for the implementation peer feedback. The data gathered in this regard are presented as follows.

Table 4.12: Students' Perceptions towards the Affective Benefits of Peer Feedback

No.	Item	Responses					
		Strongly agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
		F	F	F	F	F	F
11	Exchanging comments made me more active in the writing process.	4	9	1	1	3	18
12	Classmates' comments increased my confidence in writing.	8	5	1	3	1	18
13	Exchanging comments reduced my fear/worry about writing.	8	7	0	2	1	18
14	Exchanging comments was interesting.	11	4	2	1	0	18
15	In general, I liked comments from classmates.	6	9	0	2	1	18

As indicated in the Table, 13 students agreed to the idea that exchanging comments made them active, and only one student said that he/she had no idea. Four students said that they disagreed to the idea. Regarding confidence, 13 students agreed that exchanging comments increased their confidence in writing. While one student made no idea, four students expressed their disagreement to this idea. Whether students believed that classmates' comments reduced their fear or not, 15 students stated that it did, while three students stated that it did not reduce their fear. Concerning whether they liked the peer feedback practice in general, 15 students said that they liked while three students expressed that they disliked it.

The last item of the questionnaire is an open-ended type. In general, it is possible to conclude from what the students responded to this question that almost all the students showed a strong interest and a positive attitude towards the peer feedback they used in their writing. Some of the remarks made by the students are: "Giving and receiving comments is very important to improve writing skills; exchanging comments helped to know where I am in relation to other students; this practice is important in writing so it should continue; it is good to improve grammar, capitalization. It was a wonderful activity, but some students said that there are mistakes, they should write the mistakes". One student commented that giving and receiving comments is very essential for the development of writing; he/she explains that he/she has known how to learn writing not only by writing but also by correcting others' writing, so it was a great work. In the same way, there were students who said that this practice should continue to develop writing

skills and to deal with anxiety. According to these students peer commenting helps to compete with others, and gain more knowledge. Some of the students also stated that this practice is important for learning writing and communicating in English.

From all these comments, it is possible to conclude that students liked the practice of peer feedback they were taking part in. It seems that they recognized the importance of the writing skill and peer feedback to improve this skill.

4.3.2 Analysis of the Interview

In this study an interview was held with the experimental group students. In the analysis, the students' responses were categorised based on whether or not the students liked the peer feedback they were exchanging in their writing, whether the students perceived that peer feedback improved their writing, and what advantages peer feedback offered. Similarly, whether the peer feedback helped them to lower their anxiety, what areas of writing the students' thought peer feedback could improve, and how the students incorporated peer comments were analysed. The analysis of the students' responses is presented as follows.

1. Regarding whether or not the students liked the peer feedback practice, all the interviewees expressed their feeling that they liked the practice. It could be deduced from their responses that they appeared to perceive the uses of peer feedback. One of the students stated, "Yes I liked it, because ... it gives us an opportunity to write without fear". Students' positive attitude towards the peer feedback practice was also implied in the students' responses. This was clearly indicated by a student who stated, "Yes, I liked so much ... because I learn so much things from it, and I will be such teacher for my students".
2. The next question was whether the students thought that exchanging comments on the first draft improves writing. The students responded positively. Among the interviewees one student said, "Yes of course. I would like to reply for this by the change I have made for myself, by the improvement I have made". Another student who seems to understand the fact that students are of different levels in their knowledge, expressed that the peer comments improved his/her writing. This means the slower students would get an advantage of learning from the clever ones during comment exchange. From these points, one can see that the

students seemed to recognize the importance of peer comment exchange on writing and, thus, had developed positive attitudes towards the practice.

3. Concerning the advantages of giving and receiving comments during writing, the students expressed the following as the benefits that can be generated from peer comment exchange. These are: “It helps to see the problems that students (‘writers’) do not see; it reduces mistakes; it gives chance to see our problems and write a good text; and it reduces fear”. Emphasizing the benefit of peer feedback as collaboration in writing, one student, using a proverb, said, “Many hands make light work”. The implication of this proverb is that when students exchange comments, their writing would be done more effectively and easily than when it is done without such practice.
4. The students were also asked whether they think that exchanging comments reduces fear (anxiety) of writing. All of the interviewees asserted that it does so. From these students’ responses, it is possible to conclude that students were relaxed during the practice of their peer feedback. This, in turn, shows us that the students perceived the advantage of peer feedback in building some sort of confidence, reducing anxiety. According to one student, “When you give and receive comments you are able to practice well, and practice makes you perfect and this develops your confidence”. Similarly, one student replied saying, “Yes, it reduces the fear of the students ... because we try first and after that we improve after getting comments ... and this reduces my fear”. It could be said that the students were in a position to see peer feedback in relation to reducing anxiety in writing. They, it could be guessed, enjoyed the practice and developed their confidence as a result.
5. Regarding the areas of writing (content, organisation, cohesion, vocabulary, grammar, mechanics, and spelling) that peer commenting could address, the students seem to have different views. Some of the students stated that they mostly received and gave comments on punctuation, capitalization and grammar. Some doubted that students’ ability to give comments on grammar; hence, peer comments did not improve their grammar in writing. One of the students replied, “I think most of the students are commenting on punctuation, grammar and a little bit on layout but most of the time they comment on punctuation and capitalization”. While most of the students agreed that students’ comments could improve punctuation and

capitalization, some doubted that it improves grammar. Very few students said it improves organisation, content and cohesion. It appears that students focus was on surface level features (punctuation, capitalization, grammar); they appeared to think that these areas could be improved by peer comment exchange.

6. Utilization of the peer comments was another question posed to the students. Regarding this, most of the students stated that they used their peers' comments selectively. This was because, according to the students, some of the comments peers gave were not correct. One student said, "Most of the time, I used selectively ... some of them make errors". Similarly another student stated, "I use in a selective way, because many students may be wrong or right in giving comments". Based on the comments made by these students, it is possible to say that the students doubted the comments given by their peers, and so used the comments which they thought were correct. In doing so, it could be argued, the students were making their own judgments as to which comments are important and unimportant in improving their writing. This in turn widens their skills of reasoning and writing, too.
7. Students' general view about the use of peer feedback appears to be motivating. Five of the students replied saying that exchanging comments in writing is very important to improve writing skills. According to the students, peer comment exchange allowed a good opportunity to practice writing and reduce fear of writing. A comment made by one student reads, "In general it is very important thing and that it contributes many things for the teaching-learning process, and it should be continued".

Based on the responses of the students, it is possible to say that these students have developed a positive attitude towards this feedback. They also appeared to sense the uses of peer comments in the process of writing. The students also recognized, it could be said, the need to rewrite and do many practices in order to improve their skills of writing. Besides, the motivating effect that the peer feedback offers is also another area of the students' awareness.

Regardless of the actual change in the overall writing performance, the students seemed to think that peer comment exchange helped to improve writing. They also stated that it helped them to rewrite to practice writing. In addition to these, the awareness the students developed about the use of peer feedback in writing is another important aspect this study revealed.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

This section presents the main highlights of the whole study by touching upon the objectives, the methodology and the findings of the study. The very nature of learning and teaching writing skills where students show weakness, and the predominant way, yet one directional teacher feedback were what initiated this research. In other words, it was with the hypothesis that peer feedback can contribute to the students writing skills development that this study was designed.

As stated above, this study was concerned with investigating the effects of peer feedback on the writing performance and writing anxiety of EFL students. The study attempted to find out if there was a significant difference in writing performance and writing anxiety between the group treated with peer feedback and the one that was not. Similarly, the writing features that could be improved with peer feedback, how the students give and use their peers comments were the concern of the study. Students' perception towards peer feedback in writing was also assessed.

