
Effect of Collaborative Feedback Tasks on EFL Learners' Cognitive Emotion Regulation

Ebrahim Sheikhzadeh Marand¹, Javad Ahmadi Fatalaki^{2*}

¹Assistant Professor, Department of English, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Iran

^{2*}Department of English, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran

Received: July 03, 2023

Accepted: September 13, 2023

Abstract

This study investigated the effect of collaborative task types in speaking courses on cognitive emotion regulation. To this end, 34 EFL students were selected through cluster sampling. Two groups were selected in the study to analyze the role of collaborative feedback. The first group received the collaborative feedback provided by peers and there were discussion sessions for the solutions provided in groups. These solutions were mostly related to linguistic and communicative aspects of speaking. The second group (as the control group) did not receive the collaborative feedback. Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (CERQ) was administered to identify whether the intervention by collaborative feedback affects the level of cognitive emotion regulation. The result of data analysis by One-way MANOVA showed a significant difference between the experimental and control groups. And, with regard to the second research question, multiple regression analysis using SPSS showed that there was a high degree of predictability of dependent variable by independent ones. The result of the current study can help the policy-makers to understand the role of collaboration and the importance of devising new collaborative educational tasks for learners.

Keywords: Cognitive emotion regulation, Collaborative feedback, EFL context, Speaking course

INTRODUCTION

The study of the human behavior was started with the individuals' perception of themselves and the environment surrounding them. The new trend toward the study of human behavior owes a great deal to Bar-on (1997) who contributed his life to psychology and, also, multidisciplinary fields by devising an instrument regarding emotional intelligence. Although several studies were conducted to delineate the pattern of human behavior, none of which had this revolutionary effect on the study of the human emotions. In effect, what he devised marked the beginning of the new era in psychology and it brought forth the new perspective toward the behavior of humans around the globe. This

contribution does not end with its clinical purposes that was widely accepted. But rather, it showed its potential for the educational purposes, which can have practical implications. In this regard, the adaptation of individuals in different circumstances can be regarded as one of the most valuable implications of the studies related to behavior. For instance, the study of emotional adaptation is also useful for the academic contexts (Trentacosta & Izard, 2007). What Bar-On (1997) developed was a clear understanding of emotions regardless of situational factors. What went missing was the clear picture of regulation and adaptations that entails several consequences. Therefore, the study of behavior and emotion do not end with its static view and it goes on to serve its dynamic sense by considering changes that occur.

*Corresponding Author's Email:
ahmady.fatalaky@gmail.com

Moreover, the complexity of human behavior cannot be well-touched upon. That is, the behavioral aspect of human emotion is difficult to be evaluated and this, in turn, necessitates a profound examination of human feelings and emotions. Therefore, new models of emotional intelligence have been proposed to fill the gap and provide insightful considerations for different circumstances. For instance, one can refer to the educational settings as the venue for the development and deterioration of emotional states. In this regard, an in-depth analysis of the context may bring along positive impacts since the study of emotional states has been proven to be effective in interpersonal relationships (Elliott, Watson, Goldman, & Greenberg, 2003).

Emotional adaptation is taken as an entity that works hand in hand with other newly-developed models of feedback as a social act. However, the extent to which these concepts are consistent with each other is going to be investigated to shed more light on the parallel function of these concepts. Even if these concepts do not follow a same track, they can be considered different attributes of a wider picture regarding socialization. In other words, emotion regulation and collaboration can be taken into account as parts of a wider picture of human socialization. To this end, the present study investigates the effect of collaborative feedback on cognitive emotion regulation. And, it considers speaking course as a platform that may induce better picture with regard to the aforementioned concepts.

Cognitive Emotion Regulation

First and foremost, the difference between emotion regulation and coping should be considered to provide a tangible picture of both concepts. The former one here deals with manipulation of different emotional states in different contexts. What is of utmost significance is that the regulation of emotion does occur in both positive and negative conditions (Gross, Richards, & John, 2006). Also, emotion regulation does not limit itself to controlled action. Rather, emotion regulation encompasses a wide range of activities whether controlled or automatic. The latter one deals

with the stress management and the strategies applied to the certain situation in which individuals have no other choice. As Lazarus (1999) stated, coping is problem-centered and requires a degree of disequilibrium in emotion.

