

THE ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' ENGAGEMENT TO WRITING FEEDBACK ACTIVITIES VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' WRITING ANXIETY

Annisa Astrid, M.Pd.

A Doctorate Student of Universitas Negeri Semarang
A lecturer of English Education Study Program at UIN Raden Fatah, Indonesia

Prof. Dr. Dwi Rukmini, M.Pd.

A Lecturer of Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Drs. Ahmad Sofwan, M.A., Ph.D.

A lecturer of Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Sri Wuli Fitriati, M.Pd., Ph.D

A lecturer of Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

***Abstract:** This article aims at finding out the engagement of students to the learning activities of the implementation of teacher feedback, peer feedback and the combination of peer & teacher feedback writing technique. The research was conducted at 3 writing classes of English Department of UIN Raden Fatah Palembang, Indonesia. Observation, interview and open ended questionnaire items were employed in data collection. Based on the findings, it can be inferred that in the implementation of teacher feedback, it was found some problems related to students' engagement; students' short concentration span, teacher's appropriation, students' reluctance and students' dependency. This happened either for students having low or high writing anxiety. Meanwhile in 'peer feedback class' it was found that students either having low or high writing anxiety had lack of confidence, ability and management control in delivering appropriate feedbacks, but students showed active participation and independency. Finally in 'the combination of peer and teacher feedback' class, most of students having low and high writing anxiety showed positive behaviour, emotional and cognitive engagement to the learning activities.*

***Key Words:** Teacher Feedback, Peer Feedback, The combination of Peer and Teacher Feedback, students' engagement and Writing Anxiety*

1. Introduction

After the failure of product writing approach, process approach has bloomed since 1980 (Brown, 2007). Different with product approach, process approach emphasized the process rather than the product as the end goal of the learning process. The steps formulated in teaching writing proposed in process writing approach comprised of prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and evaluating. As proposed by several researchers, editing and revising are the important parts of the writing process that made writing feedback techniques emerged to be implemented in the

writing class (Ferris, 2003).

According to Keh (1990, p. p.294-295), feedback defined as input from a reader to writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision. There are two major sources of feedbacks; teacher feedback and peer feedback. Teacher feedback and peer feedback could be in the form of both written and verbal form. The verbal forms of feedbacks are delivered in the form of oral conference (Teacher-student face to face interaction) and group work discussion (student-student interaction).

There are many pros and cons related to the implementation of teacher feedback in writing classes. According to Hyland and Hyland (2006), writing students seems to value the feedbacks given by their teacher on their writing. However, it is still unclear how those feedbacks contribute to students' writing development. There were even studies that reported the students just employed the feedbacks from their teacher without knowing the reason why they had to use it to revise their writing.

As a result of ineffectiveness and student non appropriation of teacher feedback, the use of peer feedback writing technique is widespread in the teaching writing. Some experts mentioned peer feedback as peer review or peer response (Hyland, 2002, Ferris, 2003, and Keh, 1996). According to Hyland (2003, p.198) and Liu & Hansen (2002, p.1) Peer feedback is such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained teacher, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing.

There are also pros and cons to the implementation of peer feedback. First, Hyland (2000, p.35) mentioned that peer feedback encourages student to participate in the classroom activity and make them less passively teacher-dependent. Meanwhile, Yarrow and Topping (2001, p.262) claimed that peer feedback plays a pivotal role in increased engagement and time spent on-task, immediacy and individualization of help, goal specification, explaining, and prevention of information processing overload, promoting, modeling and reinforcement. Yang et al., (2006) added that peer feedback is beneficial in developing critical thinking, learner autonomy and social interaction among students. However, there are some researches that reported that L2 students still preferred teacher feedback to peer feedback (Hu & Lam, 2010; Liu and Chai, 2009; Tsui and Ng, 2000; Yang et al., 2006). This probably because what Hu and Lam have termed 'the L2 factor' and 'the cultural factor'. The first factor refers to "L2 learners' limited knowledge of the target language while the second one refers to a complex of cultural and social differences between L1 and L2 learners.

Regarded to the pros and cons of the implementation of teacher feedback and peer feedback the complementary roles that teacher and peer feedback have been highlighted in teaching writing especially in EFL context. Yang et al (2006) and Tsui and Ng (2000) claimed that "peer revision

should be seen as an important complementary source of feedback in the ESL classroom. Meanwhile, Caulk (1994, p.187) in his case study of teacher and peer feedback to student writing suggested that “each serves important and complimentary functions in developing writing abilities.

Besides considering the appropriate teaching techniques, the teacher should also consider learner’s variation that would influence the learning process. Psychologically, one kind of affective factors in language learning is “anxiety”: Anxiety is known as factor in academic performance (Brown, 2007, p.162). Learners’ inadequacy in the writing skill mostly stems from anxiety, which has long been recognized as a barrier in second language learning context for teachers and students.