The subjects of the study were EFL students who were taking Sophomore English course at Adama University. The subjects were treated in the control and experimental groups. The instruments used were text analysis, SLWAI, questionnaire and interview. Texts produced by the students and Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory were used to find out the level of the students writing performance and writing anxiety before and after the peer feedback training. At the same time, the data obtained from the questionnaire and the interviews were analysed qualitatively to complement these tools.

The major findings of the study are given as follows.

1. There was no significant difference in the overall writing performance of the students who were treated with peer feedback and those without such treatment.

2. Peer feedback was found to significantly improve the writing features: mechanics, grammar and spelling. The high order writing features (content, organisation, cohesion and vocabulary) were not addressed by the peer feedback exchange by the students. Analyses of students' commented on papers by peers, and the texts written after the comments, and the t-test analyses showed that peer feedback did not make any significant change in content, organisation, cohesion and vocabulary.
3. There appeared to be a significant decrease in writing anxiety by the group that was treated with peer feedback.
4. The questionnaire and interview analyses showed that students' attitudes towards the peer feedback practice were favorable and this could help to practice writing.
5. Regardless of the overall improvement of the students writing performance, the students were found to be aware of the benefits of peer feedback in writing.
6. Peer feedback also gave the opportunity to the students to rewrite their first drafts by evaluating the quality of the comments.

5.2 Conclusions

This study was conducted to find out the effects of peer feedback on the writing performance and writing anxiety of EFL students. Based on the above findings, the following conclusions could be drawn.

1. There is a relationship between students peer comment exchange, writing performance (mechanics, grammar and spelling) and writing anxiety. That is, peer feedback enhances students' writing performance in the specified writing features and reduces students' writing anxiety.
2. Peer feedback enhances students' interaction in writing there-by building up their interest and confidence.

3. Peer feedback can be taken as one means to exercise the process approach to writing in an EFL classroom. In other words, peer feedback gives the opportunity to write and rewrite before producing the final text.
4. Peer feedback was found to be helpful mainly for improving mechanics (capitalization and punctuation), grammar and spelling. The students were unable to comment on content, organisation, cohesion and vocabulary.
5. From the students questionnaire and interview it was observed that students' use of peer comments was on a selective basis; they seemed to doubt the correctness of their peers' comments.
6. Regardless of the accuracy and the scope of the peer comments, peer feedback had a role to keep the students to communicate and to rewrite their texts either using the comments or without the comments. Thus, it has a beneficial effect in teaching writing as a process.

5.3 Recommendations

This study has a bearing on the teaching and learning of the writing skills. Based on the findings and the conclusions made above, the following recommendations are forwarded.

1. Nowadays, teaching is becoming helping students to learn by themselves. One way of doing so is by letting students learn from each other. To this effect, peer feedback has a role in the process approach to writing by letting learners learn from each other how to write and rewrite. Thus, writing teachers are advised to employ this feedback technique to have students comment on each other's mechanics, spelling and grammar.
2. Anxiety could hinder students from learning successfully even when the students have the potential to learn. Hence, writing teachers are advised to make use of peer feedback as one way to tackle students' writing anxiety.

3. Peer feedback implementation could also be encouraged by the way teaching material is prepared. Thus, material writers are advised to consider how to include sections that invite peer feedback practice in writing.
4. Finally, it is difficult to generalize the effects of peer feedback on the students' writing performance and writing anxiety based on this limited study. Further studies in the area are highly recommended to substantiate the findings of the present study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abate Kassahun. 1996. "English Language Classroom Anxiety, Performance on Classroom Tasks and in Tests: A Study of some Ethiopian Civil Service College First Year Students." (MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University).
- Alderson, J. C. et al. 1995. *Language Test Construction and Evaluation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bachman, L. F. 2004. *Statistical Analyses for Language Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartels, N. 2003. "Written Peer Response in L2 Writing." *English Teaching Forum*, 41(1): 34–37.
- Berg, E. 1999. "The Effects of Trained Peer Response on ESL Students' Revision Types and Writing Quality." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3): 215–241.
- Berkow, P. 2002. *Telescope Study Guide: English Composition Writing for an Audience*. New York: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.
- Byrne, D. 1988. *Teaching Writing Skills*. London: Longman.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (ed.). 1991. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Cheng, Y.-S. 2004. "A Measure of Second Language Writing Anxiety: Scale Development and Preliminary Validation." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13: 313–335.

- Dawit Assefa. 2003. "The Effect of Training Students in Giving and Receiving Peer Feedback on Learners' Revision Types and Writing Quality: A Case Study of Second Year Students of Defense University College." (MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University).
- Dheram, P. K. 1995. "Feedback as a Two-bullock Cart: A Case Study of Teaching Writing." *ELT Journal*, 49(2):160–168.
- Edge, J. 1989. *Mistakes and Correction*. London: Longman.
- Foley, J. and Thompson, L. 2003. *Language Learning: A Life Long Process*. London: Arnold, Hodder Headline Group.
- Geremew Lemu. 1999. "A Case Study of the Requirements in Writing for Academic Purposes at AAU: Four Departments in Focus." (PhD Dissertation, Addis Ababa University).
- Getnet Tizazu. 1993. "The Responding Behaviour of Sophomore English Instructors of AAU to Students' Writing." (MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University).
- Grabe, W. and Kaplan, R. B. 1996. *Theory and Practice of Writing*. London: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Hansen, J. G. and Liu, J. 2002. *Peer Response in Second Language Writing Classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- _____. 2005. "Guiding Principles for Effective Peer Response." *ELT Journal*, 59(1): 31-38. doi: 10.1093/elt/cci004.
- Harmer, J. 1991. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Heaton, J. B. 1988. *Writing English Writing Tests*. London: Longman.

- Hedge, T. 1988. *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____ 2000. *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hess, N. 2001. *Teaching Large Multilevel Classes. Cambridge Handbook for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. 1990. "Providing Productive Feedback." *ELT Journal*, 44(4).
- Hyland, K. and Hyland, F. 2006. "Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing." *Language Teaching*, 39: 83–101.
- Italo Beriso.1999. "A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Teacher versus Peer Feedback on AAU Students' Writing Revisions." (PhD Dissertation, Addis Ababa University).
- Jordan, R. R. 1997. *English for Academic Purposes: Guide and Resource Book for Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keh, C. L. 1990. "Feedback in the Writing Process: A Model and Methods for Implementation." *ELT Journal*, 44(4).
- Kelly, W. J. and Lawton, D. L. 1998. *Odyssey: A Guide to Better Writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kurt, G. and Atay, D. 2006. "Prospective Teachers and L2 Writing Anxiety." *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(4).
- _____ 2007. "The Effects of Peer Feedback on the Writing Anxiety of Prospective Turkish Teachers of EFL." *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 3(1): 12–23.

- Leki, I. 1990. "Potential Problems with Peer Responding in ESL Writing Classroom." *CATESOL Journal*, 3: 5–17.
- _____. 1994. "Teaching Second Language Writing: Where We Seem to Be." In Kral, T. (ed.) *Teacher Development: Making the Right Moves*. Washington: United States Information Agency. (pp. 170–178).
- Lockhart, C. and Ng, P. 1993. "How Useful Is Peer Response?" *Perspectives*, 5(1).
- MacyIntyre, P. D. and Gardner, R. C. 1989. "Anxiety and Second Language Learning: Toward a Theoretical Clarification." *Language Learning*, 39: 251–275.
- Makino, T.-Y. 1993. "Learner Self-correction in EFL Written Compositions." *ELT Journal*, 47(1).
- Mangelsdorf, K. 1992. "Peer Reviews in the ESL Composition Classroom: What Do the Students Think?" *ELT Journal*, 46(3).
- McDonough, J. and Shaw, C. 1993. *Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mendonca, C. O. and Johnson, K. E. 1994. "Peer Review Negotiations: Revision Activities in ESL Writing Instruction." *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4): 745–769.
- Mesfin Abera. 2004. "An Investigation of the Level of Effectiveness of Peer Correction versus Self-correction on Grade 12 Students' Writing with a Particular Reference to Menelik II Secondary School." (MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University).
- Murray, D. M. 1995. *The Craft of Revision*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