As Thompson (1994, pp. 27-28) put it, emotion regulating can be both intrinsic or extrinsic processes "responsible for monitoring, evaluating, and modifying emotional reactions, especially their intensive and temporal features, to accomplish one's goals". The reason that highlights the importance of emotion regulation is its role in different life domains and the achievements that can be resulted due to its presence. Emotion regulation is a power by which individuals experience the emotional world around them and how they categorize them and, also, how these organizations affect human behaviors (Elliott, Watson, Goldman, & Greenberg, 2003). Shiota, Campos, Keltner and Hertenstein (2004) expressed the importance of emotion regulation by emphasizing its substantial role in interpersonal relationships.

With regard to the sources of regulation, Eisenberg and Spinrad (2004) stated that regulation may have three different orientations. First, regulation may be the result of the external factors or it may be initiated by individuals' behavior. Second, regulation may occur based on its direction toward goals or it may be an unintentional act of behavior. Third, regulation can be regarded as a voluntary or involuntary organization and behavior. By considering this orientation of regulation, Eisenberg and Spinrad (2004) defined regulation:

As the process of initiating, avoiding, inhibiting, maintaining, or modulating the occurrence, for, intensity, or duration of internal feeling states, emotion related psychological, attentional processes, motivational states, and the behavioral concomitant of emotional in service of accomplishing affect-related biological or social adaptation or achieving individual goals (p. 338).

Koole (2009) stated that emotion regulation is the process by which one can reshape the behavior by moving beyond the "spontaneous flow of emotions". What went missing in his definition is that he did not focus on external forces that may have dominant role to change

or redirect the behavior of individuals. Unlike this view, the external forces were regarded as sources of emotion regulation in Eisenberg and Spinrad's (2004) definition. This may show the comprehensive view pointed out in their definitions and orientation of emotion regulation.

Different models and measures related to cognitive emotion regulation were proposed by different scholars, such as Gross (2007), Koole (2009), Bagby, Taylor, and Parker (1994), and Garnefski, Kraaij, and Spinhoven (2002). Among these scholars, Gross provided an in-depth analysis of emotion regulation by accentuating the process model of emotion regulation comprising five important strategies, namely, situation selection, situation modification, attentional development, cognitive changes, and response modulation

With regard to the measurement of emotion regulation, Garnefski, Kraaij, and Spinhoven's (2002) model gained momentum since it is more practical one in comparison with previous models. In their view, emotion regulation works through the channel of cognition. This measurement tool encompasses diverse range of emotional states. Therefore, it can be called a multidimensional model. For instance, it covers the matter of self-efficacy, anxiety, self-confidence, and self-esteem. Self-blame and blaming others as two dimensions of cognitive emotion regulation overlap fundamentally with attribution theory in educational texts. Also, rumination and rethinking are remarkably influential for educational contexts since they focus on critical thinking. The comprehensiveness of this measure can be taken into account as the reason to apply it for the sake of studies related to educational settings.

Collaborative Feedback in Speaking Courses

As Bachman and Palmer (1996) put it, language production is based on a. language knowledge b. topical knowledge c. strategic competence d. Learner characteristic. e. affective factors. Feedback in its motivational sense tries to encourage students to speak more and have the sense of achievement repeatedly. In its second role, feedback is for the purpose of reinforcement that can be negative and positive. Despite the fact that negative and positive reinforcement

is considered to be based upon the behavioristic infrastructure, the real application of the feedback in language classroom is for the most part intermingled with these types of reinforcement. Feedback in the most neutral way works as an informer. In this sense, feedback informs the learners of their development and the map of the progress necessary for getting good grasp of knowledge over a particular skill. As Bygate (1978) stated, speaking has three phases, that is, planning, selection, and production. Feedback in this sense should be omnipresent at all these stages to serve the purpose.

Preparing students to have better performance in their speaking performance greatly depends on receiving enough comments from the external sources. These external sources vary according to the policy of the educational settings. Also, speaking should be discussed at three levels i.e. linguistic, communication, and situation (Luomo, 2004). In the traditional approaches, the instructors played significant roles in providing feedback for the learners in the widest sense. This means that imparting knowledge necessary for the development of the students' speaking in their own native language and even foreign languages was directed towards the instructor. By the development of the technology and emerging trend in computer assisted learning, the type and the nature of the transmission of this knowledge from the various sources were changed. Alongside this knowledge, these sources began to help the beginners to find the passage through which they can understand the ingredient to process their production.

