

The Effect of Peer Feedback on EFL Learners' Classroom Anxiety

Khalil Motallebzadeh¹, Ali Kondori², Sara Kazemi^{2,*}

¹Faculty Member, English Department, Islamic Azad University, Torbat-e-Heydarieh Branch, Iran.

²PhD Candidate, English Department, Islamic Azad University, Torbat-e-Heydarieh Branch, Iran.

Received 17 December 2019

Accepted 09 April 2020

Abstract

English is learned as a foreign language (EFL) in Iran, but because of the limited opportunities to practice or use it in an everyday life environment, it is not easy to make any distinguishable improvement unless the learners are very interested and active ones. When learning in this kind of EFL environment, students are very likely to experience a certain level of language anxiety, which have some damaging effect on language learning acquisition (Chen & Chang, 2004). As such studies about learners' language anxiety are very important not only in improving learners' language proficiency, but also in achieving a targeted syllabus objective or a particular teaching goal. This study aimed to explore the effect of peer feedback on the learners' classroom anxiety specifically focused on speaking ability. To this end, having administered a test of homogeneity among 70 upper-intermediate EFL male students, the researchers finally selected 50 students who were at the same level of English proficiency and were assigned to two groups- the experimental and the control group- each consisting of 25 participants. For collecting the required data, one homogenizing test, one questionnaire, a semi-structured interview and an opinion test were employed in the study. Having done analysis, the results revealed that peer feedback as a technique, has a significant effect on reducing students' anxiety. The qualitative data from the interview also revealed that the students took benefits from the peer feedback process and enjoyed the course.

Keywords: *Peer Feedback, Upper-intermediate Learner, EFL Learners, Classroom Anxiety*

Introduction

Many foreign language learners encounter great difficulty in learning the language while others find it less difficult and for a long time educators have searched for the reasons behind it. Underachievers are those students who have difficulty learning a foreign language. Lots of affective factors have been known which are influential in language learning such as attitude,

anxiety, motivation and beliefs about foreign language learning and anxiety as a determining factor has been given much attention. Zheng (2008) believed that foreign language learning can sometimes be a traumatic experience for language learners. Skehan (1989) mentioned that there are various factors affecting the learning of a foreign language such as age, intelligence, motivation, attitude, gender, personality, anxiety and so on. Language acquisition happens naturally but learning a foreign language that happens in the classroom is full of challenges for most of the students. One of these known challenges, according to Wu (2010), comes from the learners' anxiety.

There have been many studies about foreign language anxiety and the difficulties caused by this feeling with respect to activities such as listening, speaking, reading and writing. It has been shown that anxiety can have a negative effect on students' achievement and performance. According to MacIntyre (1995), anxiety can cause students to separate their attention to different sceneries at the same time; therefore, they cannot perform a good job in learning. However, there has been little study about the ways of decreasing and lessening this negative feeling. Consequently, in the present study the researchers aimed to investigate the effect of peer feedback on the students' foreign language anxiety in the classroom. To address the objective of the study, the researchers posed the following questions:

Q₁: Does peer feedback have any significant effects on the Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners' classroom anxiety?

Q₂: What are the Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners' opinions towards using peer feedback in the classroom?

Review of the Literature

Students enjoy working with each other. They can give and receive important and valuable opinions, suggestions, and compliments from a peer if given opportunities. In language education, peer feedback is a practice where one student gives feedback to another. The comments from peers are called peer feedback. So, peer feedback is a two-way process in which one cooperates with the other.

The concept of peer feedback is supported by several learning theories. Based on Collaborative learning theory (Bruffee, 1984) learning is a social process. This is a kind of communication among peers and the discussions generated help learners to negotiate meaning and understanding. According to Vygotsky (1978), the concept of 'Scaffolding', traditionally refers to a more experienced peer supporting the learning of less experienced student. Vygotsky in his 'Zone of Proximal Development' emphasizes that the cognitive development of individuals is a result of social interaction. He believes that children develop linguistically and cognitively in collaboration with more capable members of society.