Some researchers have conducted studies related to the implementation of teacher feedback, peer feedback and peer & teacher feedback that focused on students’ writing outcomes/ performance. However, there was no research which really explained on how the students engaged in the learning activities. Thus the writer was interested in conducting the research that focused on students’ engagement in the learning activities and considered writing anxiety as the personality factor to be observed.

The objectives of the research were as follows: 1) Exploring and explaining the engagement of students with different writing anxiety in learning activities done through the implementation of teacher feedback writing technique; 2) Exploring and explaining the engagement of students with different writing anxiety in learning activities done through the implementation of peer feedback writing technique. And 3) Exploring and explaining the engagement of students with different writing anxiety in learning activities done through the implementation of the combination of peer & teacher feedback writing technique.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Teacher Feedback

There are two forms of feedbacks which are commonly given by the teachers to their students’ writing; written feedback and verbal feedback in oral conference session.

2.1.1 Teacher Written Feedback

Teacher written feedback has been the common technique used in teaching writing since the process writing approach bloomed as a new means of teaching writing. The role of the feedback is not actually about to correct students’ errors in their writing but indeed as the means to connect to students’ reactions and facilitate improvement (Hyland & Hyland, 2006, p.186).

According to Ferris (1995, p.186), the types of teacher written feedback, can be categorized into

three main types: requests, criticism, and praise. Hyland and Hyland (2002, p.186) also add the terms “suggestions” and “constructive criticism” to refer to feedback that includes a clear recommendation for remediation.

Teacher feedback has been valued by many students. However, there were still critics about it. Zamel (1985) and Cohen (1987) maintain that teachers’ comments on ESL compositions are at times inconsistent. Cohen suggests that teachers’ comments on students work are often confusing, vague and not focused enough, in the areas where learners are in need of feedback. Meanwhile, Pinako and Radzik (1980) informed that students, sometimes, do not trust the feedback they receive from the teacher because they assumed that the teacher did not understand the points they were trying to make since she/he is from a different generation. Many students think that their friends would better understand their thoughts.

2.1.2 Oral Conference

Conferencing refers to the term used to describe one-on-one consultation between the teacher and the student writer during the writing process. The purpose of this activity is to allow the teacher and the student to discuss matters that cannot be handled by written responses alone (Ferris, 2003, p.38 and Hyland, 2003, p.192).

Due to the weaknesses of teacher’s written feedback, then oral conference that promotes interaction with writing teachers and students has been commonly used by the teachers. In writing conference, the teachers could communicate to their students one-to-one to support and encourage them to reflect on their writing as they continue to develop as writers.

Studies on writing conferences (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990 and Patthey- Chavez & Ferris, 1997;) have revealed that this type of interaction may be effective for students who have difficulty communicating their opinions in a large group. Writing conferences offer opportunities for students to clarify teachers’ written comments on their texts (Zamel, 1985) and at the same time to solicit ideas and suggestions to improve the quality of their writing.

2.2 Peer Feedback

The role of peer feedback emerged when there were complex issues about the unequal student – teacher relationship in terms of the distribution of power where teacher’s authority may have a special potency for ESL/EFL students who often have lack confidence in their ability to express themselves in their second language (Leki, 1990 and Reid, 1994). In the past 20 years there has been some debate about the problem of text appropriation. According to Knoblauch and Brannon (1984, p.118) cited in Hyland& Hyland (2006), writing could be stolen from a writer by the teacher’s comments. They argued that by following directive feedback closely, students do not develop either their cognitive or their writing skills through their writing, but merely rewrite

texts to reflect their teacher's preoccupations.

Peer feedback, which is referred to under different names such as peer response, peer review, peer editing, and peer evaluation, can be defined as "use of learners as sources of information for each other in such a way that learners had roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained teacher, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing" (Liu and Hansen, 2002, p.1). Classically, peer feedback is kind of activity where the students shared the feedbacks to each other in groups of four or five. Each student gives one copy of his/ her paper to every member of the group. Then, usually as homework, each group will be asked to read their peers' writing and prepare feedbacks/ comments. In the next meeting, students in each group will be asked to discuss by giving oral comments on each paper they read, as well as ask and answer clarifying questions. Then, Each student uses this feedback from the other group members to revise their writing (Mittan, 1989; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Paulus, 1999, Byrd, 2003).

Despite the great potential of peer feedback, it had been reported by some researchers that L2 students still preferred teacher feedback to peer feedback (Hu & Lam, 2010; Liu and Chai, 2009; Tsui and Ng, 2000; Yang et al., 2006). This may have been caused by some reservations which are possessed by teachers and students about the use of peer feedback. The reservations like what Hu and Lam have termed 'the L2 factor' and 'the cultural factor'. The first factor refers to "L2 learners' limited knowledge of the target language and its rhetorical conventions as they are in the process of mastering the target language and do not have the implicit knowledge of the language like native speakers do while the second one refers to a complex of cultural and social differences between L1 and L2 learners, which may impede the productive use of peer response in L2 contexts.