There is always a substantial gap between the footstep of the feedback providers and the personal perspective and styles of the learners with diverse cultural values that impose several attributes to the style of the speaking performance. However, at the initial steps of speaking, striking a balance between these two different styles is not worthwhile. In a nutshell, those who are at the initial step of speaking should stick to the general rules of speaking and be open to every type of criticism and negative feedback. This may be in line with what is called 'mediation' with its comprehensive perspective (Lantolf, 2006). As Lantolf (ibid)

stated, mediation occurs in three levels i.e. inside the mind of the individuals, between the mind and the environment, and finally between individuals.

Features of the Good Feedback

There are various critical perspectives regarding the features of the appropriate feedback in discussion classrooms. Van Steendam, Rijlaarsdam, Sercu, and Van den Bergh (2010) stated the quality of the peer feedback should be investigated through its accuracy, consistency, and the similarity with teachers' feedback (as cited in Gielen, Peeters, Dochy, Onghena, & Struyven, 2010). One of the drawbacks of this perspective is its emphasis on the accuracy of the peer-feedback. That is, accuracy in feedback should be accomplished by teachers who meticulously present the error correction in the final steps. However, there may be exceptional conditions in which some students have in-depth knowledge of discussion-based courses features. In such circumstances, some students can provide valuable comments for their peers who had insufficient knowledge.

Regarding the nature of the feedback whether it is developed by the teacher or peers, Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006, p. 206) introduced a model in which they demonstrated

seven features of the good feedback for preparing students to have self-regulated performances:

1. helps clarify what good performance is (goals, criteria, expected standards);
2. facilitates the development of self-assessment (reflection) in learning;
3. delivers high quality information to students about their learning;
4. encourages teacher and peer dialogue around learning;
5. encourages positive motivational beliefs and self-esteem;
6. provides opportunities to close the gap between current and desired performance;
7. Provides information to teachers that can be used to help shape teaching.

Despite the fact that these features are quite effective for the implementation of the feedback in education settings, the utilization of such criteria may have several difficulties. These criteria are good guideline for having general knowledge over the appropriate feedback, but this model does not include all aspects of the facilitative features of feedback.

With regard to the criteria for the good feedback, Gielen et al. (2010, p. 307) compared their evaluation with other studies' result in the following table:

Table 1
Summary and Comparison of Criteria Used for "good" Peer Feedback

Kim (2005)	Sluijsmans et al. (2002)	Prins et al. (2006)	Gielen et al. (2010)
Criterion-orientation	Use of criteria (1 point per criterion)	Presence of content related remarks (weight 3)	- Comments related to the assessment criteria (Appropriateness) -Explanation of judgment 1: Reference to specific behavior (Specificity)
Justification	-	Presence of explanations of remarks (weight 2)	Explanation of judgment 2: Justification
Suggestion	Constructive suggestions (1 point per comment)	Presence of good and clear suggestions for improvement/advice (weight 1)	Presence of suggestions for improvement
-	Positive comments (1 point per comment)	Balance of positive and negative remarks (weight 1)	Presence of both positive and negative comments (unless no negative possible)
-	Negative comments (1 point per comment)	-	-
-	Posing questions (1 point per question)	Presence of questions fostering reflection (weight 1)	Presence of thought-provoking Questions

-	-	Clear formulation (descriptions instead of keywords) (weight 0.5)	Clear formulation
-	Structure (max. 4 points for presence of clear judgment, summary of suggestions for improvement, positive comment at beginning or end, and length of conclusion)	Clear structure in report (weight 0.5)	(Not applicable in pre-structured feedback form)
Completeness			
-	No use of 'naive words' (minus 1 point per word, such as nice, good, excellent, fine)	-	-
-	-	Presence of external examples (weight 0.5)	-
-	-	Style (first person instead of judging) (weight 0.5)	-