Over the last 10 years, most empirical studies in the SL/FL contexts have demonstrated the benefit of corrective feedback in improving learners' speaking and writing abilities. For instance, Lyster (2004) conducted research on pre- and post-test designs with 179 fifth-grade students of French as L2, allocating them into two experimental groups with different feedback types and

one control group with no feedback provided. The results showed that the group that received feedback and was pushed to be more accurate in their output outperformed the other two groups in both oral and written post-tests. Mackey's (2006) research with 28 university learners of English in the USA also demonstrated the effectiveness of interactional feedback from the teacher. In her research, the students were allocated into one experimental group with the provision of feedback and a control group without any feedback at all. The results showed that in the post-test, the experimental group outperformed the control group on the tasks involving English plurals and past tense.

Some researchers generated similar results. Ellis, Loewen and Erlam's (2006) conducted an experimental study with 34 adult learners of English at a private language school in New Zealand. The results showed that in a post-test (involving oral and written tasks) with a focus on English regular past tense, two experimental groups with either implicit or explicit feedback outperformed the control group with no feedback provided. The study also showed that the group receiving explicit feedback involving grammar explanation outperformed the other experimental group which received implicit feedback involving the reformulation of problematic utterances.

Shehadeh (2011) believed that learning takes place through face-to-face interaction and shared processes. In foreign language settings, it has also been understood that peer feedback provides learners with opportunities to use language in a meaningful way.

Steen-Utheim et. al. (2019) believed that receiving feedback is important for students' learning and studies have shown that students can have a number of difficulties when trying to learn from feedback. Working on feedback and its impact on higher education students, Agricola et. al. (2020) believed that verbal feedback has a great impact on students' feedback perception but cannot improve students' self-efficacy, or motivation.

Ferris (2003) and Storch (2004) mentioned that peer feedback helps students become more self-aware, that is they notice the gap between how they and others perceive their writing, thus enhances self-reflection and self-expression, facilitates the development of critical and analytical reading and writing skills, promotes a sense of co-ownership, and therefore encourages students to contribute to making decision, and finally, it improves reflective thinking.

Jiang et. al. (2020) studied the effect of supervisor feedback for undergraduate thesis writing from three aspects: error feedback, non-error feedback and the focus of supervisor feedback. Findings of their study revealed that both error feedback and non-error feedback can improve the writing of students. Moreover, Smith (2017) worked on collaborative peer feedback and proposed a model to increase the quality of peer feedback and describe its implementation and believed that receiving feedback has a great influence on students' achievement.

Empirical research regarding corrective feedback in the 2000s continued to examine the effectiveness of corrective feedback and different feedback types. Most studies have demonstrated that corrective feedback has positive impacts on learners' improvement in terms of accuracy in SL or FL learning. Ellis (2009) explicitly claims that corrective feedback is beneficial and should be provided.

Anxiety

English is learned as a foreign language (EFL) in Iran, but because of the limited opportunities to practice or use it in an everyday life environment, it is not easy to make any distinguishable improvement unless they are very interested and active learners. When learning in this kind of EFL environment, students are very likely to experience a certain level of language anxiety, which has some damaging effect on their language learning (Chen & Chang, 2004).

Inconsistent results have been revealed in these early researches exploring the relationship between anxiety and the teaching of language. Some studies found negative relationship, several other studies found positive relationship; few others found no relationship between anxiety and language learning. Some researchers have attempted to study this area more specifically, with more consistent results. Horwitz et. al. (1986), Young (1991) and MacIntyre & Gardner (1994) revealed the relationship between anxiety and English language learning which showed the presence of foreign language anxiety among learners. However, most of such researches revealed consistent moderate negative correlation between language anxiety and language learning specifically achievement (Horwitz, 2001). In a research done by De Costa (2015), a critical and interdisciplinary perspective of language anxiety was explored.

Some researchers have grouped anxiety into two groups. One is facilitative and the other is debilitating. Facilitative anxiety refers to an advantage which results in improved performance. Debilitative anxiety is considered to be detrimental which leads to poor performance. Anxious thoughts can disrupt cognitive control (Bellinger et. al, 2015). According to Ando (1999), the former is associated with positive performance, whereas the latter is induced by negative results and may lead to poor performance. When teachers find their students anxious, they should decide whether their anxiety is truly disadvantageous. Such a finding is supported by Backman's (1976) study, in which the two least linguistically competent subjects scored the highest and the lowest on the anxiety scale. According to von Worde (1998), Young (1990) anxiety is a factor that may lead to improvement in performance and thus called facilitating anxiety and it may lead also to impaired performance and hence known as debilitating anxiety. Further, Bailey (1983) mentioned that facilitative anxiety results in achievement in second language learning. In this study, hence, anxiety is examined from the debilitating aspect.