- Nelson, G. L. and Murphy, J. M. 1993. "Peer Response Groups: Do L2 Writers Use Peer Comments in Revising their Drafts?" *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1): 135–141.
- Norish, J. 1992. *Language Learners and their Errors*. London: Macmillan Publishers.
- Nunan, D. (ed.). 1992. *Collaborative Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Raimes, A. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. C. and Lockhart, C. 1994. *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, W. 1981. *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Rollinson, P. 2005. "Using Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class." *ELT Journal*, 59(1). doi: 10.1093/elt/cci003.
- Scovel, T. 1978. "The Effect of Affect on Foreign Language Learning: A Review of the Anxiety Research." *Language Learning*, 28: 129–142.
- Solomon Abate. 2001. "The Realization of Process Approach to Writing at the Level of Grade 10." (MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University).
- Taye Chefo. 2005. "The Effect of Written Feedback on Promoting Students' Writing Skills in English with Reference to First Year Preparatory Students: A Case Study of Kellem Comprehensive Secondary School." (MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University).
- Tesfaye Solomon. 1995. "The Effectiveness of Learner Self-correction of Written Errors in the EFL Classroom." (MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University).

- Tudor, I. 1996. *Learner-centeredness as a Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tusi, A. M. B. and Ng, M. 2000. "Do Secondary L2 Writers Benefit from Peer Comments?" *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2): 147–170.
- Ur, P. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Villamil, O. S. and de Guerrero, M. C. 1998. "Assessing the Impact of Peer Revision on L2 Writing." *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4): 491–514.
- White, R. and Arndt, V. 1991. *Process Writing*. London: Longman Group U. K. Limited.
- Williams, M. and Burden, R. L. 1997. *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yonas Adaye. 1996. "Teaching Writing as a Process at the First Year Level at AAU with Special Reference to College English." (MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University).
- Zamel, V. 1985. "Responding to Student Writing." *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(1): 79–101.
- Zeng, Y. 2006. "Peer Feedback in College SLW Classroom." *Sino-US English Teaching*, 3(3).
- Zhang, S. 1995. "Re-examining the Affective Advantages of Peer feedback in the ESL Writing Class." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3).
- <http://www.yale.edu/bass.2peerreview.html>. Retrieved on 16/03/2007.

Appendix A: Guidelines for Peer Feedback Practice

i. Peer Review Guidelines (For training students)

1. Always begin by seeing if the writer has something he or she wants to know from you about the paper.
2. Your role should be to assist your fellow writer in expressing her or his ideas. Do not get caught up in providing critical evaluations, and do not rewrite the paper.
3. Read as a reader, rather than as a critic. Describe how you react to the piece; if there is something you do not like or follow, say that, rather than “this is bad, or this is wrong.”
4. Do not serve primarily as a proofreader. If you happen to notice a recurring error, point it out.

(From: <http://www.yale.edu/bass.2peerreview.html>)

ii. A Process Model for Reading and Revising

Read through the draft. Understand what the writer meant to say. Do not rely on one quick reading. Read it once to get a sense of the piece as a whole, again to look at details to see what it says and how it put together. Do not be too concerned with the exact words. Go underneath them to understand the ideas they present.

Now take the draft apart. List what you think are the major ideas and state what seems to be the author’s purpose. Under each main idea, note what the writer does to back it up. Considering the purpose, the major ideas, supporting information as you see them, what ideas affect you most strongly? What else might you need to know? What would you like to hear more about?

Consider the additions and changes you were thinking about. Remember writers cannot incorporate all suggestions. The idea is to use them to stimulate thoughts on specific ways to revise the draft.

(From: Spear 1988 quoted in Grabe and Kaplan 1996:384)

Appendix B: Peer Evaluation Feedback Criteria

1. Approach

- a) First, read for general impression with focus on content and organization.
- b) Second, read with focus on specific writing components: content, organisation, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

2. Criteria

a) Content

- treatment of the subject/knowledge of the topic
- considerable variety of ideas or argument
- relevance to the topic
- accurate detail/development of thesis

b) Organisation

- fluency
- ideas clearly stated and supported
- logically sequenced (coherence)
- connectives appropriately used (cohesion)

e) Mechanics

- spelling
- punctuation
- capitalization
- layout (indentation, margin)

c) Vocabulary

- mastery of words
- choice of words
- effective words/idioms

-legibility

-paragraphing

d) Language use

- concord
- tense
- number
- word order

From: *Jacobs et al. (1981) and Carroll and West (1989) cited in Italo (1999)*

Appendix C: Peer Feedback Checklist

Use the following questions as a guide to comment on your classmate's paragraph.

1. Is the content of the paragraph clear? What should be added and what should be reduced?
2. Is the organisation of the paragraph clear? Is there coherence in the ideas? How can the text's organisation be improved? Is the margining correct?
3. Are there cohesive devices (connectors) used? Are they clear? What should be added to improve the cohesion?
4. Are the vocabularies used clear? Are they appropriately used? What can you comment on the words used?
5. Is the grammar appropriately used? Is there any problem with tense, agreement, number, pronoun, etc. used?
6. Is there any problem with capitalisation and punctuation in the paragraph? Which ones are they? List/ underline them?
7. Are the words correctly spelt? How can the errors be corrected?
8. What are your general comments about the paragraph so that the writer would improve the text further?

Appendix D: Topics for Paragraph Writing

1. How to Get Good Grades in All subjects

- studying in schedules
- asking points not clear
- discussing with friends
- using reference materials
- taking care on exam times, etc.

2. Preparing Instant Coffee

- getting ready coffee powder and sugar
- boiling water
- arranging cups
- adding the powder into the cups
- stirring
- serving, etc.

3. How to Get to Adama University from Adama Bus Station

- go out of the station through the main gate, facing Palace Hotel
- turn left when you come to the road
- go straight until you come to the main road
- turn left and go straight until you come to the Adama Post Office, etc.

4. Story Telling

- think of any traditional story or any incident you have encountered
- write a paragraph about it
- give a title for your paragraph

5. The Use of Water

- for drinking by animals and humans
- for cleaning purposes
- for irrigation
- for generating electric power, etc.

Appendix E: Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (Developed by Cheng, 2004)

The following statements are designed to assess the fear (anxiety) you may have in writing. Read the statements below very carefully. For each statement, among the choices 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 *circle* the most suitable one for *you*. As the findings of this inventory are going to be used for research, I kindly request you to be honest while answering the questions.

You do not need to write your name.

1. *I strongly disagree*
2. *I disagree*
3. *I have no strong feelings either way*
4. *I agree*
5. *I strongly agree*

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 F: Analytic Scale Marking

Marks	Criteria
	Relevance and Adequacy of Content
0	The answer bears almost no relation to the task set; totally inadequate answer
1	Answer of limited relevance to the task set; possibly major gaps in treatment of topic and/ or pointless repetition
2	For the most part answers the task set, though there may be some gaps or redundant information
3	Relevant and adequate answer to the task set
	<i>Compositional Organisation</i>
0	No apparent organisation of content
1	Very little organisation of content, underlying structures not sufficiently apparent
2	Some organisational skills in evidence but not adequately controlled
3	Overall shape and internal pattern clear
	<i>Cohesion</i>
0	Cohesion almost totally absent -writing is so fragmentary that comprehension of the intended communication is virtually impossible
1	Unsatisfactory cohesion may cause difficulty in comprehension of most of the intended communication
2	For the most part satisfactory cohesion though occasional deficiencies may mean that certain parts of the communication are not always effective
3	Satisfactory use of cohesion resulting in effective communication
	<i>Adequacy of Vocabulary for purpose</i>
0	Vocabulary inadequate even for the most basic parts of the intended communication
1	Frequent inadequacies in vocabulary for the task. Perhaps frequent lexical inappropriacies and /or repetitions
2	Some inadequacies in vocabulary for the task. Perhaps some lexical inappropriacies and/or circumlocution
3	Almost no inadequacies in vocabulary for the task. Only rare inappropriacies and/or circumlocution
	<i>Grammar</i>
0	Almost all grammatical patterns inaccurate
1	Frequent grammatical inaccuracies
2	Some grammatical inaccuracies
3	Almost no grammatical inaccuracies
	<i>Mechanical Accuracy I (Punctuation)</i>
0	Ignorance of conventions of punctuation
1	Low standard of accuracy of punctuation
2	Some inaccuracies of punctuation
3	Almost no inaccuracies of punctuation
	<i>Mechanical Accuracy II (Spelling)</i>
0	Almost all spelling inaccurate
1	Low standard of accuracy in spelling
2	Some inaccuracies in spelling
3	Almost no inaccuracies in spelling