2.3 The Combination of Peer and Teacher Feedback

In order to alleviate the problems faced in the implementation of peer feedback, Ferris (2003) suggested having teacher's intervention during the activities. As for methods to implement peer feedback, guidelines and worksheets provided by teachers can be the most important procedures in order to save time and contribute to effective and efficient feedback (Grabe and Kaplan, 1996, p.381 and Ferris and Hedgecock, 1998, p.186-187).

Further, Hyland (2002) emphasized that because L2 students generally had lack of language competence of native speakers who can often react intuitively to their classmates' papers, peer response practices are most effective if they are modeled, taught, and controlled. Peer response training can lead to significantly more meaning changes and higher marks on L2 writers' second draft regardless of proficiency levels.

In addition to Pre-Training activity, Rollinson (2005:27) suggested that there should be kind of

“intervention training” .The broad objective of intervention training is to maximize the benefits of the peer response activity for each group and each student. The teacher deals with specific problems in the feedback or revising strategies of particular groups or individuals as they arise, and suggests techniques for improving response or revision behaviors.

2.4 Writing Anxiety

Writing anxiety or writing apprehension is defined in a variety of ways. It is used generally to mean the negative and anxious feelings that disrupt part of the writing process. It also relates to the tendency of people to approach or to avoid writing (Cheng, Horwitz, & Schalert, 1999;. Furthermore, Cheng (2004) developed and evaluated a self-report L2 writing anxiety measure that conforms to a three-dimensional conceptualization of anxiety. The results suggest that both the total scale and the individual subscales of the SLWAI have good reliability and adequate validity.

2.5 Students Engagement

There are many experts tried to define what student engagement is. In this reserach, the writer used what Fredricks, Blumenfeld and Paris (2004) have proposed that students’ engagement has multiple dimensions: behavioral, emotional and cognitive. Behavioral engagement draws on the idea of participation and includes involvement in academic, social, or extracurricular activities; it is considered crucial for achieving academic outcomes. Then, emotional engagement focuses on the extent of positive and negative reactions to teachers and classmates. Finally, cognitive engagement is defined as the students’ level of investment in learning; it includes being thoughtful and purposeful in each stage of the activities and being willing to exert the effort necessary to comprehend complex ideas or master difficult skills.

3. Method of Research

This research employed qualitative data collections. The writers employed observation, interview and open ended questionnaire items as the tools to collect the data. Prior data collection, the students were asked to fulfill SLWAI (Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory) in order to classify the students into students with high and low writing anxiety.

In the first process of data collection, the observation was done by the writer to gain the detailed phenomena on students’ engagement during the learning activities. The observation was done in three writing classes (PBI 4A which was taught by using teacher feedback technique, PBI 4B which was taught by using peer feedback technique and PBI 4C by using the combination of peer and teacher feedback writing technique). Students’ engagement was observed on how they engaged in the process of learning in terms of three aspects of students’ engagement; behavior, emotional and cognitive. Then, in order to support the data gained from the observation, the

writer distributed a set of open ended questionnaire item to the students. The questionnaire was given after all the treatments had already conducted.

Finally, In order to clarify the information got from the questionnaire, the writer conducted interviews to eight students from each writing class. The students were chosen based on the level of their writing anxiety. 12 students having low writing anxiety, and 12 students having high writing anxiety were interviewed in order to elicit more detailed information on their opinion toward learning activities they had in the writing class.

The writer analyzed those qualitative data by using “Thematic Analysis” proposed by several experts (Heigham & Croker, 2009; Mackey & Gass, 2012 and Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data (Braun & Clarke: 2006, p.6). A theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research questions, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set.

Findings

4.1 Students’ Engagement During Learning Activities in ‘Teacher Feedback’ Class Viewed from Students’ Writing Anxiety

The themes and the codes of qualitative data gained from observation sheets, open ended questionnaire items and interview are summarized as follows:

Table 1.