Rezazadeh and Tavakoli (2009) had an investigation in the Iranian context. They studied the relationship between levels of test anxiety and gender, academic achievement, years of study among Iranian EFL learners. They found that female students had a higher level of test anxiety and there was no meaningful relationship between test anxiety and years of study. In another study also, MacIntyre and Devaele (2014) said that female learners reported more anxiety in a foreign language classroom.

Method

Participants and Setting

In this study, sample population was selected from Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners, studying at Gooyesh Language Institute in Mashhad, Iran. Having administered a test of

homogeneity among 70 upper-intermediate EFL male students, the researcher finally selected 50 students who were at the same level of English proficiency. Also, the participants' native language was Farsi and their age ranged from 14 – 18. The researcher assigned the participants into two groups- the experimental and the control group- each consisting of 25 participants. The educational setting was selected based on the accessibility and availability of the researcher.

Instrumentation

For collecting the required data, one homogenizing test, one questionnaire and an opinion test were employed in the study. Each of which is going to be discussed thoroughly in the following sections.

The Objective Placement Test

The objective Placement Test (upper Intermediate) was selected from the Placement and Evaluation Package Interchange Third Edition/Passages second Edition (Lesley, Hasen & Zukowski, 2008) as the homogenizing test. The objective placement test consists of three sections: Listening (20 items), Reading (20 items), and language Use (30 items), and requires 50 minutes to administer. The questions in the Listening, Reading, and language Use sections consists of four – option multiple – choice items. The maximum score of the test was 70. In order to select the participants from the same language proficiency, the researchers used the scoring guidelines of the objective placement test. Therefore, the participants whose scores were between 50 and 55 were as the participants of the current study.

The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Questionnaire

In second-language learning, Language-learning anxiety is an established concept and can be measured by questionnaires. The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), which was developed by Horwitz et al. (1986), has been extensively used to measure the extent of students' anxiety levels during language classes. The FLCAS contains 33 items on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree with an option of neutral. The FLCAS will be designed to investigate students' language anxiety concerning communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation (Horwitz et al., 1991). The FLCAS has been rigorously validated for internal reliability, test-retest reliability, and construct validity (Horwitz, 1991; Horwitz et al., 1986). Other studies using the FLCAS also yielded high reliability scores. For example, in a study by Eslami (2010), the FLCAS showed an internal reliability of .94.

Interview

In order to ask the participants' opinions about using peer feedback in the classroom an interview was run and the students in the experimental group were asked eight open-ended questions. The questions were asked in English. The time allocated for each interview was five minutes. Therefore, the whole time for this interview was 25 minutes.

Procedure

First of all, researchers administered a test which was selected from the *Placement and Evaluation Package of Interchange Third edition/passages Second Edition* (Lesley, Hasen, & Zukowski, 2008) as the homogenizing test among 70 Upper-intermediate male students who studied at Gooyesh Language Institute in Mashhad, Iran. Based on the result of the homogenizing test, fifty students who were at the same level of proficiency were selected as the participants for this study. Then the students were divided into two equal groups as control and experimental and they were distributed in each group similarly. All the participants were male. They aged 14 – 18 and their average was 16. Then, in order to check the learners' level of anxiety, the researcher administered the FLCA questionnaire for two groups. The time allocated for each student was 15 minutes. This study lasted about nine weeks and in each week two sessions were set for 90 minutes. A quasi-experimental design with a variety of data collection methods was carried out for both control and experimental groups. The procedure mainly focused on investigating the difference between pre- and post-measures (e.g. pre- and post-tests) within each class. The research methods employed in the design for both classes included: pre- and post FLCA questionnaire, and post open-ended interview for just experimental group and the treatment included eight L2 English-speaking lessons.

The English-speaking lessons were designed to elicit the learners' feedback behaviors in experimental group. The pre- and post FLCA questionnaire was used in order to address Research Question one. The open-ended interview was expected to respond to the Research Questions two. Students in the experimental group first learned useful functions for conducting discussions, such as giving opinions, reasons, and examples, and then participated in discussions on various topics using the phrases they learned. Since the participants were predominantly accustomed to teacher-centered instruction in their previous learning experiences, the first two sessions of the course were conducted with more guidance from the teacher. During this time, all the learners in the experimental group received instruction about the purpose of the course, the structure of the tests, the type of tasks involved and the expectation for their performance in the class. For instance, the learners were explicitly asked to try their best to answer all the questions in English. The learners were also explicitly told to try their best to produce longer utterances when performing the tasks. This act resulted from an agreement between the researchers and the participants that all the participants were to be fully informed about the research design as long as no other participants' privacy or welfare was put at risk. In other words, they learned the basic skills of English discussion and how to work in a student-centered classroom. Peer feedback was introduced in week two. All the participants worked ingroups of five. They were asked to monitor their peers while participating in a 45-minute group discussion.