From: Alderson et al. (1995: 109-110)

Appendix G: Pre-training Writing Results of the Two Groups
Group 1 Writing Activity 1

w1																						
No.	con.			org.			coh.			voc.			Gr.			Mec.			sp.			sum av.
	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	
1	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.8	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	7.6
2	1	1	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1	0.8	1	1	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.0	6.8
3	3	2.5	2.8	3	2.5	2.8	3	2.5	2.8	3	2.5	2.8	2.5	1.5	2.0	1.5	2	1.8	2	2.5	2.3	17.0
4	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	6.0
5	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	1	1	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	1	0.5	0.8	6.5
6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	10.1
7	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.8	1	1	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1.5	1.3	5.0
8	1.5	2	1.8	1	1	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	1	1	1.0	8.6
9	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	5.5
10	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.8	2.5	1.5	2.0	1.5	2.5	2.0	12.0
11	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1	0.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	7.0
12	1	1	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	4.5
13	2	2	2.0	2	2	2.0	3	2	2.5	2	3	2.5	2.5	1.5	2.0	1.5	2	1.8	2	2	2.0	14.8
14	3	2.5	2.8	2	2	2.0	3	2.5	2.8	3	2	2.5	2	2.5	2.3	2	2	2.0	3	2.5	2.8	17.0
15	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	7.3
16	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1.5	1.3	1	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	6.0
17	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	4.8
sum			22.5			17.0			18.5			22.8			20.6			21.6			23.3	146.3
Av.			1.3			1.0			1.1			1.3			1.1			1.2			1.4	8.6

Rater 1 = r1

Rater 2 = r2

av. =average

Correlation of the two raters = 0.97

Group 1 Pre-training Writing Results
Writing Activity 2

w2																							
No.	con.			org.			coh.			voc.			gr.			mec.			sp.			sum av.	W1+w2 av.
	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.		
1	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	2	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	2	1	1.5	1	1	0.8	7.3	7.5
2	2	2	2.0	1	0.5	0.8	2	1	1.5	2	1.5	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	2	1.5	1.8	2	1	1.5	10.5	8.9
3	2.5	2	2.3	2.5	3	2.8	2	1.5	1.8	3	1.5	2.3	2	1.5	1.8	3	2	2.5	2	2.5	2.3	15.5	15.5
4	2	1.5	1.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2	1.8	3	1.5	2.3	1	1.5	1.3	3	1	2.0	11.3	9.0
5	1	2	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1	1.0	2	1	1.5	2	1	1.5	0	0.5	0.3	1	1.5	1.3	8.0	7.3
6	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	2	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	3	1.5	2.3	10.3	10.1
7	1.5	2.5	2.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1.0	1	2	1.5	2	1.5	1.8	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	8.8	7.0
8	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	3	2	2.5	2	2	2.0	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	2	1.5	1.8	11.3	10.3
9	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	2	0.5	1.3	1	2	1.5	2	0.5	1.3	0	0.5	0.3	0	0.5	0.3	6.3	5.8
10	2	2	2.0	1.5	1	1.3	2	1.5	1.8	2	1.5	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	10.3	11.0
11	1.5	2.5	2.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	2	1	1.5	1.5	2	1.8	1	0.5	0.8	1	1.5	1.3	2	1.5	1.8	9.5	8.5
12	2.5	1.5	2.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	1	1	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	8.8	6.5
13	3	2	2.5	1.5	2.5	2.0	3	2.5	2.8	3	2.5	2.8	2	2.5	2.3	3	1.5	2.3	1	1.5	1.3	15.8	15.4
14	2	2.5	2.3	2	2	2.0	3	2.5	2.8	3	1.5	2.3	3	2	2.5	3	2	2.5	2	2.5	2.3	16.5	16.8
15	1	2	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	0.5	0.8	1	0.5	0.8	1	0.5	0.8	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	6.8	6.7
16	1.5	1.5	1.5	0	1	0.5	3	1	2.0	3	1.5	2.3	1	1	1.0	0	1	0.5	1	1.5	1.3	9.0	8.0
17	1	2	1.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1.0	2	1	1.5	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	3	2	2.3	11.5	8.4
sum			30.3			17.0			27.5			29.8			24.8			23.0			24.8	177.0	162.4
Av.			1.8			1			1.6			1.8			1.5			1.4			1.5	10.5	9.6

Rater 1 = r1

Rater 2 = r2

av. = average

Correlation of the raters = 0.91

w1 = Writing activity 1

w2 = Writing activity 2

Group 2 Pre-training Writing Results
Writing Activity 1

No.	con.			org.			coh.			voc.			Gr.			Mec.			sp.			sum av.
	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	
1	1	0.5	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	1	0.5	0.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1	0.5	0.8	6.3
2	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	7.1
3	1	1	1.0	1	0.5	0.8	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	2	2	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2	1.8	10.3
4	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1.5	2.0	2	2.5	2.3	2	2.5	2.3	12.8
5	1.5	1	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	7.0
6	3	2.5	2.8	3	2.5	2.8	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	3	2.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	3	2	2.5	3	2	2.5	17.5
7	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	2	1.5	1.8	8.3
8	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	5.5
9	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1	0.5	0.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	2	1.5	1.8	8.0
10	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1	1.3	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	6.4
11	1	1	1.0	2	1.5	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	1	2	1.5	11.6
12	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	6.3
13	2	3	2.5	1.5	2	1.8	2	2	2.0	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	2	1.8	2	1.5	1.8	2	1.5	1.8	13.3
14	1.5	1	1.3	1	1	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	2	1.5	1.8	1	0.5	0.8	1	0.5	0.8	1.5	2	1.8	8.0
15	0.5	1	0.8	1	0.5	0.8	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	6.3
16	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	4.1
17	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	2.5	2.3	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	1.5	2.0	15.5
18	2	1	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	2	1.8	2	2	2.0	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	10.3
sum			23.3			22.2			23.2			23.8			23.1			24.1			24.8	164.3
av.			1.3			1.2			1.3			1.3			1.3			1.3			1.4	9.1

