

UC Berkeley

The CATESOL Journal

Title

"Two Heads Are Better Than One": A Curricular Innovation Through Peer Feedback in a Low-Proficiency ESL Writing Class

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1jp499jv>

Journal

The CATESOL Journal, 28(1)

ISSN

1535-0517

Author

Sivaslian, Lindsey

Publication Date

2016

DOI

10.5070/B5.36039

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed



“Two Heads Are Better Than One”: A Curricular Innovation Through Peer Feedback in a Low-Proficiency ESL Writing Class

Peer feedback benefits in composition have been researched in various EFL and ESL contexts. Typically carried out in intermediate to advanced proficiency-level contexts, little has been done with low-level students, potentially because of greater perceived challenges with syntactic, grammatical, and linguistic knowledge. This curriculum-inquiry project investigates the effects of using a collaborative approach rather than an evaluative approach for peer feedback in low-proficiency-level writing tasks. Working alongside an existing reading and writing curriculum, the peer feedback innovation seeks to support the overall course goals while providing explicit, scaffolded support to navigate the necessary pragmalinguistic knowledge, collaborative attitudes, and peer feedback tasks. In addition to the student-reported benefits of feedback and linguistic evidence of their ability/inability to incorporate collaborative attitudes, the inquiry ends with practical suggestions for writing instructors of low-proficiency students.

Introduction

Peer feedback as a means of writer training and development has a far-reaching past, traceable to a critical juncture in writing pedagogy: the shift from product-oriented instruction to process-oriented instruction. Introduced in the 1960s in L1 contexts, this recursive, communicative, and analytical method shifted the instructional focus and goals from students' finished product to the development phases of writing (Tang & Tithecott, 1999). A technique that engaged students in analysis and subsequent revisions, peer feedback

became one of many popular techniques used in the process approach and thus has been studied since its genesis.

Many assumed that peer feedback, as an effective strategy in L1 writing classrooms, would likewise be beneficial in nonnative speaker (NNS) composition contexts. This assumption was largely supported by Edelsky's 1982 study describing the frequent cognitive parallelisms between L1 and L2 writing (Zhang, 1995). The unquestioning and uncritical attempt to generalize from L1 writing pedagogy without adjustments is one of many controversies surrounding peer feedback in NNS contexts. Researchers such as Silva (2003) have cautioned specifically against this, noting cultural, linguistic, and affective challenges (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). For example, in the cultural domain, a Chinese student may avoid critical feedback, being more concerned with preserving his or her partner's positive face, whereas a Saudi student may seem overly direct to the same student, causing a great deal of discomfort for the feedback pair.

As a result of the debates and attempts to address the challenges, a few different frameworks for peer feedback have emerged. In the late 1980s, DiPardo and Freedman noted the shifting power dynamics involved in using peer response groups and proposed a theoretical framework that emphasizes the actual actions around students' engaging in responsive tasks over teacher-driven directives (1988). Another framework that emerged was that of social constructivism, which views peer feedback as a cognitive exercise grounded in social, collaborative interaction (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005).

The usefulness of peer feedback is contested based on issues including trans-peer cultural differences, questions of validity regarding classmates' knowledge, and effectiveness of student responses (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). Yet many who recognize the benefits to be imparted through peer feedback advocate for an explicit and intentional training approach in peer feedback to mitigate these concerns (Lane & Potter, 1998; Min, 2006). Among these benefits are feedback from multiple and authentic audiences, heightened critical-thinking skills that transfer to one's own writing, an active role in learning, and meaningful contextualized oral interactions that support overall fluency processes (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005).

For the purposes of this curricular innovation, a collaborative framework has been used to inform the feedback approach and relevant pragmalinguistic support. In the article that follows, I will provide a background on relevant literature, discuss the project context, explain the goals and scope and sequence of the curriculum, describe the data-collection methodology, report findings, and render conclusions and future implications.

Background of Relevant Literature

Amid the large body of literature that could be examined and explored around peer feedback with L2 students, the focus has been narrowed to three important aspects of peer feedback that are particularly relevant to the development and execution of this curriculum project. They are as follows: perceptions of peer feedback, reviewer stance with associated speech acts, and approaches to instruction.