Peer Feedback from Socio-cultural Perspective

Peer feedback owes a lot to socio-cultural theory of Vygotsky (1978) from the theoretical perspective and communicative language learning from the pedagogical perspective that made the role of teachers colorless by putting more emphasis on the purposeful communication. This purposeful communication is the product of the authenticity of the educational tasks in which even student take the role of feedback provider automatically. This case is observable in learners' native language speaking practices, while ESL and specially EFL learners do not normally consult their peers to improve their speaking and try to follow the lead of the teacher. Peer feedback also has been evaluated and discussed from two major perspectives that are cognitive and social. In the former perspective, the analytical and the critical view on the students' speaking are highlighted. In the latter perspective, social aspects of the speaking are given the prominence (Pica, 1996). This aspect of the peer evaluation follows the socio-cultural theory of learning that emphasizes on the dominant role of the societal factors in the development of the learners' abilities. Contexts in which peer feedback is implemented is the part of this societal factors that determine the success of this types of feedback. As an example, students are more dependent on their teachers' comments in EFL setting, while students in ESL settings are less inclined to receive all the

comments from their teachers due to their access to the native speakers who can provide them with more valuable comments than their teachers. In this sense, one can trace the authentic type of interaction for the ESL learners.

Formative assessment in its narrowest sense is in line with peer feedback because both of them deal with the qualitative types of comments for the process-based development rather than a product-based approach. Peer feedback and formative assessment are designed for the purpose of supporting instruction by providing intermediate checks. However, formative assessment is one way-road in which the examiner does not see the trace of development in his/ her knowledge. In other words, students take the role examiner and examinee in the peer feedback and this fact leads them to take advantages of their interactions and gain enough experience by viewing their own work and evaluate their peers' speaking. Although students evaluate their peers' speaking performance, they do not have enough expertise. Cho, Chung, King, and Schunn (2008) stated that there are several assignable attributes for the experts' comments. Expert comments are with more ideas, longer explanation, and less praise, while the peers' comments are with clarification request.

Peer Feedback Pros/Cons

This is quite obvious that peers do spend more time on providing feedback. This is also more

probable that peers provide the feedback immediately after receiving the input because most teachers are busy and have to spend their whole time scoring and evaluating the performances of their students in different settings. Therefore, peer feedback saves time for the teachers to make comments for the whole class. Although peer feedback is less accurate in comparison with the teachers' one, peer feedback can be a solution for the large classes with more than forty students. The other factor that is quite influential for the effectiveness of the feedback is the interactive sense of these feedback that can design a two-way road on which students receive the appropriate feedback in the short period of time and can have more time to get rid of some errors that remain in the mind of the speakers and cause the speakers to follow it unconsciously.

Although peer feedback is one of the most appreciated methods of collaborative speaking, it has its drawback due to the contextual factors. In this respect, one can evaluate the cultural differences as an example of the several reasons that some teachers take into account when they want to bring new methods of instruction up. For instance, Asian students are more inclined to receive the feedback from their teachers because they consider them as the natural source of the knowledge and they do not respect their peers' comment. Thus, the implementation of such approaches may result in the total failure of the course. As Kim and Mathes (2001) expressed, there is a significant difference between implicit and explicit feedback. However, one should tentatively agree with this claim due to cultural differences.

Another issue is that students do not have sufficient knowledge to critically evaluate their peers' speaking. Unfortunately, lack of knowledge may mislead students to follow a special style that is related to their inter-language level in ESL and EFL contexts. Saito and Fujita (2004) stated that teachers always express their concern for the quality of the peer feedback due to the limited knowledge of the students with the same degree of proficiency. Nevertheless, if the teachers provide students with the samples and supervise the whole

process by having direct contact with the feedback provider and feedback receiver, the negative effect of the students' lack of knowledge will be compensated. Furthermore, the Internet access gives the students the opportunity to have more samples and tips regarding the features of good speaking. They can also inform their teachers of the new trends if the teachers do not have the appropriate time to surf the net to find new sources and enjoy others' experiences. Thus, the utilization of the technology should be reemphasized due to its overwhelming sense in education settings and, mostly, in speaking courses with diverse sets of purposes from the very general one to its specific sense (LSP).

Research Questions

RQ1. Do collaborative feedback tasks yield better level of cognition emotion regulation?

RQ2. Is there any relationship between cognition emotion regulation and the language learners' scores in the non-collaborative speaking task?

METHOD

Participants

In order to fulfill the aim of the study, the researcher selected students from discussion classes. The rationale behind this selection is the importance of verbal production and its congruity with emotional states. To this end, 34 students were selected based on cluster-sampling. The students' ages ranged from 17 to 38 years. The students were on the advanced level of proficiency in English. They did not take part in any studies before. In other words, they were not subjected to any intervention in their language learning and unaware of any educational intervention in favor of research. They signed a consent letter since the researchers recorded their voices and their class was considered a platform for the main phase of the study.