Rater 1 = r1

Rater 2 = r2

av. = average

Correlation of the raters = 0.92

Group 2 Pre-training Writing Results
Writing Activity 2

	w2																						
No.	con.			org.			coh.			voc.			gr.			mec.			sp.			sum av.	W1+w2 av.
	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.		
1	2	2.5	2.3	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	2	1.5	1.8	1	2	1.5	2	2.5	2.3	2	2.5	2.3	12.5	9.4
2	2	2	2.0	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	2.5	2.0	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	2	1.5	12.5	9.8
3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	2	1.5	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	1	1.5	10.0	10.1
4	1	2	1.5	1	1	1.0	2	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	8.5	10.6
5	1.5	2.5	2.0	1	1.5	1.3	3	2	2.5	2	2	2.0	1	1.5	1.3	1	2	1.5	1	1	1.0	11.5	9.3
6	1.5	2	1.8	3	1.5	2.3	3	2.5	2.8	3	2.5	2.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	15.3	16.4
7	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	2	2	2.0	3	1.5	2.3	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.8	12.8	10.5
8	2	2	2.0	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	2	1.5	1.8	2	1	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	2	1.5	10.0	7.8
9	1.5	1	1.3	2	1	1.5	2	1	1.5	1	0.5	0.8	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	2	1	1.5	9.0	8.5
10	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	3	1.5	2.3	1	1	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.0	9.0	7.7
11	2.5	1.5	2.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2.5	2.0	3	2.5	2.8	2.5	1.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2	1	1.5	14.0	12.8
12	1	2	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.0	2	1	1.5	1	2.5	1.8	1	2	1.5	2	1.5	1.8	10.0	8.2
13	2	2	2.0	0.5	1.5	1.0	2	1	1.5	2	1.5	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	2	1.5	1.8	1	1	1.0	10.3	11.8
14	1.5	0.5	1.0	0	0.5	0.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.0	2	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	0.5	0.8	7.0	7.5
15	2	1	1.5	0	0.5	0.3	2	1	1.5	2	1	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	7.0	6.7
16	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1	0.8	1	0	0.5	5.0	4.5
17	2.5	3	2.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	2	1.5	1.8	3	2.5	2.8	2	1.5	1.8	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	13.8	14.6
18	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.0	2	1.5	1.8	2	2	2.0	1.5	2.5	2.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	10.5	10.4
sum			30.3			20.8			30.3			30.8			27.0			25.3			24.3	188.5	176.4
av.			1.7			1.2			1.7			1.7			1.5			1.4			1.3	10.4	9.8

Rater 1 = r1

Rater 2 = r2

av. = average

Correlation of the raters = 0.78

w1 = Writing activity 1

w2 = Writing activity 2

Appendix H: Pre-training Writing Anxiety Inventory Results of the Two Groups

Group 1 Students' Pre-writing Anxiety Results

	No.	Items																						sum
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
<i>Subjects</i>	1	5	4	4	3	2	3	4	3	5	3	3	4	5	3	2	4	4	3	4	4	5	3	80
	2	5	4	3	4	4	3	5	4	3	4	4	5	5	4	3	4	4	3	5	3	5	4	88
	3	4	3	5	4	3	4	3	3	4	5	3	5	4	3	3	2	5	3	3	3	4	3	79
	4	5	4	4	3	4	5	3	4	5	3	2	3	4	5	4	3	4	4	5	4	5	4	87
	5	4	4	5	3	4	5	3	4	3	3	5	4	4	5	3	2	3	3	5	4	5	4	85
	6	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	99
	7	5	4	5	4	5	3	4	5	3	4	5	5	5	4	3	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	94
	8	4	3	5	3	4	3	3	4	2	5	3	4	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	5	3	75
	9	5	4	3	4	3	2	4	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	3	5	5	90
	10	5	5	4	4	3	4	5	4	4	3	5	5	3	4	2	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	88
	11	4	4	5	5	4	3	2	4	5	4	4	5	3	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	92
	12	5	4	3	4	4	3	3	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	3	4	5	4	4	3	3	89
	13	4	3	5	3	3	2	5	4	5	4	3	4	3	3	2	4	4	3	3	3	5	3	78
	14	4	3	3	2	3	3	4	4	3	2	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	5	3	4	3	74
	15	5	5	4	3	2	3	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	5	5	5	2	89
	16	5	4	3	4	5	4	4	3	5	5	4	3	3	4	5	3	4	4	5	4	4	5	90
	17	5	4	3	4	5	4	5	3	4	5	4	4	5	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	5	4	89
	Sum	79	67	68	61	63	58	66	69	68	67	67	71	66	68	57	61	68	63	73	64	78	64	1466
	Av.																							86.2

Group 2 Students' Pre-training Writing Anxiety Inventory Results

	Items																							
Subjects	No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	sum
	1	5	4	5	5	4	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	3	4	5	4	4	3	4	5	5	5	95
	2	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	3	4	5	5	5	4	4	3	3	3	5	5	4	93
	3	4	3	2	4	5	4	3	2	3	4	5	4	5	4	3	2	3	4	5	4	4	4	81
	4	5	4	5	4	5	3	4	4	5	3	4	2	4	5	4	4	4	4	3	5	5	4	90
	5	5	4	4	5	4	3	2	4	5	5	4	3	3	4	5	4	3	5	4	3	5	5	89
	6	4	3	3	2	3	4	5	4	4	3	3	4	3	5	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	79
	7	4	3	3	4	3	5	4	3	3	4	5	4	3	3	4	5	4	3	4	5	5	4	85
	8	5	4	5	4	5	3	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	5	5	94
	9	5	5	4	5	4	4	3	4	5	5	3	3	4	5	3	4	2	5	5	4	5	4	91
	10	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	3	4	5	3	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	95
	11	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	2	4	4	3	5	4	5	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	81
	12	5	4	4	3	3	5	4	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	4	3	5	4	3	4	5	5	90
	13	4	4	5	4	3	3	4	3	2	4	4	4	3	4	3	5	4	5	4	4	5	4	85
	14	4	3	4	2	2	4	3	4	4	5	4	2	5	2	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	75
	15	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	3	4	3	4	5	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	4	5	93
	16	4	5	5	4	3	4	5	3	4	3	4	3	5	3	5	4	3	2	2	5	5	4	85
	17	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	2	5	4	3	2	4	3	4	5	3	4	5	5	4	82
	18	4	4	5	4	4	3	2	4	3	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	88
Sum		81	69	76	70	69	67	69	67	66	72	72	69	70	73	69	74	66	67	68	77	84	76	1571
Avg																							87.3	

Appendix I: Post-training Writing Results of the Two Groups

Group 1, Writing Activity 1

w1																						
No.	con.			org.			coh.			voc.			gr.			Mec.			sp.			sum av.
	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	
1	1	1	1.0	1	0.5	0.8	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.8	6.8
2	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	2	1.5	1.5	1	1.3	10.0
3	1	2.5	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	2.5	1.8	1	2	1.5	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	10.8
4	2	1.5	1.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	0.5	0.8	1	1.5	1.3	1	2	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	8.8
5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.0	1	0.5	0.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	8.3
6	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1	0.8	1	2	1.5	1	1	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	0.5	1	0.8	7.8
7	1	1	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	7.3
8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	2.5	1.8	1	2.5	1.8	2	1.5	1.8	1	2	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	2	1.5	10.8
9	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	7.3
10	1	2	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	8.5
11	2	2.5	2.3	1	2.5	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.5	11.3
12	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1	2	1.5	1	1	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	9.0
13	2.5	2.5	2.5	2	1.5	1.8	2.5	2	2.3	2	1.5	1.8	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	2.5	2.0	1.5	2.5	2.0	14.8
14	3	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2	2.5	2.3	2	1.5	1.8	2.5	1.5	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	2.5	2	2.3	15.0
15	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1	2	1.5	2	2	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	11.8
16	1	2	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	9.0
17	1	1	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	7.0
sum			27.3			22.8			22.3			23.8			25.0			21.0			22.0	164.3
Av.			1.6			1.3			1.3			1.4			1.5			1.2			1.3	9.6