Themes and Codes for Students’ Engagement in Learning Activities in ‘Teacher Feedback’ Class Viewed from Students’ Writing Anxiety

Themes	Codes
1. Students’ positive behavior engagement during learning activities	A. Most of students having low and high writing anxiety always stayed on task given by the lecturer B. Most of the students having low and high writing anxiety participated actively in learning activities
2. Students’ negative behavior engagement during learning activities	A. Some high writing anxiety students participated passively in learning activities B. Some students having low and high

	writing anxiety had split concentration and got bored
3. Students' had positive emotional engagement during learning activities	<p>A. All of Low and high writing anxiety students felt that their lecturer's written comments were useful</p> <p>B. All of low and high writing anxiety students believed that verbal feedbacks from the lecturer in oral conference useful</p> <p>C. Some students having low writing anxiety were very confident to have discussion with the lecturer</p>
4. Students' negative emotional engagement during learning activities	<p>A. Some students having low writing anxiety and most of students having high writing anxiety felt nervous to see the lecturer face to face in oral conference</p> <p>B. Some students of low and high writing anxiety felt reluctance to ask questions to the lecturer in oral conference</p> <p>C. Some students having high writing anxiety felt that written comments are hardly to understand and difficult to act on</p>
5. Students' negative cognitive engagement during learning activities	<p>A. Most of students having high and low writing anxiety tended not to be independent, they relied much on detailed comments from the lecturer</p>

4.2 Students' Engagement During Learning Activities in 'Peer Feedback' Class Viewed from Students' Writing Anxiety

The themes and the codes of qualitative data gained from observation sheets, open ended questionnaire items and interview are summarized as follows:

Table 2.

**Themes and Codes for Students' Engagement in Learning Activities in 'Peer Feedback'
Class Viewed from Students' Writing Anxiety**

Themes	Codes
1. Students' positive behavior engagement during learning activities	<p>A. Most of students having low and high writing anxiety always stayed on task given by the lecturer</p> <p>B. Most of the students having low and some students having high writing anxiety participated actively in learning activities</p>
2. Students' negative behavior engagement during learning activities	A. Most of high writing anxiety students participated passively in learning activities
3. Students' positive emotional engagement during learning activities	<p>A. Most of Students having low and high writing anxiety showed their respect to their peers in group</p> <p>B. Most of Low writing anxiety and some high writing anxiety students felt enjoyable in the activities of sharing feedbacks to their friends</p> <p>C. All of Students having low and high writing anxiety regarded the feedbacks from their peers were useful and important to revise their essay.</p>
4. Students' negative emotional engagement during learning activities	<p>A. Most of high writing anxiety students Felt unconfident in sharing feedbacks with their friends</p> <p>B. Most of high writing anxiety students felt scared that their friends would get mad because of their incorrect feedbacks</p> <p>C. Most of students having high writing anxiety felt uncertain to the feedbacks they gave and those they accepted</p>

<p>5. Students' positive cognitive engagement during learning activities</p>	<p>A. Most of Students having low and high writing anxiety were willing to exert the effort</p> <p>B. by the activity of reading and giving feedbacks to their peers' essay, All of students having low and high writing anxiety gained knowledge and learned to be aware on the mistakes</p> <p>C. Most Students having high and low writing anxiety showed perseverance in learning</p> <p>D. Most Students having low and some high writing anxiety became more autonomy (had control on their learning)</p>
<p>6. Students' negative cognitive engagement during learning activities</p>	<p>A. Some students having high writing anxiety tended not to be independent, they relied much on detailed comments either from the lecturer or their peers</p>

4.3 Students' Engagement During Learning Activities in 'the Combination of Peer & Teacher Feedback' Class Viewed from Their Writing Anxiety

The themes and the codes of qualitative data gained from observation sheets, open ended questionnaire items and interview are summarized as follows

Table 3.

Themes and Codes for Students' Engagement in Learning Activities in 'the Combination of Peer & Teacher Feedback' Class Viewed from Their Writing Anxiety

Themes	Codes
<p>a. Students' positive behavior engagement during learning activities</p>	<p>A. Most of students having low and high writing anxiety always stayed on task given by the lecturer</p> <p>B. Most of the students having low and high writing anxiety participated actively in learning activities</p>

b. Students' negative behavior engagement during learning activities	A. Some high writing anxiety students participated passively in learning activities
c. Students' positive emotional engagement during learning activities	<p>A. All of Students having low and high writing anxiety showed their respect to their peers in group</p> <p>B. All of Low writing anxiety and some high writing anxiety students felt enjoyable in the activities of sharing feedbacks.</p> <p>C. All of Students having low and high writing anxiety regarded pre training sessions useful for doing the peer feedback activities</p> <p>D. All of Students having low and high writing anxiety regarded the feedbacks from the lecturer in the middle of the activities useful to revise the essay</p> <p>E. Most of Students having low and high writing anxiety regarded the feedbacks from their peers were useful and important to revise their essay.</p>
d. Students' negative emotional engagement during learning activities	<p>A. Some high writing anxiety students Felt unconfident toward their writing ability when they were required to share feedbacks among their friends</p> <p>B. Some high writing anxiety students felt scared that their friends would get mad because of their incorrect feedbacks</p>
e. Students' positive cognitive engagement during learning activities	<p>A. Most of students having low and high writing anxiety were willing to exert the effort</p> <p>B. by the activity of reading and giving feedbacks to their peers' essay, all of the students gained knowledge</p>