Instruments

The main phase of the study was conducted by the administration of emotion regulation questionnaire that consisted of 36 items in 5-point Likert scale format. The items were categorized into nine different sections that

evaluate different dimensions of emotion regulation. These nine dimensions are 1. self-blame, 2. acceptance, 3. rumination, 4. Positive refocusing, 5. refocusing on planning, 6. positive reappraisal, 7. putting into perspective, 8. catastrophizing, and 9. other-blame. Garnefski, Kraaij, and Spinhoven (2002) devised this questionnaire that was estimated to have high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.68$ to $\alpha = .86$).

Data Collection Procedure

The whole phase of the study took place in six weeks. And, due to selection of several groups at different time spans, the main phase of the study with pre-test/post-test stages started in February and finished in March. The students were divided into two groups. In the first session, they were asked to complete the Cognitive Emotion Regulation questionnaire (CERQ) to identify their level of emotion regulation and check whether they can be homogenized with regard to their level of emotion regulation for the fulfillment of the further stages of the study that dealt with intervention through feedback in the form of collaboration. As the students were selected based on cluster-sampling, their group were analyzed and compared with each other at the very beginning of the study. Then, the researchers chose the experimental group. In the first group, students were asked to provide feedback for their peers and collaboratively help each other with regard to every aspect of speaking, that is, Vocabulary, grammar, accent, intonation, and pragmatic appropriateness. Students in this group were asked to help each other and provide non-judgmental peer feedback and analyze their peers' performance and find some solutions for the betterment of speaking skill. In this group, students were asked to find the best strategies for speaking

(Collaborative enquiry) and the solutions and feedback were presented in groups and all groups were asked to discuss the feedback and comments. In the second group (control group), the students were not asked to collaborate with each other to provide feedback. In this group, students acted individually and could respond with less anxiety and more self-confidence since no error correction occurs. The study compared these two groups with regard to collaboration and its effect. The last phase of the study ended with re-evaluation of students' performance in CERQ.

Data Analysis

The present study was methodologically an experimental one. Both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were used and reported by the application of SPSS software (22nd edition). Regarding the first research question, One-way MANOVA was used to track any significant difference between two groups for all nine dimensions of emotion regulation. All requirements of this method of data analysis were met before its application. The normality of distribution was among these requirements. As for the second research question, Multiple Regression analysis was used to identify whether there are correlations between speaking scores of the students in the second group in which feedback was not provided by peers in a collaborate format and cognitive emotion regulation.

RESULTS

The following tables are the result of the study regarding the first research question that deals with the access to collaborative feedback provided in EFL classes. In this regard, One-way MONOVA was run to identify the differences between groups.

Table 2
Multivariate test

	Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.994	450.273b	9.000	24.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.006	450.273b	9.000	24.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	168.852	450.273b	9.000	24.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	168.852	450.273b	9.000	24.000	.000
ref	Pillai's Trace	.528	2.988b	9.000	24.000	.016
	Wilks' Lambda	.472	2.988b	9.000	24.000	.016
	Hotelling's Trace	1.120	2.988b	9.000	24.000	.016
	Roy's Largest Root	1.120	2.988b	9.000	24.000	.016

Based on the table (Table 2), there was a significant difference between two groups of the study, $F(9, 24) = 450.27, p < .05$; Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.472$. In order to understand what elements

of cognitive emotion regulation differ in two groups, test of between-subject's effects is necessary (Table 3).