Eight 90-minute English-speaking lesson for the experimental group was designed to prompt the provision of peer feedback while the given tasks were performed. The lessons took place once a week. For each lesson, the learners were given a task that was different from the tasks given in the other seven lessons. Each week, the students in experimental group were given a topic to discuss in groups of five. Each member of the group was encouraged to do five things in

each lesson: 1) perform a speaking task in groups (all groups were asked to perform the same given task), 2) take a role in the group work and provide different types of feedback to each other during the group work. 4) give a presentation in front of the whole class after the group work and 5) provide feedback on other groups' presentations. All groups were given time to discuss the topic or issue before discussing as a group in front of the other students in class.

For experimental group, each lesson started with an introduction for the learners to teacher feedback types. The learners were introduced to definitions of feedback types developed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) by the researchers in Farsi. This was followed by the provision of examples of each type of teacher feedback and a whole-class plenary discussion. The learners were also invited to provide examples of their own, based on their experiences of receiving corrective feedback. Next, the learners were asked to spend 15 minutes completing the given task. Then, the learners were invited to give a group presentation about their group work in front of the whole class. It was recommended that they have at least two learners from their group delivering the presentations. Those who remained as the audience watching either their own group's presentation or other groups' presentations were asked to pay attention to what errors were made by the presenters. After all the groups had finished their presentations, the learners were invited to another plenary discussion. They were asked to give comments on the group presentations as well as to provide delayed, anonymous corrections. That is, the learners were asked not to state who made the errors, but just to indicate what errors they noticed and, if possible, to correct those errors. But in control group there was no special treatment or activities. At the end of the treatment, the FLCA questionnaire was given again to check the learners' level of anxiety. The interview for getting the learners' opinion was just run for the learners in the experimental group to ask their opinions about using peer feedback in the classroom.

Findings

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the effect of peer feedback on students' anxiety. The researchers tried to analyze the data obtained from the instruments. To do so, SPSS (19.0) was employed and relevant tests were conducted to come up with rational results. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were presented. Descriptive statistics included mean, standard deviation, reliability and normality. Inferential statistics including t-test were presented to test the null-hypotheses formulated by the researchers.

The main purpose of this study was to examine the effect of peer feedback on Iranian upper-intermediate EFL Learners' classroom anxiety. Also, review of relevant literature highlighted the gap existing regarding the issue. Therefore, it makes sense to bridge the gap by conducting such studies on the effects of peer-feedback on Iranian EFL learners' anxiety level.

Normality of data from placement test, pretests and posttests

In order to ensure the normality of data, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was conducted for all data. Null hypothesis of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is the normality of data. If the obtained P-Value is more than 0.05 then the null hypothesis is accepted. Table 1 summarizes the data.

Table 1.

Results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

N		Placement	preanx	Postanx
		50	50	50
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	56.9200	1.4192E2	1.3420E2
	Std. Deviation	4.39777	1.05092E1	9.49328
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.103	.135	.112
	Positive	.091	.100	.071
	Negative	-.103	-.135	-.112
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.730	.955	.791
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.661	.321	.558

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Note: 'placement' stands for Objective placement Test, 'preanx' stands for 'anxiety pretest'; 'postanx' stands for 'anxiety posttest'

As Table 1 manifests, P-value for all variables is greater than 0.05 [$\text{sig}(\text{two-tailed}) > .05$] [p for placement is .66; p for preanx=.32; p for postanx=.55], therefore the null-hypothesis of "Kolmogorov-Smirnov" indicating the normality of data is accepted.

Results of Objective Placement Test (OPT)

In order to homogenize the participants, OPT was administered to the first population. Table 2 shows the performance of control and experimental groups at the outset of the study.

Table 2.