Perceptions, Benefits, and the Value of Training Peer Reviewers

While Zhang (1995) concluded that students overwhelmingly prefer teacher feedback to peer feedback, Rollinson (2005) claims there is still great value in peer feedback. He asserts,

Once the peer response process is underway, the [student's] perception of the value ... is likely to change if she begins to receive useful feedback, or finds that commenting on essays is helping her to be more critical of her own writing. (p. 24)

Peer feedback requires students to engage in collaborative communication, carrying out a number of different sociopragmatic interactions including arguing, explaining, clarifying, and justifying (Rollinson, 2005). Often students blindly accept teacher feedback, but peer feedback leads students to engage in higher metacognitive thinking skills as they evaluate peer feedback and decide whether or not to incorporate it into subsequent drafts.

Peer response allows for negotiation between students that fosters critical thinking and exploration around ideas and affords students the opportunity to then translate those thoughts into writing (Lockhart & Ng, 1995). Mendonca and Johnson (1994) found that "peer review forces L2 students to exercise their thinking as opposed to passively receiving information from the teacher" (p. 765). They also concluded that peer review benefited overall SLA processes through the meaningful, contextualized, and frequent oral negotiation process necessitated by peer feedback. Bender (1989) found that advanced, confident writers have also demonstrated successful implementation of feedback in subsequent drafts. Engaging in peer feedback has also been shown to make students more critical of their own work (Furneaux, 2002; Rollinson, 2005).

Peer response has been criticized on the grounds that students often lack necessary linguistic skills to articulate feedback or discern problematic areas in writing (Jacobs, 1989), undervalue their opinion (Hinkel, 2014), are reluctant to disagree with peers, and may question their own authority to make critical evaluations (Carson & Nelson,

1996). It has been suggested that writing instructors may work around some of these challenges through careful instruction on how and why (Lane & Potter, 1998) to engage in peer review sessions and that teachers should also bear responsibility in monitoring students' comments about their peers' writing (Newkirk, 1984). Most of the problems associated with these criticisms can be mitigated or put to rest if an instructor is willing to carefully set up the peer review tasks, provide adequate training, and engage in ongoing monitoring of peer review sessions (Min, 2006; Rollinson, 2005).

The Role of Reviewer

Individual students from different cultures with unique personalities bring different attitudes, experiences, and expectations to peer feedback sessions. These differences can be outwardly observed in the choice of language, tone, and focus of talk in feedback sessions, as well as overall feelings about the feedback experience. These differences are the source of much of the contention and many of the challenges around peer feedback. Hence, the role of the reviewer became an important point of analysis in developing this project, and the literature that follows informed and inspired much of the resulting feedback training and lesson content.

In focusing on the role of the reviewer, this section reviews some rare and interesting research that has been conducted in the hopes of raising student awareness and equipping student populations in developing greater competencies to exercise in peer review sessions. As the target class's cultural and linguistic backgrounds vary, consideration of the effect such variables play is worth noting. In their 1996 study, Carson and Nelson found differences between the way Chinese students and Spanish students approached peer feedback. The former demonstrated more face-saving strategies and were governed by "harmony maintenance" (p. 2). Operating under collectivistic notions, the authors observed that Chinese students struggled to critically respond to peer writing, preferred to write criticisms rather than speak them, and may unsuccessfully try to soften critical comments through indirect questions, as illustrated in the following excerpt:

Data Extract 1: Unsuccessful Critical Feedback

S: At that specific moment I understood what Daisy was saying, but I didn't get her point... I didn't know why she was asking me that question. [*Luisa (2), 44-52*] (p. 16)

The Spanish students, on the other hand, believed that helping their partner improve was of primary importance and good social inter-

actions were secondary. The authors conclude that the natural tendencies in social settings maintained by the Chinese students could inhibit the peer review process, thus establishing the need for pedagogical intervention.

Additionally, Hinkel (2014) identified three cultural and pragmatic challenges that led to insufficient support or detail in ESL students' writing:

1. Lack of perceived authority to make judgments or express their opinions on topics;
2. Undervaluing their opinion; and
3. The belief that excessive detail is trivial to readers and implies a lack of humility.

Hinkel's (2014) finding reveals a fundamental problem related to the sociopragmatics of peer review, mainly, that students may lack a clear understanding of their role and authority for performing the various functions necessary in successful peer review sessions. The source of this problem has already taken root at the outset of peer review sessions and therefore should be addressed before students engage in such activities. It dictates a need for a strong pedagogical approach that first defines the purpose of peer review for students and then establishes their role and authority during the session.