Table 3
Between subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	SB	31.344 ^a	1	31.344	3.218	.082
	AC	98.882 ^b	1	98.882	9.002	.005
	RU	35.791 ^c	1	35.791	3.619	.066
	PR	13.830 ^d	1	13.830	.923	.344
	RP	143.647 ^e	1	143.647	9.422	.004
	PRP	35.309 ^f	1	35.309	3.528	.069
	PIP	55.621 ^g	1	55.621	4.570	.040
	CA	36.520 ^h	1	36.520	1.457	.236
	OB	147.549 ⁱ	1	147.549	6.977	.013
Intercept	SB	8297.814	1	8297.814	851.835	.000
	AC	8096.529	1	8096.529	737.095	.000
	RU	7096.497	1	7096.497	717.623	.000
	PR	6302.771	1	6302.771	420.525	.000
	RP	6637.647	1	6637.647	435.361	.000
	PRP	8516.485	1	8516.485	850.984	.000
	PIP	5920.445	1	5920.445	486.482	.000
	CA	4758.402	1	4758.402	189.810	.000
	OB	4898.844	1	4898.844	231.653	.000
Rcf	SB	31.344	1	31.344	3.218	.082
	AC	98.882	1	98.882	9.002	.005
	RU	35.791	1	35.791	3.619	.066
	PR	13.830	1	13.830	.923	.344
	RP	143.647	1	143.647	9.422	.004
	PRP	35.309	1	35.309	3.528	.069
	PIP	55.621	1	55.621	4.570	.040
	CA	36.520	1	36.520	1.457	.236
	OB	147.549	1	147.549	6.977	.013
Error	SB	311.715	32	9.741		
	AC	351.500	32	10.984		
	RU	316.444	32	9.889		
	PR	479.611	32	14.988		
	RP	487.882	32	15.246		
	PRP	320.250	32	10.008		
	PIP	389.438	32	12.170		
	CA	802.215	32	25.069		
	OB	676.715	32	21.147		
Total	SB	8730.000	34			
	AC	8681.000	34			
	RU	7414.000	34			
	PR	6853.000	34			
	RP	7408.000	34			
	PRP	8837.000	34			
	PIP	6454.000	34			
	CA	5663.000	34			

Corrected Total	OB	5841.000	34
	SB	343.059	33
	AC	450.382	33
	RU	352.235	33
	PR	493.441	33
	RP	631.529	33
	PRP	355.559	33
	PIP	445.059	33
	CA	838.735	33
	OB	824.265	33

Based on table 3 that focuses on between subjects' effects, receiving collaborative feedback influenced acceptance, refocusing on planning, putting into perspective, and other-blame as the dimensions of cognitive emotion regulation.

The following tables shows the result of the

study with regard to the second research question that focuses on the degree to which emotion regulation dimensions predict the speaking score in the group that received collaborative feedback. Multiple regression was used to pinpoint the predictability of independent variables.

Table 3
Model summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Sig. F Change
1	.941	.885	.754	1.39678	.885	.010

Table 4
ANOVA Results

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	105.343	8	13.168	6.749	.01
1 Residual	13.657	7	1.951		
Total	119.000	15			

R (the value is 0.941), as the quality of prediction for the dependant variable, shows high proportion of variance by the effect of independent variables. R^2 value also shows that for 88

% the variation in dependent variable is due to the independent's ones. The F ratio in ANOVA also indicates that independent variables predict dependent ones ($F(8, 15) = 6.749, p < 0.05$).

Table 5
Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	
(Constant)	2.628	4.425		.071
1 SB	.76	.190	.562	.001
AC	.682	.179		.003
RU	1.048	.190	.848	.001
PR	.692	.122	.594	.009
RP	.063	.148	-.081	.682
PRP	.109	.147	.112	.485
PIP	.095	.108	-.135	.406
CA	.729	.078	.655	.019
OB	.064	.094	-.114	.515

Coefficient table (table 5) shows the predictability of dependent variable by independent ones through a stepwise procedure. As it is observed, Acceptance, Rumination, Self-blame, Catastrophizing, and Acceptance were the predictor of the dependent variable. Except for blaming others, putting into perspective, Positive reappraisal, and refocus on planning, other independent variables predictability was significant. That is, different subscales of cognitive emotion regulation as the independent variables predict speaking scores gained by EFL learners.

DISCUSSION

Speaking classroom. For instance, feedback can play the role of motivator, reinforcer, and even informer in language instruction. Feedback in speaking as a productive activity should follow some strict criteria

Language production in its different modes depends on various factors that contribute to the effectiveness of the performance by the individuals. As Bachman and Palmer (1996) stated, language production is contingent upon affective factors. The current study may be an attempt to decipher this connection with a new perspective. As the result of the study is related to the first research question shows, the collaborative tasks in the form of collaborative feedback provided by the peers in the educational setting are much more facilitative with regard to the cognitive emotion regulation that may, in turn, influence the communication. The very outstanding result in this research question is the role of collaborative feedback in some special dimensions of emotion regulation, that is, acceptance, refocusing on planning, putting into perspective, and other-blame as the dimensions of cognitive emotion regulation. If one focuses on the last dimension, s/he may understand that if students receive more collaborative feedback from their peers in the class, their degree of other-blame increases. This issue may be incongruent with the effectiveness of collaborative feedback. As Saito and Fujita (2004) stated, the effectiveness of collaborative feedback is to some extent questioned because of the same degree of proficiency among the students.