Results of independent samples t-test for OPT

Group	N	M	SD	Df	t	Sig (two-tailed)
Control	25	56.00	4.23	48	1.49	.14
Experimental	25	57.84	4.45			

As Table 2 shows, there was not any significant differences [$df = 48$, $t = 1.49$, $\text{sig}(\text{two-tailed}) = .14 > .05$] between control ($N = 25$, $M = 56$, $SD = 4.23$) and experimental ($N = 25$, $M = 57.84$, $SD = 4.45$) in OPT. Therefore, the participants' homogeneity was confirmed before implementing the treatment. That is, the participants were at the same language proficiency at the start of the study.

Results of anxiety in pre-test

Before the treatment, The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) was administered to the participants in both groups. Results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5.

Results of independent samples t-test for anxiety in pre-test

Group	N	M	SD	Df	T	sig(two-tailed)
Control	25	139.92	11.74	48	1.35	.18
Experimental	25	143.92	8.90			

According to the data in Table 5, there is no significant [$df=48$, $t=1.35$, $\text{sig}(\text{two-tailed})=.18>.05$] difference between control ($N=25$, $M=139.92$, $SD=11.74$) and experimental ($N=25$, $M=143.92$, $SD=8.90$) groups in anxiety pretest. That is, participants in both groups had the same level of anxiety in language classrooms.

Results of anxiety in post-test

In order to check the effects of the treatment on the participants' anxiety and to test the second null-hypothesis, independent samples t-test was conducted. Results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6.

Results of independent samples t-test for anxiety in post-test

Group	N	M	SD	Df	T	sig(two-tailed)
Control	25	137.28	11.02	48	2.40	.020
Experimental	25	131.12	6.53			

As Table 6 shows, level of anxiety in the experimental group ($N=25$, $M=131.12$, $SD= 6.53$) was significantly [$df=48$, $t=2.40$, $\text{sig}(\text{two-tailed}) = .02<.05$] better than that of control group ($N=25$, $M=137.28$, $SD= 11.02$) in the posttest. Accordingly, the resulted enhancement in the participants' anxiety can be due to the implementation of peer feedback. Therefore, the second null-hypothesis that is "Peer feedback has no significant effect on the EFL learners' classroom anxiety" was also rejected.

Results of semi-structured Interview

In addition to quantitative data, qualitative data including results obtained from the semi-structured researcher made interview were analyzed. Participants' responses to the interview items are as follows:

- Concerning the first question, "Have you ever noticed any feedback made by your peers during group discussion in the classroom" the majority of the participants stated that they paid attention to the feedbacks provided by their peers during the discussion and tried to correct their erroneous products.

Participant A: I paid attention to his feedback and tried to restate my expression. Sometimes my classmate waited till I finished my speaking and then asked me to repeat my erroneous products.

- Concerning the second question "Can you describe the situation to me?" the interviewees referred to the situation in which their classmates had corrected their errors.
- Regarding the third question "What was your reaction when you found your peer(s) made feedback?" the majority of them stated that they tried to correct their errors and respect their classmates.

Participant B: It was good to listen to your classmate and correct the error. I think it implies that you show respect for him.

- Regarding the fourth question "Did you provide feedback to him/her?" the interviewees stated that they provide their classmates with feedbacks which were sure of the correctness.

Participant C: I knew that I had to give feedback when I was certain that it was correct. I think that it needs a vast language knowledge and skill to offer corrective feedbacks and correct your classmate's erroneous products.

- Concerning the fifth question "How did you provide your feedback?" the interviewees had different opinions. Some of them argued that they did not have required knowledge and skill to give feedback. However some of them believed that they were able to give feedbacks. According to their statements, it was manifested that the first step is error identification and then the appropriate time to correct it.

Participant D: After I recognized the error, I waited till he finished his statement, then I asked him to restate his utterance. Then I tried to make him aware of what was erroneous.

- Concerning the sixth question "What was your peer's reaction to your feedback?" their responses indicated their peer's different reactions. Some of them accepted and some of them tried to discuss about the feedback provided for them.

Participant E: My classmate believed that I wanted to interrupt him and tried to ignore my feedbacks. However, being aware of his errors, he decided to correct them.

- Concerning the seventh question "How did you feel when you provided your feedback to him/her?" the majority of the participants stated that they felt proud and confident after giving feedback.

Participant F: I was proud of myself to give feedback. Through feedbacks I could scaffold him not to commit some errors.