Lockhart and Ng (1995) add that a reviewer should not be authoritative in nature and the writer passive, describe the negative effects of such a power dynamic, and also emphasize the importance of reviewers' focusing during sessions on understanding the writer's actual intention over the reader's perception of it. In this study, the speech acts associated with this investigation are clarification requests, confirmation checks, and questions that elicit more information. Then, reviewers may proceed to offer opinions and suggestions, or can, through the use of negotiation tactics, elicit the desired information from the writers themselves, thereby functioning in a more collaborative role, which was most favored by Lockhart and Ng.

Actual data from their study are quite informative and worth analyzing to discover the relationship between the reviewers' assumed role/stance and its effect on the resulting interaction and *how* that interaction is negotiated and the speech acts employed. Lockhart and Ng (1995) analyzed 27 video recordings of ESL peer feedback sessions and identified four categories of reader stances (authoritative, interpretive, probing, and collaborative) as well as five functional categories of language (summarize essay, give suggestion, give opinion, give information, express intention) used across those stances. Those four

stances and their corresponding characteristics are summarized in Appendix A. While the authors noted that different stances could be beneficial depending on the instructional goals, the discovery modes (probing and collaborative) seemed to be favored for effectiveness and students' ability to internalize and apply feedback. The collaborative mode seemed to be the most favored of the two. Hence, it is interesting to note the different kind of speech acts (functions) and the ratio between the readers' and writers' talk time noted by the authors and the subsequent impact on the tone of the session. While the other three stances remained fairly balanced in talk time, in the authoritative stance the reader (R1) dominated the floor with opinion statements and giving information, allowing the writer little opportunity to reflect on his intended meaning and reformulation to that end:

Data Extract 2: Authoritative Reader Stance

(R1): Um... You have men-you you have mentioned the generation gap but do not Uh, but you did not Uh mention how it forms, and then the spy-psychiatric problems, what about that? You have not given any examples to who what what are the problems.... oh maybe I get I give another point. Uh I think Uh a part of your passage is not Uh logical.

[Extract 1-A4445] (pp. 616-617)

The above dialogue seems very direct and "You"-subject fronted. Giving information and opinions in this way could be having a strong and negative effect on the writer, who is virtually silent throughout the dialogue. R1 was unsuccessful in discovering the writer's intention because he was operating solely on his own assumptions. Lockhart and Ng (1995) report that this writer (W1) incorporated reader feedback the least into the following draft, suggesting it was not helpful or not a desirable mode of delivery.

The interpretive stance also had high incidence of opinion statements, and there were also informative statements and a fair number of suggestions given by the reader (R2) and more interaction with the writer (W2). The following excerpt illustrates that this stance lends itself to better interaction and sharing of the floor between the reader (R2) and the writer (W2):

Data Extract 3: Interpretive Stance

(R2): I think that your description is very vivid. Very good. But if you can describe more about the reaction of the Romanians, I think your writing // will be better//

[positive assessment and opinion statement]

(W2): of that Romanian// You mean that the bald Romanian?=
[clarification request]

(R2): =The one teach you how to dance. I think it's very good.
You're your writ-writing will be more perfect.

[information/opinion statement]

(W2): Just to add more information about these two events?=
[clarification request]

(R2): =Not only your own feeling. Uh more description about the
reaction of the Uh Romanians or other people.

[information/opinion statement]

(W2): I see.

[Extract 6-A0904] (p. 622)

While the authors note improvement from the first approach in that it is text driven rather than task driven, they still find fault with the reader (R2) for basing revisionary comments on his or her own interest/bias rather than seeking to understand the writer's (W2) intentions. R2 at least starts out with a positive assessment compared to R1, who delves straight into negative feedback. Turn taking is evident and the floor is shared to a greater extent in this interaction, in stark contrast to the first. W2 is actually able to make two clarification requests.

The probing stance added to the above using information requests and opinion requests. As stated above, it is considered a discovery mode because unlike with the authoritative and interpretive stances, the reader (R3) is not assuming the writer's (W3) intention but seeks to uncover it. Thus, the various speech acts here work together to build mutual discovery of the accurate articulation of the writer's (W3) intent. Both speakers also gave confirmation utterances and it can clearly be seen that the attention to the writer's intent is first being questioned, then explained, and then elaborated upon. Throughout the dialogue, both speakers equally share the floor and the frequent overlaps may indicate that both parties view the interaction favorably:

Data Extract 4: Probing Stance

(R3): Um... the most important point I find you made in your assignment is "the doctors and nurses are willing to accept the mercy killing, it is quite difficult to persuade the the administrators to do this."