Rater 1 = r1

Rater 2 = r2

av. = average

Correlation of the raters = 0.76

Group 1 Post-training Writing Results
Writing Activity 2

	w2																					
No.	con.			org.			coh.			voc.			gr.			mec.			sp.			sum av.
	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	
1	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	8.5
2	2	2.5	2.3	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	2	1.8	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	2	2.5	2.3	14.0
3	1	2	1.5	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	10.3
4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1	2	1.5	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	9.3
5	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	11.3
6	2	2	2.0	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	7.3
7	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	8.5
8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	8.5
9	1	2	1.5	1	0.5	0.8	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1	1.0	8.0
10	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	1.5	2.5	2.0	1.5	1	1.3	1	1	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	11.6
11	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	2.0	2	2	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	2	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	12.0
12	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	0.5	0.8	6.0
13	2.5	2	2.3	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	2.5	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	2.0	1.5	2	1.8	2.5	2.5	2.5	14.3
14	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	2	1.8	2.5	1.5	2.0	1.5	2.5	2.0	15.5
15	0.5	1	0.8	1	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	6.5
16	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.0	0	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.8	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	6.8
17	1.5	2.5	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.3	10.5
sum			28.8			25.0			21.5			25.0			23.2			22.0			23.8	168.9
av.			1.7			1.5			1.3			1.5			1.4			1.3			1.4	9.9

Rater 1 = r1

Rater 2 = r2

av. = average

Correlation of the raters = 0.87

Group 1 Post-training Writing Results
Writing Activity 3

No.	w3																					Sum av.	W1+w2+w3I av.
	con.			org.			Coh.			voc.			gr.			mec.			sp.				
	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.		
1	1	2	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	1	0.8	8.0	7.7
2	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	1.5	2	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	2	1	1.5	9.6	11.2
3	3	2.5	2.8	3	2.5	2.8	2	2.5	2.3	3	2.5	2.8	2	2	2.0	1.5	2	1.8	3	2.5	2.8	17.1	12.7
4	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.8	2	2	2.0	1.5	2	1.8	2	1	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	11.8	10.0
5	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	1	0.5	0.8	1	0.5	0.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	0.5	0.8	7.3	8.3
6	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	7.6	8.9
7	1	2	1.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1	1.0	6.5	7.0
8	1.5	1	1.3	1	0.5	0.8	1	0.5	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	7.3	8.9
9	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.3	9.5	8.3
10	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	5.5	8.5
11	2	3	2.5	2	1.5	1.8	2.5	1.5	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	3	2.5	2.8	14.5	12.6
12	1	1	1.0	1	0.5	0.8	1	0.5	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1	1.0	6.5	7.2
13	2	2	2.0	2	2	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	3	2	2.5	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	1	1.5	1.3	13.3	14.1
14	3	2.5	2.8	2	2.5	2.3	3	2.5	2.8	2.5	2	2.3	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	3	2.5	2.8	17.5	16.0
15	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	1	0.5	0.8	1.5	1	1.3	1	1	1.0	1	2	1.5	2	1.5	1.8	8.5	8.9
16	0.5	2	1.3	0.5	1	0.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	1	1	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	6.5	7.4
17	1.5	2	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1	1.3	9.3	8.9
sum			27.5			20.8			22.0			25.5			21.1			25.5			23.8	166.4	166.4
av.			1.6			1.2			1.3			1.5			1.2			1.5			1.4	9.8	9.8

Rater 1 = r1

Rater 2 = r2

av. = average

Correlation of the raters = 0.94

w1 = Writing activity 1

w2 = Writing activity 2

w3 = Writing activity 3

Group 2 Post-training Writing Results

Writing Activity 1

w1																						
No.	con.			org.			coh.			voc.			gr.			mec.			sp.			sum av.
	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	
1	2	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	2.0	1.8	10.5
2	1	1	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1	1.3	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	9.3
3	2	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.3	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	2	2.5	2.3	10.9
4	1.5	1	1.3	1	0.5	0.8	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	7.3
5	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	2	1.5	1.8	1	1.0	1.0	9.3
6	2	2	2.0	1	2	1.5	2	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1.5	2.0	2.5	2	2.3	12.1
7	2.5	2.5	2.5	2	2	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	2.5	3	2.8	2	2.5	2.3	2	2.0	2.0	14.6
8	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	0.5	0.8	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.0	6.5
9	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	2	2.5	2.3	2	2	2.0	2	2.5	2.3	12.8
10	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	8.3
11	2.5	1.5	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2	1.8	2	1	1.5	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	13.3
12	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	0	0.3	0	0.5	0.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.3	6.3
13	1.5	2	1.8	2	1.5	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	3	2.8	2.5	3	2.8	2.5	3.0	2.8	14.6
14	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	1	1.3	2.5	1.5	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	1.5	1.0	1.3	11.0
15	1.5	1	1.3	2	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1.0	1.3	9.3
16	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	9.0
17	3	2.5	2.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	15.1
18	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.8	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2	1.8	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	11.8
sum			28.5			23.3			25.1			25.3			29.6			30.1			29.8	191.6
av.			1.6			1.3			1.4			1.4			1.6			1.7			1.7	10.6

Rater 1 = r1

Rater 2 = r2

av. = average

Correlation of the raters = 0.85

G2 Post-training Writing Results

Writing Activity 2

	w2																					
No.	con.			org.			coh.			voc.			gr.			mec.			sp.			sum av.
	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	
1	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	7.8
2	1.5	1	1.3	1	0.5	0.8	1.5	1	1.3	1	1	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	0.5	1.0	7.6
3	1.5	2	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	13.6
4	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.8	8.6
5	1.5	2	1.8	1	1	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	2.5	2	2.3	2	2	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	12.6
6	2	1.5	1.8	2	2	2.0	2	2	2.0	1	1.5	1.3	2	2	2.0	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	3	2.8	14.2
7	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	2	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	14.8
8	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	7.3
9	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1	1.3	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	1.5	2.0	1.5	2.5	2.0	11.3
10	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	6.8
11	1.5	2	1.8	2	1	1.5	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.8	2.5	3	2.8	2.5	2	2.3	13.9
12	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	7.0
13	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	2.5	2.3	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	13.3
14	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	2	1.5	1.8	8.4
15	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	3	2.8	2	2.5	2.3	13.1
16	1	1	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	1	1	1.0	8.6
17	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	2	2	2.0	2	3	2.5	2.5	2	2.3	2.5	3	2.8	16.3
18	2	1.5	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	2	1.5	1.8	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	3	2.8	2.5	2	2.3	13.1
sum			24.9			21.8			26.1			25.4			31.9			33.8			33.9	197.6
av.			1.4			1.2			1.4			1.4			1.8			1.9			1.9	10.9

Rater 1 = r1

Rater 2 = r2

av. = average

Correlation of the raters = 0.92

G2 Post-training Writing Results

Writing Activity 3

	w3																						W1+w2+w3 av.
No.	con.			org.			coh.			voc.			gr.			mec.			sp.			sum av.	
	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.	r1	r2	av.		
1	1	1.5	1.3	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	2	1	1.5	2	1	1.5	8.3	8.8
2	0.5	1	0.8	0	0.5	0.3	0	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	5.6	7.5	
3	1.5	2	1.8	1	1.5	1.3	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	1.5	2.0	14.1	12.8
4	1	1	1.0	1	1	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	2	2.5	2.3	9.6	8.5
5	1	1.5	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1	0.5	0.8	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	9.0	10.3
6	2	2	2.0	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	2	2.0	2.5	3	2.8	2	1	1.5	2	2.5	2.3	13.9	13.4
7	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	2.5	2.3	3	2.5	2.8	2	1.5	1.8	2.5	3	2.8	2	2	2.0	3	2.5	2.8	16.4	15.2
8	1	0.5	0.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	2	1.8	2	2	2.0	10.1	8.0
9	0.5	1	0.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5	1	0.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.8	2.5	2	2.3	2	2.5	2.3	10.3	11.5
10	1	1	1.0	0	0.5	0.3	1.5	0.5	1.0	1	2	1.5	1	1	1.0	1.5	2	1.8	1.5	2	1.8	8.3	7.8
11	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	1.5	1.8	2	2.5	2.3	2	2	2.0	2	2.5	2.3	1.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	1.5	2.0	14.3	13.8
12	0.5	1.5	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	0	1	0.5	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1	2	1.5	0.5	1	0.8	7.3	6.9
13	2	1.5	1.8	2	1.5	1.8	2	1.5	1.8	1.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	3	2.8	2.5	1.5	2.0	2	2.5	2.3	14.3	14.0
14	1	1	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	2	1.5	1.8	2.5	2.5	2.5	10.6	10.0
15	1.5	2.5	2.0	2	1	1.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3	2.5	2.8	2.5	3	2.8	2.5	2.5	2.5	3	2.5	2.8	16.8	13.0
16	0.5	1	0.8	1.5	0.5	1.0	1.5	1	1.3	1	1	1.0	1	1.5	1.3	1.5	2	1.8	0.5	1.5	1.0	8.0	8.5
17	1.5	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2	2.5	2.3	2.5	1.5	2.0	2.5	2	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5	2	2.5	2.3	15.9	15.8
18	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.8	0.5	1	0.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.3	0.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	7.3	10.7
sum			23.5			23.5			24.8			27.8			33.1			32.5			34.4	199.5	196.2
av.			1.3			1.3			1.4			1.5			1.8			1.8			1.9	11.1	10.9