Other-blame dimension of emotion regulation may be related to this fact that students do not accept their peer's comments and try to blame them for their own faults. Since the degree of other-blame increases parallel to the rate of collaborative feedback, this may show that students do not accept their peers' comments due to the lack of knowledge. Refocusing on planning was another dimension of emotion regulation that seemed to be raised due to the influence of collaborative feedback. Eisenberg and Spinrad (2004) pointed out that emotion regulation is to a great extent the result of external forces. In the present study, one may refer to the corrective force as that external forces that influence the individuals' perception about themselves and open a new gate for reshaping the behavior.

Koole (2009) stated that emotion regulation is moving beyond the spontaneous flow of emotion and this viewpoint may be more echoed in refocusing on planning as its dimension. When the students receive collaborative feedback, they control their use of linguistic and nonlinguistic elements in their performances. This control may change their view about themselves and the situation. Also, they may show the result of this change in their behavior. Therefore, collaborative feedback is an important tool to raise students' awareness on their language production. When students confront their peers' comments in the present study, they may cope with the situation. What is paradoxical here is that both dimensions, other blame and refocusing on planning, occur at the same time. While the former is considered to be something quite disadvantageous for the students who enjoy collaborative feedback, the latter is the manifestation of students' eagerness to think about what they did and try to resolve the uncertainties in case of new situations. Eisenberg and Spinrad (2004) stated that external forces may be the predictors of emotion regulation. Collaboration and collaborative feedback in this study showed that the role external forces can be investigated and emotion regulation is not all dependent on personal behavior as an internal change. There are different sources that may influence the speaking performance of students in educational contexts. The density of emotion

regulation after receiving the collaborative feedback is one of the upshot of the present study. That is, the changes of emotion regulation degree due to the collaborative feedback shows that students' performances are influenced by their social interactions.

Regarding the second research question, as it is observed, there was a meaningful relationship between dimensions of emotion regulation and speaking performances of those students who did not receive collaborative feedback at the final stage of the study. The reason to choose this group as the group under study was to eliminate the interfering role of collaborative feedback and directly emphasize the relationship between emotion regulation and speaking proficiency. Shiota, Campos, Keltner and Hertenstein (2004) expressed a positive attitude toward the role of emotion regulation in the development of interpersonal skill. The result presented in this study supported this view because the relationship between speaking competence and emotion regulation became evident. As discussed by Garnefski, Kraaij, and Spinhoven (2002), emotion regulation is a cognitive process by which individuals learn to understand the situations and try to adapt themselves to their varied nature. In Garnefski, Kraaij, and Spinhoven's (2002) model, anxiety and self-confidence were stated to be among the major factors. Anxiety and self-confidence also show themselves in speaking performance of the students. Those who are self-confident and less anxious can perform better in speaking skill and this may show that these students have control on their emotions. Moreover, rumination in Garnefski, Kraaij, and Spinhoven's (2002) scale can show that individuals try to reflectively analyze their behavior. As for EFL students' speaking skill, this rumination may occur and students try to understand why they were too stressed out while they were competent. Reflection can be regarded as the main strategy that bridges the gap between emotion regulation and better speaking performance. As students experience failure and stress, they try to find new strategies and conceive their feelings and reactions after the experience. This reflection may lead

to better analysis of situation and better performance.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed at examining the effect of collaborative feedback on EFL learners' emotion regulation. The result of the study showed that collaboration among language learners influences their emotion regulation power. A speaking course was selected because it provides more opportunity for face-to-face interactions. There was no education regarding different types of feedback and students were asked to express feedback in their own style. In future studies, the role of education can be highlighted and different types of feedback and their role can be discussed. In this study, the major focus was on the collaborative sense of feedback and students were asked to cooperatively correct their errors and there was no room for judgmental views.

As for the relationship between cognitive emotion regulation and speaking skill, except for blaming others, putting into perspective, Positive reappraisal, and refocus on planning as subscales of emotion refection, other subscales of emotion regulation predicted speaking score statistically. This piece of information may help the researchers to understand that higher speaking competence may be related to emotion regulation of EFL learners.