[information given regarding content]

(W3): (pause) Yes, I think Um the main... ideas, the most important ideas in my... composition is this one=

[confirmation of R interpretation]

(R3): =mm=

[back channeling- phatic]

(W3): =and I tried to use my composition to Um... a sort of persuade the others to... accept the idea of euthanasia

[information- articulates intent]

(R3): You want them to accept your idea?

[clarification request]

(W3): I think Um... I do... support Um the idea of euthanasia, and I... wish that by using this composition, they will accept my ideas as well.

[information-explains intent]

(R3): mm. But do you think Uh... it is a top- this is a topic, ... which people have different opinions about that Um...=

[requests opinion]

(W3): =for very long time=

[agreement with added information]

(R3): =yes, for very long time and ... in my opinion, I can't make a decision on whether I can accept this or not because you see, killing a person or to prolong his life, is two, very extreme matters.

[opinion w/hedging]

(W3): Yeah You know when I was first Um... when I first wrote this Um assignment, ... I am a sort of in the middle. And I tried to present the views in ... both, in both for and against, but then Um... I tried to ... but then find that there is more... disadvantage rather than advantage.

[information-elaborates on intent]

[Extract 10-A0514] (p. 626)

The collaborative stance's responses looked similar to the probing stances, but the excerpt below actually shows the writer taking the initiative and seeking to elicit an assessment to ascertain the reader's perception of a part of his paper.

Data Extract 5: Collaborative Stance

(W4): So how about the cooking part?

[elicitation]

(R4): The cooking part. It's interesting.

[confirmation check and elicitation response]

(W4): Because I love to eat=

(R4): =really? (laughter)

(W4): (laughter) Yes.

(R4): But... what kind of fun can you get during cooking?

[asking opinion]

(W4): Because you have you will have the satisfactory, when you have cooked a dish that your family would like it and other people would like it, would would appreciate your effort. So I think it's... it's rewarding=

[giving opinion]

(R4): =rewarding=

[echoic repetition]

(W4): =to hav- to cook a dish.=

[continuation of opinion]

(R4): = But it seems you you did not mention this part very... detailly.

[hedged information-indirect suggestion]

(W4): Yes, // Yes// . (laughter) Yes I I I'd better write it down.

[accept suggestion]

(R4): mmMM

[Extract 13-A3135] (pp. 629-630)

This initiation connects to a finding from the needs analysis reported by the course instructor that students needed to learn not only how to *give* feedback on peer's work, but how to *elicit* it on their own. There are places of laughter and request overlap, indicating that this session was particularly engaging to both parties. The reader is able to help the writer develop additional information to make the paper stronger and successfully suggests its incorporation with a hedging act ("it seems") and a suggestion that relies on implicature for the writer to interpret its meaning. The writer does so successfully and agrees with the reader to make the change. In the end, the writer benefited from the interaction and decides to include the reader's suggestion in his next draft. Interestingly enough, regarding the five functional categories, authoritative and interpretive readers gave their opinion most frequently while probing and collaborative readers more frequently gave information.

Lockhart and Ng (1995) conclude that the outcome of a peer feedback session is greatly influenced by the stance the reader takes. For the purposes of this article and the subsequent curriculum it informs, it is also interesting to note the differing speech acts associated with the favorable stances, the differing turn-taking styles, and who held the floor and for what duration. A relevant study by Lane and Potter (1998) found that reviewers' stances may be chosen by the readers based on their own personality characteristics rather than instruction in peer review that they have received. This is not to say that

instruction is ineffective and that a reviewer's stance is predetermined, but rather that course instructors wishing to incorporate peer review into their writing classrooms need to take into account different student personalities. It may be helpful to raise students' awareness of this fact in order to increase their own self-awareness, making favorable stances through instruction more obtainable.

Approaches to Instruction

In considering pedagogical methods for this study, two types of instructional research were considered and then integrated in the curriculum project that follows: that of pragmatic and peer feedback instruction. Peer feedback inherently contains speech acts with highly influential pragmatic force that necessitate such considerations.

Kasper and Rose (2002) studied the role of instruction in acquiring target language pragmatic principles and forms. Among their conclusions, they found value in explicit instruction related to Schmidt's noticing hypothesis (1990). Notable among their findings was that sociopragmatic errors are correctable through explicit metapragmatic discussions and are dependent on the dynamics of the interaction and the situation in which the speakers find themselves. They also concluded that a range of pragmatic features (discourse markers and strategies, pragmatic routines, speech acts, overall discourse characteristics, and pragmatic comprehension) *are* teachable, learners who receive instruction fare better than those who do not, and that pragmalinguistic errors are correctable through recasts and detected in ongoing interaction. Findings from several studies reveal that pragmatic competence for L2 learners comes through explicit, intentional instruction (Kasper & Rose, 2002; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Silva, 2003).