Rater 1 = r1

Rater 2 = r2

av. = average

Correlation of the raters = 0.96

w1 = Writing activity 1

w2 = Writing activity 2

w3 = Writing activity 3

Appendix J: Post-training Writing Anxiety Inventory Results of the Two Groups

Group 1 (Control Group) Students Postwriting Anxiety Results

Items																								
	No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	Sum
subjects	1	5	4	3	4	5	4	4	3	4	5	4	4	5	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	5	4	88
	2	5	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	5	4	3	3	4	5	2	3	4	4	4	5	5	84
	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	2	3	2	4	3	4	4	2	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	75
	4	5	5	4	3	3	3	3	5	3	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	5	5	3	88
	5	5	5	4	4	3	4	5	4	3	3	5	5	3	4	3	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	91
	6	5	4	3	4	5	3	4	5	5	4	3	4	5	3	4	5	3	5	4	3	4	4	89
	7	4	4	5	3	4	5	3	4	4	2	3	5	4	5	4	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	89
	8	4	2	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	5	3	2	4	4	3	74
	9	5	4	5	4	5	3	4	5	4	3	5	4	5	5	3	4	4	3	3	4	5	5	92
	10	5	4	5	4	4	3	4	5	5	4	3	5	5	3	3	4	3	4	5	4	3	4	89
	11	4	3	4	5	4	4	2	3	4	3	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	3	4	4	5	4	89
	12	5	4	5	4	5	3	3	4	5	4	3	5	5	4	3	4	5	4	5	3	5	5	93
	13	3	3	4	3	4	2	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	5	2	4	3	4	3	5	4	4	76
	14	3	3	4	3	2	2	1	3	4	3	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	3	72
	15	5	4	4	3	4	5	3	4	3	4	5	3	4	5	4	3	3	4	5	4	5	4	88
	16	4	3	5	4	5	3	3	4	5	5	4	3	5	4	5	3	4	5	4	5	5	5	93
	17	5	4	4	3	2	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	5	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	79
Sum		76	63	69	61	67	58	55	66	64	61	63	69	70	66	63	64	65	67	66	71	77	68	1449
Av.																								85.2

Group 2 (Experimental Group) Students' Postwriting Anxiety Results

	Items																							
Subjects	No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	sum
	1	5	4	4	3	4	3	3	5	4	4	5	4	2	3	4	5	4	3	3	4	5	4	85
	2	4	4	3	5	5	4	3	5	5	3	4	2	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	5	4	4	84
	3	4	3	5	3	4	3	5	4	3	4	5	3	4	4	3	2	3	3	5	4	4	3	81
	4	5	3	4	4	5	3	4	4	3	3	4	2	4	5	4	3	5	4	5	5	4	3	86
	5	5	3	2	5	4	3	5	3	4	4	3	2	3	4	3	2	4	5	4	3	3	4	78
	6	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	2	4	3	4	3	2	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	69
	7	4	2	3	4	3	2	3	5	3	5	3	4	3	3	4	2	5	3	5	4	3	3	76
	8	5	4	5	3	5	3	4	4	4	5	4	3	2	3	4	3	4	4	3	5	4	5	86
	9	4	4	2	4	3	2	3	3	5	4	3	2	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	5	3	73
	10	5	3	3	4	3	2	5	4	3	5	5	3	4	3	4	3	5	5	3	5	4	4	85
	11	3	2	3	3	4	3	2	2	4	3	4	3	4	5	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	2	71
	12	5	3	4	3	4	5	4	3	4	4	5	5	4	5	3	5	4	3	4	3	5	4	89
	13	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	5	3	4	2	3	4	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	70
	14	4	2	3	2	5	4	3	4	4	5	3	2	4	4	3	4	5	4	5	3	4	3	80
	15	5	3	4	3	5	3	5	5	3	5	5	3	4	5	4	3	5	3	4	3	5	5	90
	16	4	5	4	3	4	5	5	4	4	4	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	5	3	5	4	4	93
	17	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	2	3	3	5	2	2	3	3	4	5	3	2	3	4	3	71
	18	4	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	4	5	4	3	2	3	5	3	4	2	3	4	5	3	75
	Sum	75	56	64	61	72	56	69	65	69	72	73	52	58	69	64	60	71	64	67	69	73	63	1442
	Av.																							80.1

Appendix K: Questionnaire for the Experimental Group Students

Dear Student:

The following statements are related to your perception of the practice of giving and receiving comments to and from your classmates on writing. Think about the comments you have been giving and receiving during the writing activities for the last three weeks. Then, put a tick mark (✓) in front of each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each.

Note: 1= Strongly agree

2= Agree

3= No idea

4= Disagree

5= Strongly disagree

You don't need to write your name.

Thank you!

No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5
1	Classmates' Comments helped me to rewrite my first draft.					
2	Classmates' comments were important as they are not for marking.					
3	Comments from classmates helped me to improve my writing.					
4	Knowing what to do during peer commenting helped me to know how to give and receive comments.					
5	Peer commenting increased the number of people who read my writing.					
6	My classmates gave me useful comments on the content of my writing.					
7	My classmates gave me useful comments on the form of my writing.					
8	My classmates gave me useful comments on content and form of my writing.					
9	I incorporated most of my classmates' comments into my second writing when I found the comments useful.					
10	Since students' comments were misleading and useless, I did not use their comments.					
11	Exchanging comments with classmates made me more active in the writing process					
12	Exchanging comments with my classmates on writing increased my confidence in writing.					
13	Exchanging comments helped me to reduce the fear I have in writing.					
14	Exchanging comments was interesting.					
15	In general, I liked the comments from my classmates.					

16. Add any comments you feel about the comments you have been giving to and receiving from each other on the writing activities for the last four weeks. Evaluate the whole process.

Appendix L: Interview Questions for the Experimental Students

This interview is concerned with the perceptions you have regarding the comments you were giving and receiving on the writing activities since the beginning of the training. I kindly request you to be genuine in your responses.

1. As stated earlier, you have been taking part in the writing activities by giving and receiving comments to and from your classmates in your writing activities. Have you liked it or not? Why?
2. Do you think that exchanging comments on the first draft improves writing? Yes/No? How?
3. What can you say specifically about the advantages of giving and receiving comments during writing the first draft?
4. Do you think that exchanging comments during writing reduces students' anxiety (fear) towards writing? How?
5. What areas of writing (organisation, content, layout, grammar, spelling punctuation, capitalization) can classmates' comments improve?
6. How did you incorporate (use) the comments given by your classmates? I mean, did you use all the comments given or did you use the comments selectively? Why?
7. In general, what can you say about the use of classmates' comments in the process of writing?