	<p>and learned to be aware on the mistakes and avoid to do those mistakes</p> <p>C. Most of the students having high and low writing anxiety showed perseverance in learning</p> <p>D. Most of the students having low and high writing anxiety became more autonomy (had control on their learning)</p>
--	--

Discussion

5.1 Students' Engagement During Learning Activities in 'Teacher Feedback' Class Viewed from Students' Writing Anxiety

Based on the results of students' engagement analysis in the 'teacher feedback' class, most of students either having low or high writing anxiety always stayed on their task. Students always kept focused during teacher's explanation session. The students exhibited body posture that indicates they were paying attention to the lecturer and being focused on the learning activities with minimum disruptions. Besides, it was determined that most of students having low writing anxiety participated actively in learning activities. However, most of high anxiety students were not too active; they frequently kept silent, and seemed shy to get involved in the activities.

Moreover, Most of the students either having low or high writing anxiety showed that they were enthusiastic in learning but there were some students looked bored, especially when the lecturer had to see some students who asked her questions related to the task, it would make some other students had chit chat, or did something not related to the task. Whenever the lecturer discussed with the student who asked her, there were spaces for other to have chit chat or throwing little jokes.

Indeed the implementation of teacher feedback writing technique actually emphasized teacher-centered learning, where the lecturers/ the teachers have bigger control in learning activities. Some weaknesses related to teacher-centered learning had been discussed by several researchers. Related to students' participation, Hansen & Stephens (2000) have proposed that the teacher-centered learning would make students to be passive recipients. Besides, Vedanayagam (1994) described that in teacher-centered learning, attention from the students would be high in the first 15 minutes, and then the attention would decline rapidly until the final 10 minutes of the meeting.

Additionally, all of the students either having low or high writing anxiety confirmed that their lecturer's written comments were useful. The students argued that the written comments were useful for the students in order to make their essay better. From the lecturer's written feedbacks, the students could find out what mistakes they had done, revised those mistakes and aware for not doing the same mistakes again. However, the feedbacks were frequently about features of language; grammar, punctuation, spelling, and word choices.

The fact of limited feedbacks given by the lecturer/ the teacher has already been illustrated by other researchers. Ferris (1997) for example illustrated that as the course progressed, the frequency of the teachers' comments decreased. This probably caused by teacher's fatigue and an overwhelming marking load. Another reason related to the limited feedbacks given by the teacher was probably caused by varied ability of the students in the class (Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990). In their research, Cohen & Cavalcanti (1990) described that, the nature of feedbacks differed according to proficiency. They found that intermediate level students received the most comments, followed low and then high level learners. In the case of lower level learners, they received few comments on vocabulary and content and the teacher tended to give comments on grammar and mechanics.

Furthermore, all of the students either having low or high writing anxiety admitted that sometimes they need to confirm their lecturer's written feedbacks that they felt unclear and understandable. The fact from other researches also discovered that some student writers used the feedback without actually understanding the reasons for it (Crawford, 1992; Hyland, 1998 cited in Goldstein, 2004). While others found the feedback confusing and difficult to understand (Goldstein, 2004). Goldstein (2004) concluded that instructors need to find ways of providing open channels of communication for students to clarify doubts about the feedback they received. It was also what has been reported by Zamel (1985) that generally, it was found that students often found the teacher's written comments unclear, confusing and inconsistent.

In contrast, the writer discovered that the process of oral conference were not that too successful. Most of students having high writing anxiety felt very nervous when they were asked to see their lecturer face to face in oral conference session. Even, they confirmed that they prefer written feedback to verbal feedbacks. It is because, they felt that their lecturer's written feedbacks were already clear, and they just fixed their essay based on the feedbacks. They felt that having discussion with the lecturer could make them confused on what to discuss with their lecturer.

Besides, most of the students either having low or high writing anxiety felt reluctance to ask and having counter discussion with their lecturer. Based on the writer's observation in oral conference, each student had to see to the lecturer one by one to have direct discussion to the lecturer. The lecturer always answered all of the questions from the students gently. However, the questions given by the students are too general, and it seemed that there were no counter

responses from the students after the lecturer described / answered the students' question. It was clear that students felt reluctance to ask questions to their lecturer frequently. Culturally, in Indonesia, commonly students have regarded the teacher at schools have big authority in the class. Indeed, the authority related to determining their final scores. This probably caused students' reluctance to have discussion to their lecturer.

5.2 Students' Engagement During Learning Activities in 'Peer Feedback' Class Viewed from Students' Writing Anxiety

Moreover, in the 'peer feedback' class, based on the results of the analysis of the data gained from the observation, it was found that most of students having low and high writing anxiety always stayed on task given by the lecturer. In other words, most of them always focused on learning.