Regarding research on instructional practices specifically used in peer feedback, the following recommendations have been made: Lane and Potter (1998) saw all peer review groups increase integration of peer feedback in drafts after receiving instruction in the process of peer feedback, including handouts, lectures with discussion, videotaped demonstrations, and role-plays. Student acquisition of peer feedback skills seemed receptive to these forms of instruction. Furneaux (2002) recommends using a group peer feedback model in which three or four other students read and comment on each student's paper in their group. She suggests this gives writers more perspective and can reinforce feedback that is common among readers and discern erroneous feedback from weaker students in a group. An important component of this method is that student-reviewers may not see other reviewers' comments. Furneaux also recommends the use of content-specific checklists to help guide readers both in their

reviewing and discussing of a partner's text.

Combining these two areas of pedagogy, additional studies reveal the following information that was helpful to the development of this peer feedback curricular innovation. Min's (2006) study found that students benefited from explicit instruction in giving peer feedback that followed the following four-step procedure first modeled to the students by the writing instructor:

1. Clarify writers' intentions;
2. Identify the source of the problems;
3. Explain the nature of problems;
4. Make specific suggestions.

Students' varying approaches to peer feedback, while culturally sensitive (Carson & Nelson, 1996), are not fixed but are sensitive to instruction (Min, 2006). Students will not instinctively know their role in peer review and how it is carried out but require explicit instruction in these areas (Hinkel, 2014). To address this, Rollinson (2005) suggests a "propaganda phase" in which students are educated on the benefits of peer feedback versus teacher feedback, clarifying the role of the responder as collaborator (not director), modeling nonthreatening practices, and discussing appropriate versus inappropriate commenting, providing balanced feedback (including strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions for improvement), and discussion of obligation to revise versus freedom to reject reviewer's comments.

Once a peer review session has begun, readers/reviewers do better to take a discovery-oriented approach, focusing on the writer's meaning or intention rather than the reviewer's opinion (Lockhart & Ng, 1995). Instructing students in probing and collaborative response techniques is helpful to that end. These techniques generally focus on readers' *asking for* rather than *giving* information and opinions on content and meaning. Positive sessions were also characterized by confirmation checks, clarification requests, hedging criticisms, overlaps in speech turns, and even laughter (Lockhart & Ng, 1995). Teaching learners the pragmatic force and implications of speech acts in peer review sessions (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994) may raise learners' awareness and skill in exercising various speech acts to accomplish peer review goals.

Project Context

The Students

This current study is conducted in an intensive English program (IEP) in an English for academic purposes (EAP) context. Students

spend eight hours per week for 12 weeks in this reading and writing class, for a total of 96 instructional hours over the course of the semester. The class makeup is as follows: five Saudi students, five Chinese students, three Japanese students, and one Libyan student. Nine of the students are male, and five of the students are female. Most are undergraduate bound. The majority of the students are around 20 years old, but the overall age range is 19-35.

Before beginning the semester, all students underwent an intensive, two-day-long placement process beginning with a full TOEFL exam and then follow-up diagnostics in writing, listening, and speaking. Students in this study all fell into the TOEFL range of 360-430 at the outset of the semester. The language school uses this score to categorize their level as being low-intermediate proficiency. They have enough English to be in an intensive English program, but their vocabulary and grammatical abilities are such that defining words in English is greatly restricted in that there are a limited number of words that can be used in such an explanation. Another challenge is the degree to which they know a word. A student may have knowledge of a word in one sense but may be unable to demonstrate understanding of it in another. An example of this can be seen with the word *idea*. The students demonstrate knowledge of this word in oral production, but when asked to identify an idea in a classmate's paper they liked, the concept became too abstract for many, and the task was met with mixed success.