Appendix M: Transcription of the Interview

This interview is concerned with the perceptions you have regarding the comments you were giving and receiving on the writing activities. I kindly request you to be genuine in your responses.

Q1. As stated earlier you've been taking part in the writing activities by giving and receiving comments to and from your classmates in your writing activities. Have you liked it or not and why?

Student 1: Yes, I like it because it gives us an opportunity to write ... without a fear. I think this is my opinion.

Student 2: Yes, I liked so much, because I learn so much things from it and I will be such teacher for my students for the coming, I learn so much things from that.

Student 3: I would like to comment on this that this comment help me to keep on my fearer to keep on this kind of thing and it can help us to do things that we have done before. This is what I could like to say.

Student 4: Okey, I would, eh ... I would like to say thank you very much for giving me this chance first, and about the comments I have received from my friends, it, I think it is quite good for us, for me, eh ... it's because of it is personal question, I can say I. It gives me, it has given me so much eh ... too much eh ... eh improvement on my writing skill, and on I also will like to see it and direction of my comment, the comment I given for my friends it has also provide me some knowledge some how to correct or have to rewrite eh, s ... students paragraph.

Student 5: Honestly speaking, it is good, eh for a future we have, e ... hee ... become a teacher and to ... to capable writing it is very important for us.

Q2. Do you think that exchanging comments on the first drafts improves writing? Yes/No, how?

Student 1: I think it is yes. My answer is yes because sit helps to know the punctuation, and the organisations of the statement to be correct with our... with our friends' comments. That is my ...

Student 2: Eh... eh- I think it is the ... I ... it help me to improve my punctuation my organisation of paragraphs and I learn so much from it.

Student 3: Yes, it helps us in many ways because in the draft we may have some problems and that problems might be evaluated by friends and within that comment our, I might were a good paragraphs.

Student 4: Yes, of course. i.e. ...I would like to reply for this by bye... the change I have made for myself, by the improvement I have made; and I have seen it from myself and now it is practical.

Student 5: I say yes, first yes because eh may... my friends have many knowledge, eh ... el ... we are not equal in knowledge but eh ... the when they comment me I get some emm ... improvement from them and it made me improve my mistakes.

Q3. Very specifically, what can you say about the advantages of giving and receiving comments during writing the first draft?

Student 1: eh ... giving eh-eh my comment on giving this giving and receiving eh comments from friends and giving them the chance eh ... in my opinion I think this is kinds of activity is good because eh ... I may see the problems of they don't see and that may be a good help for them and for me too.

Student 2: It has many advantages for the ... improve our writing skills eh- they know eh, what I miss my mistake and I improve my mistake and it has many advantages.

Student 3: Ok. There is advantage that we can get from peer friends. Here, for example, we might be mistaken for the first one and after that we can be eh, corrected. And then there is a proverb which says, 'M ... many hands make light work' this can be work out here. This is ...

Student 4: I think it is quite difficult ehh ..., I mean when you give comment you are able to understand no have... now how to you have to know to give it comments or to eh correct eh the given paragraph and ... eh, I think it is, I think it's good and eh ... ehh ... quite difficult, both.

Student 5: Eh I, I, I comment xxx ... xxx ... eh ... advantages like I, eh, before I made many mistakes or errors and when they comment me I get er ... knowledge from them and they are most of them are capable and thy made me eh-e-h improve my writing paragraphs.

Q4. Do you think that giving and receiving comments reduces students' anxiety or fear forwards writing? How?

Student 1: Yes ... I think this is a good, it is a good eh ... this is a good advantage for students to get comments from students eh... from the peers because is the first they get comment and the know how the eh they don't eh....

Student 2: Yes, It is. It reduces the fear? And anxiety of the students, for example ehm-h-em ... first my fear because we trying first and after that improve eh after getting the comments I am improve my mistakes and this reduces about my fear.

Student 3: Yes, I think so, you know because the main think that we should bear in our mind eh-whenver we are sit to write a paragraph we should develop confidence and whenever we write something we can just solve our fear and anxiety because whenever we are given a kind of writing that we should eh ... keep on writing and then we can develop our self confidence.

Student 4: Yes, I believe so because ehh ... when you give comments and receive comments you are able to practice well and practice makes you perfect when you became perfect you became confident.

Student 5: Her-eh. Personally, ehm... the comment of p eh ... my peer it is ehh ... it made me accept without any fear and it made ehh ... it make me it is perfect.

Q5. What areas of writing that means organisation, content, layout, grammar, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, etc. Can classmates' comments improve?

Student1: Er... but eh. I didn't want to say 100 percent. It minimizes some percents, my class rather my teacher ... I think ... emm ... grammar.

Student 2: Ok. What ... from what I received before I think they are better than better on commenting ehe, spelling, punctuation, and grammar, no no ... not grammar but spelling, punctuation and coherence, order these kinds of elements of paragraph, not the grammar part, the contest th other parts of the paragraph.

Student3: Eh- yes, I would like to add that my friends or my peer friends shown me something that, they always comment me on the grammar part, I don't know why, that it might be my problem, but it might not be mine ut they comment m on this way and also punctuation, and others.

Student 4: My classmate students give me eh ... comments ... eh on punctuation, grammar coherence and... mostly on punctuation they can comment.

Student5: I think ... eh ... most o the students are commenting on punctuation, are grammar and a little bit on layout, sometimes in organisation but, most of the time they comment on punctuation, and capitalization, such kind of things.

Q6. How did you incorporate or include the comments given by your classmates, I mean, did you use all the comments given or did you us the comments them selectively?

Student 1: Eh ... most of the time I use selectively but eh ... some of the students they give a comment eh... it some of them make error most of them are not correct.

Student 2: No, I use the comments selectively because they eh ... they often make a mistake, and I, I tried to know ... see the better one, and the given me correctly, a ... and ... I use it that way.

Student 3: Em ... because my friends are not that much know how because I have to be selective I have no ... we have to be selective in that way because the ... they might be mistaken.

Student 4: No, I use selectively because they make some mistakes and ee ... I ... used that ... I used before.

Student 5: I use it in selective way eh ... because eem ... many students may be wrong or right in giving comments, so I ... I have to be selective in eh receiving comments because they make mistakes, they might made me mistake on my next writing so I ... I have to be selective.

Q7. In general, what can you say about the use of classmates 'comments in the process of writing?

Student 1: E ... e. I ... say ... I want to say personally, it is very important to improve our writing skills ee... the comments they given for me it is e ... I say it is good.

Student 2: Ok, I think it has haa ... a very good eh ... contribution for all of us, for students to became a good e ... writer and ... er ... to develop our skill based on that we can ee ... rewrite or correct um ... eh ... peer's paragraph writing, and that eh ... e ... makes us how to know the ee ... correcting part or how to ... practice ehe ... and ...xxxx Them ... their work and ... I think it has great contribution for us.

Student 3: Um, in general it is very important thing and that it contributes many things for teaching-learning process, and it should be continued and not, in fact not the last, it should be continued and not, in fact not the last, it should be continued, that I would like to say.

Student 4: I think it is modern creativity, and ... I appreciate this xxx I would like to use um ... such thing for the coming ... in my class, and ... I will learn such a way for my students.

Student 5: I think it is better, ... is very good giving comments and deceiving comments from my peers ... friends because it gives us e ... the opportunity to write motivate way, not in anxiety way ... so I think it is good for our writing to we can be motivated to write a paragraph without anzayiti (anxiety). That is my comment.

Appendix N: Sample Peer Comments

Appendix O: Sample Marked Text

Appendix P: Statistical t-table

From: Bachman (2004), Statistical Analyses for Language Assessment

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and that all sources of materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

NAME : TEMESGEN CHIBSA

SIGNATURE : _____

PLACE : ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY, DFL

DATE OF SUBMISSION : FEBRUARY 28, 2008