Then, it was found that most of the students having low and some students with high writing anxiety participated actively in learning activities. Based on the observation, the writer explored that most of low anxiety students contributed their feedbacks actively. Most of high anxiety students were not too active. They frequently kept silent, and seemed shy to get involved in the activities but it did not mean that they did not focus on the activities. They still showed the interest and did everything assigned by the lecturer.

Moreover, most of the students either having low or high writing anxiety actually felt uncertain to the feedbacks they gave and they accepted. The writer found that some students having low writing anxiety and most students having high writing anxiety had moments where they felt confused and unsure whether what they had done were already okay or not. Besides, each member of the group could not manage the process discussion well. Sometimes, there was more than one person talked in giving comments at the same time. They could not manage the time to share feedbacks and cannot divide the role in balance. Most of the comments were about mechanics and grammar. The facts showed that they needed the lecturer to convince them that they were on the right track. This situation happened because the students realized that they were on the same learning stage where they felt that they had the same capability. Besides, the students used to have teacher centered learning. They felt much secure if they were handled fully by their lecturer. However, some of them felt that the lecturer should not interfere very much. The input from the lecturer was needed only as the reflection on what they had done.

Most of students having low writing anxiety felt confident in giving and sharing feedbacks among their friends. In contrast, students having high writing anxiety felt scared that their friends would get mad to their feedbacks. This is because students having low writing anxiety tended to have better writing capability that made them confident to share feedback to their friends in group.

Finally, in terms of cognitive engagement, some of the students seemed still confused on how to do the activities. They hardly initiated the discussion; they did not know how to communicate well in their group. The groups that consist of different kinds of students in terms of their writing anxiety seemed could handle the discussion. However, everyone still tried hard to follow the activities. In other words, all of the students were willing to exert the best effort they could to follow all stages of activities. The process of reading peers' essay in group followed by the activity of giving and sharing feedbacks had encouraged them to have extra efforts, by reading more books, and checking everything in the dictionary.

In addition, Based on the results of data analysis gained from the interview session, it was found that by the activity of reading and giving feedbacks, students gained knowledge, learned to be aware on the mistakes and avoid doing those mistakes. The writer explored that the process of reading peers' essay was really beneficial for the students. The students could learn from their peers' essay on new vocabulary and the way to develop ideas. Even, the students could learn from their peers' mistakes and raise their awareness for not doing the same mistakes again.

Finally, based on the analysis of the data gained from students' responses toward open ended questionnaire item, it was found that students having low and high writing anxiety became more autonomy. In other words, they had control on their learning. Most of students having high and low writing anxiety also showed perseverance in learning. Despite of all difficulties the students faced, they always tried hard to follow all of the stages in learning activities.

Moreover, Based on the results of the data analysis gained from students' responses toward open ended questionnaire items, and interview, it was found that all of students having low and high writing anxiety regarded the feedbacks from their peers useful and important. However, actually the feedbacks given by the students to their peers in group were commonly just about mechanics (spelling, capitalization and punctuation) and grammar.

Besides, it was found that all of low writing anxiety and some high writing anxiety students felt enjoyable in the activities of sharing feedbacks to their friends. They felt happy by joining each activity, because they could share to their friends, and from the activities, they would learn from their friends' mistakes and made them aware for not doing the same mistakes. It was also found that all of students having low and high writing anxiety showed their respect to their peers in group. Based on the observation, the writer discovered that the group members did every group work and showed their respect to each other. They listened to their peers in their group who shared the ideas by making eye contact and not interrupting others. The students solved each task together with their group members. Students having low writing anxiety that tended to have high writing ability were always willing to help students having high writing anxiety who tended to have low writing ability.

Thus, actually peer feedback activities could create conducive learning activities, where the students got involved in peer group discussion. The students felt enjoyable in learning and felt that peer feedback was very helpful to reduce their anxiety in writing. They did not feel anxious whenever they were asked to finish one expository essay. This phenomena confirmed to some researchers who believe that the use of peer feedback in L1 settings as well as in ESL/EFL writing classrooms should be practiced for releasing anxiety in writing (Mendonça and Johnson, 1994; Villamil and de Guerrero, 1996).

However, there were some researches that in Asia live discussion could not be successful because culturally like Carson and Nelson (1994:23) cited in Levine et al (2002:2) found that Chinese speaking students studying ESL would generally work toward maintaining group harmony and mutual face-saving to maintain a state of cohesion. This meant that the peer review groups were less successful because of an unwillingness to criticize others. However, the situation did not happen in the research study. Even, when there was a group happened to have all of students having high writing anxiety that tended to have low writing ability but they still could cooperated well, and the process of sharing and giving feedback still ran well. Thus, the problems were only students' lack of capability and limited comments that they shared to their peers.