- Concerning the last question "Do you think your feedback is or was helpful? Why? How? Why not?" there was a consensus among the participants indicating the effectiveness of their feedbacks. The majority of them mentioned that they would not give feedback if were not aware of the committed error as well as the correctness of their utterance.

Participant G: My feedbacks were helpful. My teacher supervised the class. It was obvious that they helped my classmate. I practiced much before being involved in the process of giving feedbacks.

Similarly, results of Kurt's and Atay's (2007) interview showed that their participants took benefits from the peer feedback process since through feedbacks provided by their friends they became aware of their mistakes.

Discussion and Conclusion

Based on the present findings learners feel less anxious in classrooms where peer feedback is allowed. This may be as a result of learner-centeredness which allows the learners to be active instead of being just passive ones without any activity and dynamicity in the class. This finding lent support to what found by Kurt and Atay (2007) who investigated the effects of peer feedback on the writing anxiety of prospective Turkish teachers of EFL arriving at the finding

that the peer feedback group experienced significantly less writing anxiety than the teacher feedback group at the end of the study.

The present finding was in disagreement with Zhang's and Rahimi's (2014) argument suggesting that EFL learners did not find CF as a threatening measure and source of anxiety. Consequently, it can be safely suggested that by making learners aware of the goals of instructional techniques (e.g., CF), as suggested by Ellis (2009), teachers can assist their students develop positive beliefs towards those instructional techniques (Zhang & Rahimi 2014).

Moving back to the point, research problem, where the study began, this research with all its (de) limitations brought the idea of how adopting peer feedback embedded within a course syllabus, or here more specially a simple English term, can bring about a lot of changes and decreasing students' anxiety, as the post-test findings proved, the point which is missing in our educational system as well as the curriculum. What this research was aiming at was the point to make students more self-directed, creative, and initiative learners in order to make them more responsible for their own learning and therefore take on some social responsibilities when faced with their friends, peers, and later on with people in their society.

Drawing attention on the other studies done in the realm of peer feedback, this research like most of the other ones proved the fact that adopting peer feedback surely can decrease students' anxiety, what Kurt and Atay (2007), believe that adopting peer feedback in class has some effects. First, it helps student to take more responsibilities in learning process. In addition to do assignments, students have to read others' work carefully so that one is not only responsible for his/her own work but also the others'. Second, peer feedback provides diversity with teaching compared with the traditional way of giving teacher feedback. In peer feedback session, students not only listen to teacher's instruction, but also work with their peers to do more practices in other skills. Moreover, in order to increase one's confidence, sharing opinion with peers is helpful. Peer feedback allows students to interact with their peers and creates high social skills while learning material more effectively. Peer feedback also gives students an opportunity to work as a unit instead of individuals working alone. Accordingly, practitioners can make use of peer feedback to develop their English learning skills. Moreover, practitioners can make use of peer feedback to decrease their anxiety.

In addition, pedagogically several benefits of peer feedback have been reported in the literature. Peer feedback promotes learners' autonomy, can increase student-student interaction time (Ludstorm & Baker 2009), and even motivates students to perform better (Kurt & Atay, 2007). Moreover, teacher workload can be reduced by sharing responsibilities for feedback from learners (Topping, 2009). It is educationally worth since teachers are often overloaded.

The results of the present study can be beneficial for different groups. First, teachers and instructors who are working with various groups of learners. Second, supervisors and those who are in charge of pre-service training courses for teachers can use the results and provide teachers with some training courses about giving feedback to students in a positive way. Material developers also can take advantage by reading and using the results of the present study when they are designing exercises for students.

To sum up, through the quantitative as well as the qualitative data that was gathered here, using different types of peer feedback (Rong-Xuan Chu, 2013) can be considered as some practical means of reducing EFL learners' anxiety.

In order to fill the existing gaps, the following suggestions are enumerated for future studies. First, the present study employed a quasi- experimental design to investigate the effect of peer feedback on Iranian EFL learners' classroom anxiety, further research is suggested to use a correlation study design to investigate if there is any significant correlation between EFL learners' attitude towards peer feedback and their speaking ability as well as anxiety. Second, the present study was conducted in a physical context; further research is suggested to integrate technology into the treatment. Third, participants included upper-intermediate EFL learners, further research is suggested to be conducted among other EFL students. Forth, the present study focused on peer feedback, further research is suggested to do a comparison between peers' verses teachers.