Future studies can address different approaches that can influence emotion regulation and use new models to help EFL learners to control their emotions. In this study, speaking skill was selected for the intervention but other studies can concentrate on writing skill and implement different feedback techniques.

The results of this study can help the language teachers to understand the role of emotions and feelings in speaking courses and find new strategies to help language learners to cope with stress, anxiety, lack of self-esteem and self-confidence. However, action research is needed to find the effect of new models and approaches to enhance learners coping power. Therefore, researchers in the fields of Applied Linguistics and Psychology can work cooperatively to find new linguistic, communicative, and psychological techniques.

References

- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bagby, R. M., Parker, J. D.A., & Taylor, G. J. (1994). The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale-II. Convergent, discriminant, and concurrent validity. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 38(1), 33-40.
- Bar-on, R. (1997). *The emotional intelligence inventory (EQ-I): Technical manual*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bygate, M. (1987). *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cho, K., Chung, T. R., King, W. R., & Schunn, C. (2008). Peer-based computer-supported knowledge refinement: An empirical investigation. *Communications of the ACM*, 51(3), 83-88.
- Eisenberg, N., & Spinrad, T. L. (2004). Emotion-related regulation: Sharpening the definition. *Child Development*, 75(1), 334-339.
- Elliott, R., Watson, J. C., Goldman, R. N., & Greenberg, L. S. (2003). *Learning emotion focus therapy: The process-experiential approach to change*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Garnefski, N., Kraaij, V., & Spinhoven, P. (2002). *Manual for the use of the cognitive emotion, regulation questionnaire: A questionnaire measuring cognitive coping strategies*. Leiderdorp, the Netherlands: DATEC.
- Gielen, S., Peeters, E., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Struyven, K. (2010). Improving the effectiveness of peer feedback for learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 20(4), 304-315.
- Gross, J. J. (2007). *Handbook of emotion regulation*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Gross, J. J., Richards, J. M., & John, O. P. (2006). Emotion Regulation in Everyday Life. In D. K. Snyder, J. Simpson, & J. N. Hughes (Eds.), *Emotion regulation in couples and families: Pathways to dysfunction and health* (pp. 13-35). American Psychological Association
- Ho, J., & Crookall, D. (1995). Breaking with Chinese cultural traditions: Learner autonomy in English language teaching. *System*, 23(2), 235-243.
- Kim, H. R., & Mathes, G. (2001). Explicit vs. implicit corrective feedback. *The Korea TESOL Journal*, 4(1), 57-72.
- Koole, S. (2009). The psychology of emotion regulation: An integrative view. *Cognition and Emotion*, 23(1), 4-41.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2006). Sociocultural theory and L2: State of the Art. *Studies In Second Language Acquisition*, 28(1), 67-109.
- Lazarus, R.S. (1999), *Stress and Emotion: A New Synthesis*, New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Luoma, S. (2004). *Assessing speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lydia Wen, M., Tsai, C. C., & Chang, C. Y. (2006). Attitudes towards peer assessment: a comparison of the perspectives of pre-service and in-service teachers. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 43(1), 83-92.
- Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in higher education*, 31(2), 199-218.
- Pica, T. (1996). Second language learning through interaction: Multiple perspectives. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 12(1), 1-22.
- Shiota, M. N., Campos, B., Keltner, D., & Hertenstein, M. (2004). Positive emotion and regulation of interpersonal relationships. In P. Philippot & R. S. Feldman (Eds.), *The regulation of emotion* (pp. 127-155). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Thompson, R. A. (1994). Emotion regulation: A theme in search of definition. *Mono-graphs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59(2), 25-52.
- Trentacosta, C., & Izard, C. (2007). Kindergarten children's emotion competence as a predictor of their academic competence in first grade. *Emotion*, 7(1), 77-88.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Readings on the development of children*, 23(3), 34-41.

Biodata

Ebrahim Sheikhzadeh Marand received his Ph.D. degree in Linguistics from Allameh Tabataba'i University and he is currently an assistant professor at Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch.

E-mail: *E.sheikhzadeh@iauctb.ac.ir*

Javad Ahmadi Fatalaki received his Ph.D. degree in Applied Linguistics from Allameh Tabataba'i University and his fields of interest are cultural studies and teacher education.

E-mail: *ahmady.fatalaky@gmail.com*