5.3 Students' Engagement During Learning Activities in 'the Combination of Peer and Teacher Feedback' Class Viewed from Students' Writing Anxiety

Based on the results of the data analysis gained from the observation, it was found that students either having low or high writing anxiety had positive behavior engagement during learning activities in the implementation of the combination of peer & teacher feedback writing technique. Most of students having low and high writing anxiety always stayed on task given by the lecturer and most of the students having low writing anxiety participated actively in all stages of learning activities. However, it was found that most of students having high writing anxiety had negative behavior engagement during learning activities in the first few meetings, most of high writing anxiety students participated passively in learning activities, but in the last few meetings, all of them have already mingled in their group and actively contributed in group discussion.

Based on students' responses toward open ended questionnaire items and the interview, it was found that all of the students either having low or high writing anxiety regarded the pre-training session useful for them. From the pre-training session, the students got the guideline, on how to give effective feedbacks to their friends. Besides, some students admitted, that by having pre-training session, they were able to initiate the process of group discussion. They knew how to create life discussion by using proper language. Finally, the students felt that they were

motivated to be independent in deciding which feedbacks that should be used or not to revise the essay.

Based on students' responses to the open ended questionnaire item and the interview, the writer discovered that all of the students either having low or high writing anxiety realized that their lecturer's feedbacks in the middle of learning activities were useful to refresh their mind on what they should do during peer feedback activities.

Meanwhile, from the extracts of the interview and questionnaire, the writer found that some students having high writing anxiety were unconfident when they were asked to share feedbacks to their peers in group. This was because the students especially the ones having high writing anxiety realized that they had lack of writing capability, and even lack of English ability. However, this situation did not make them frustrated and stopped doing sharing feedback activities.

Besides, based on some extracts of the questionnaire, it was shown that some students having high writing anxiety felt scared that their friends would get mad of them because of their feedbacks. This feeling actually was caused by their unconfidence to their own writing ability. They realized that they had lack of writing ability and got afraid that they would give wrong feedbacks that would make their friends insulted. However, it depends actually to how close the students to their peers in group. Based on the interview to one student having high writing anxiety, it was revealed that he was very comfortable in his group, because his friends were really open to any kind of feedbacks.

Finally, Based on the results of data analysis gained from the observation, questionnaire and interview, it was found that students either having low or high writing anxiety had positive cognitive engagement toward some aspects in learning activities. First, students having low and high writing anxiety were willing to exert the effort. Second, by the activity of reading and giving feedbacks to their peers' essay, students gained knowledge and learned to be aware on the mistakes and avoid doing those mistakes. Third, Students having high and low writing anxiety showed perseverance in learning. Forth, Students having low and high writing anxiety became more autonomy; they had control on their learning.

It seems that the implementation of the combination of peer and teacher feedback ran well and effective because of the lecturer's intervention during sharing feedback session. This kind of intervention made the students felt secure and sure on what they do during the activities. By having such gently reminder from the lecturer during the lecturer's review in the middle of learning activities, the students were always reminded to do the effective feedback sharing sessions and become aware for not doing the same mistakes again.

To conclude, indeed the implementation of the combination of peer and teacher feedback gave the solution to the problems faced in the implementation of teacher feedback and peer feedback. In the implementation of teacher feedback some common problems faced are students' short concentration span, teacher's appropriacy, students' reluctance and students' dependency. These problems could be covered by the implementation of the combination of peer and teacher feedback, where by having sharing feedbacks in group, the students were automatically engaged in the activities. They did not just focus on their lecturer that made them easy to get bored. Sharing feedbacks with others would limit the revision which were only derived from their lecturer. These activities would also automatically develop students' cognitive aspects because they would not just accept the feedbacks from their peers but could have personal control to consider the feedbacks to revise their essay. Having feedbacks from peers would also increase students' awareness on writing audience. They would be realized that somehow there would be readers on their writing.

Indeed, the students cannot be left to have sharing feedback activities without any interference from the teacher or the lecturer, because they used to work with their full teacher's control. To let the students work wholly independently would make them a bit depressed. They looked confused, they could not manage the process well and as the results the quality of their work became poor. Thus, teacher's intervention would be needed in order to refresh about what have already happened, remind the common mistakes and increase students' awareness for not doing the same mistakes.

6. Conclusions

- a. Most of students having low writing anxiety and some having high writing anxiety have positive behavior engagement and emotional engagement toward all stages of learning activities. Meanwhile, all of students tended to have negative cognitive engagement toward learning activities.
- b. Peer feedback which emphasizes collaborative learning and student-centered learning cannot be done independently without any intervention from the teacher or the lecturer. However, If there was such good drilling system on how to give effective feedback, the clear guideline, and the lecturer's reflection that reviews and reminds the common mistakes done by the students, then the implementation of peer feedback is still promising
- c. The implementation of the combination of peer and teacher feedback ran well and effective either for students having low or high writing anxiety because of the lecturer's intervention during sharing feedback session. This kind of intervention made the students felt secure and sure on what they have done during the activities. By having such gently reminder from the lecturer, the students were aware on doing the effective peer feedback sessions and aware for not doing the same mistakes again.