References

- Agricola, B. T., Prins, F. J. & Sluijsmans, D. (2020). Impact of Feedback Request Forms and Verbal Feedback on Higher Education Students' Feedback Perception, Self-Efficacy, and Motivation. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 27 (1), 6-25.
- Ando, M. *Distinctive Language anxiety factors among college students: Toward the further development of measures and theories*. (Doctoral dissertation, at the university of Texas.
- Austin, (1997). UMI Dissertation Services, 17, 9931459. Backman, Nancy. "Two Measures of Affective Factors as They Relate to Progress in Adult Second- Language Learning." *Working Papers in Bilingualism* 10(1976): 100-22.
- Bailey, K. M. (1983). Competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language learning: looking at and through the diary studies. In H. W. Seliger, & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Bellinger, D.; De Caro, M. & Ralston, A. (2015). Mindfulness, Anxiety, and High- stakes Mathematics Performance in the Laboratory Classroom. *Consciousness and Cognition* 37, 123- 132.
- Bruffee, K. (1984). Collaborative learning and the " conversation of mankind". *College English*, 46(7):635-652.
- Chen, T. & Chang, G.B. (2004). The relationship between foreign language anxiety and learning difficulties. *Foreign Language Annals* 37(2), pp. 279-289.
- De Costa, P. (2015). Reenvisioning Language Anxiety in the Globalized Classroom through a Social Imaginary Lens. *Language Learning*, 65(3), 504- 532.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies In Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 339-368.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). Implications for second language students. Mahwah, NJ: *Lawrence Erlbaum Associates*.
- Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language Anxiety and Achievement. *Annual Review of Applied linguistics*, 21, 112-126.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125-132, 1986.tb05256.x <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781>.
- Jiang, Sh. & Yan, X. (2020). Research on the Effect of Supervisor Feedback for Undergraduate Thesis Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 13 (1), 43- 50.

- Kurt, G., & Atay, D. (2007). The effect of peer feedback on the writing anxiety of prospective Turkish teachers of EFL. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 3(1):12-23 http://eku.comu.edu.tr/index/3/1/gkurt_datay.pdf (Retrieved 11/05.2011).
- Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 30-43.
- Lyster, R., & Izquierdo, J. (2009). Prompts versus recasts in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning*, 59(2), 453-498.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. Cambridge University Press, 19, 3766.
- MacIntyre, P. & Devaele, J.M. (2014). The Two Faces of Janys? Anxiety and Enjoyment in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 2, 237- 274.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). *The Subtle Effects of language Anxiety on Cognitive Processing in the second Language* (pp. 283-305).
- Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 405-430.
- Rezazadeh, M. & Tavakoli, M. (2009). Investigating the Relationship among Test Anxiety, Gender, Academic Achievement and Years of Study: A Case of Iranian EFL University Students. *English Language Teaching*, 2(4).
- Rong-Xuan Chu. (2013). Effects of peer feedback on Taiwanese Adolescents' English Speaking practice and Development. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Edinburgh)
- Shehadeh, A. (2011). Effects and student perceptions of collaborative writing in L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20, 286-305.
- Skehan, P. (1989). Individual Differences in Second Language Learning. London: Edward Arnold.
- Smith, D. A. (2017). Collaborative Peer Feedback. *International Conference Educational Technologies*, 183- 186.
- Steen-Utheim, A. & Hopfenbeck, Th. N. (2019). To Do or Not to Do with Feedback. A Study of Undergraduate Students' Engagement and Use of Feedback within a Portfolio Assessment Design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44 (1), 80-96.
- Storch, N. (2004) 'Writing: Product, Process, and Students' Reflections', In *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 153 – 173.
- Topping, K. (2009). Peer Assessment. *Theory into Practice*, 48 (1), 20- 27.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, D. J. "An investigation of students' perspectives on anxiety and speaking." *Foreign Language Annals*, 23, 1990, 539-553.
- Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a Low-Anxiety Classroom Environment: What Does Language Anxiety Suggest? *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(4), 426-437.
- Wörde, R. A. (1998). An investigation of students' perceptions of foreign language anxiety (Doctoral dissertation, George Mason University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstract international*, 59-03A, 0717.
- Wu, K. (2010). The Relationship between Language Learners' Anxiety and Learning Strategy in the CLT Classrooms. *International Education Studies*, 3 (1).
- Zheng, Y. (2008). Anxiety and Second / Foreign Language Learning Revisited. *Canadian Journal of New Scholars in Education* 1 (1).