7. Suggestions

The writers would like to offer some suggestions as follows;

1. Since the scope of the research is very limited, then it will be necessary to conduct further research on how each feedback influence the development of each aspect of writing in students' revision.
2. Since there is only one psychological factor which is assumed to have interaction to the implementation of writing feedback techniques, it would be necessary to determine any other factors.
3. It would be necessary to conduct such research and development if it is necessary to find out suitable steps on the implementation of the combination of teacher and peer feedback in teaching writing.

References

- Braun, V and Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp.77-101
- Brown, H.D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York, NY: Pearson Education
- Byrd, R.D. (2003). Practical tips for implementing peer editing tasks in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36 (3), 434-439.
- Caulk, N. (1994). Comparing teacher and student responses to written work. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 181-188
- Cheng, Y. S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 313-335. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.07.001>
- Cheng, Y.S, Horwitz, E.K. & Schallert, D.L., (1999). Language writing anxiety; Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning*, 49, 417-446
- Cohen, A. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In A. Wendon and J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning*. New York: Prentice Hall
- Cohen, A.D., & Cavalcanti, M.C. (1990). Feedback on composition: Teacher-student verbal reports. In B. Kroll *Second Language Writing Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ferris, D. (2003). Responding to writing. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. & Hedgcock, J. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D.R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision: *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 315-339
- Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), pp. 35-53.
- Fredricks, J.A., Blumenfeld, P.C., and Paris, A. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept: state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74, 59-119.
- Grabe, W and R.B. Kaplan. (1996). *Theory and Practice of Writing*. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman Limited
- Goldstein, L.M. (2004). Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and student revision: Teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 63-80
- Goldstein, L., & Conrad, S. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, pp. 443-460.
- Hansen, E.J., & Stephens, J.A. (2000). The ethics of learner-centered education: Dynamics that impede the process. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 32(5), 40-47.
- Heigham, J & Croker, R. (2009). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hyland, K & Fiona Hyland. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University. 39, 77-95. doi:10.1017/S0261444806003399
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and researching writing*. Essex, England: Pearson Education
- Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and Feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(1), 33-54

- Hu, G.W. & Lam, S.T.E. (2010) Issues of cultural appropriateness and pedagogical efficacy: exploring peer review in a second language writing class. *Instructional Science*, 38, 371–394
- Keh, C.L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: a model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*. 44(4), pp. 294-304
- Leki, I. (1990). Potential problems with peer responding in ESL writing classes. *CATESOL Journal*, 3, pp.5-19
- Levine, A. Brenda Oded & Ulla Connor. (2002). Variation in EFL-ESL peer response. *TESL-EJ*. 6(3), 1-18
- Liu, M.H. & Chai, Y.H. (2009). Attitudes towards peer review and reaction to peer feedback in Chinese EFL writing classrooms. *TESL Reporter*, 42 (1), 33-51
- Liu, J. and Hansen, J. (2002) *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*, the University of Michigan Press: Michigan.
- Mackey, A and Susan M Gass. (2012). *Research Methods in Second Language Acquisition: A Practical Guide*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell
- Mendoca, C. & K. Johnson (1994). Peer review negotiations : Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly* 28(4), 745–768.
- Mittan, R. (1989). The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power. In D.M. Johnson, & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in Writing: Empowering ESL Students*, 207-219. Newyork: Longman
- Nelson, G., & Murphy, J. (1993). Peer response groups: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts? *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 135–142.
- Paulus, T.M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265-289.
- Patthey-Chavez, G. & D. Ferris (1997). Writing conferences and the weaving of multi-voiced texts in college composition. *Research in the Teaching of English*. 31(1), 51–90.
- Pinako, S., & Radzik, A. (1980). The student editing method. *Theory Into Practice*, 19, 220-224

- Reid, J. (1994). Responding to ESL students' texts: The myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), pp. 273–294.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30
- Tsui, A.B.M & Maria NG. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147-170
- Vedanayagam, E.G. (1994). *Teaching Technology for College Teacher*. Newdelhi: Sterling Publishers. Ltd.
- Villamil, O.S., & e Guerrero, M.C.M. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Social-cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5(1), 51-75.
- Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Learning*, 15(3), 179-200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.004>
- Yarrow, F. and Topping K. J. (2001). Collaborative Learning: The Effects of Metacognitive Prompting and Structured Peer Interaction. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 261–282. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/000709901158514>.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79-101.