The Existing Curriculum

The curriculum consists of a course reader and descriptions of scaffolded daily tasks to accomplish during the course of the 12-week semester. As it is an intensive English program, the students spend eight hours per week over the course of four days in their reading and writing class. They have an additional 14 hours of work per week spread across two other classes: Oral Communication Skills and Grammar. The reading and writing curriculum seeks to develop the following skills:

<i>Reading-Related Skills</i>	<i>Writing-Related Skills</i>
1. Prereading strategies: previewing texts and making predictions	1. Responsive writing
2. Reading for ideas	2. Brainstorming strategies: listing, free-writes, and clustering

3. Articulating an article's main idea and analyzing supporting details	3. Learning and following the writing process with a culminating essay
4. Vocabulary strategies: guessing word meaning from context, prefixes and suffixes, and incorporating new vocabulary into writing	4. Paragraph development: supporting main ideas and topic sentences with examples, stories, and explanations
5. Outside reading projects	5. Rhetorical patterns used in US academic contexts

Explanation of Peer Feedback Curriculum

Goals/Outcomes

In consideration of and in an effort to reinforce the existing course goals, the peer feedback goals were developed and articulated as such:

1. Support Existing Curriculum: Idea development and elaboration through peer review
2. Support Student Writing Development:
 - a. Raise metacognitive awareness of content and ability to analyze deeper
 - b. Collaboration with peers for ideas
 - c. Comprehensibility of ideas

Scope and Sequence (Development and Explanation)

The scope and sequence are woven together with the existing curriculum's unit topic, focus, and particular writing assignment. For the detailed scope and sequence, see Appendix A. Drawing from Rollinson's (2005) steps and combining them with his and Min's (2006) techniques, peer feedback rationales and foci, objectives, activities, and specific pragmatic language are taught within each unit. The instructional approach in each unit is also explicit and collaborative, as outlined in the research above.

It is worth noting the overall progression: Early on in Units 1 and 2 the focus is on getting students used to and comfortable reading each other's papers in a low-stakes way. Compliment language and tasks are also used in these units. The third unit takes the longest to teach as it contains explicit instruction through video, role-play (see Appendix B), and analysis of the two feedback modes. The language in the role-play is influenced by actual transcripts in Rollinson's (2005) study, and the content was molded around the Unit 3 writing task to further reinforce goals and enable student success on papers. Given

students' lower proficiency, it was necessary to simplify the language used to distinguish feedback models, so the first mode is referred to as "parent-style" and the second as "discovery-style" in the accompanying lesson materials. There is also a language-discrimination task (see Appendix C) for the students before they begin the actual feedback activity. The specific language used in this task is taken from an earlier needs assessment conducted by the researcher in an ESL composition course. The fourth unit shifts to a focus on paragraph content and organization, and in the feedback session students are asked to assess and comment on the relevancy of information in the paragraphs and make suggestions of places in the paragraph where their partners could add more details for clarity and support. Previous rationales and techniques are reviewed and modeled before new ones are taught. Students are given explicit elaboration requests, language to talk about irrelevant ideas, as well as additional and convincing rationales, one example being the story of the Lundstrom and Baker (2008) study, in which students who *only gave* feedback showed greater gains in writing during the course of the semester than students who *only received* feedback. Given the time constraints of developing this project and presenting by its deadline, Unit 5 was the only unit whose content could not be piloted in this study. It is worth noting, however, that the findings indicate a need for the focus and objectives contained in this unit.

An example of the peer feedback scope and sequence from Unit 3 is shown in Figure 1. Note how the existing writing assignment and description are supported by the feedback curriculum. Within the sample, it can readily be seen how the instruction to "clearly explain why" then influences the unit feedback rationale (enhance clarity), objectives (identify areas in writing that are unclear, make clarification requests, and discover their own writing's comprehensibility), activities (pair work in which unclear ideas are marked with a question mark), and specific speech acts that were taught (clarification requests) to accomplish these objectives. Such structure can be seen in the other four units as well.

Methods of Data Collection

After the development of the curriculum came the opportunity for piloting. Working alone and under time constraints, the researcher's piloting of materials was limited to Units 1-4. Data were collected during the course of nine weeks within the 12-week course by the researcher and students themselves (recordings). Instructor journal entries were written after each of the feedback sessions, recording general observations, student comments, and insights from the day. Three

Unit (w/ Dates)	Writing Assignment	PF Rationale and Focus	Objectives	Activity	Classroom Language
3: Work and Job Satisfaction Start Day 14: March 5 FB Day 18: March 12	Response Paper: 1. Describe your ideal job What are the qualities of the job? 2. Why are these qualities important? 3. Use details and examples so your classmates can clearly understand WHY you would be satisfied with the job	Rationales: 1. Enhance clarity (help partner know what can't be understood and clarify) 2. meaningful language negotiation Focus: 1. Model different roles—collaborative stance (through questions) versus authoritative stance (through judgment statements) 2. Beware of interpreting meaning; ask for clarification	SWBAT: Identify areas in peer's writing that are unclear SWBAT: ask peers clarification requests that invoke writer elaboration of ideas SWBAT: discover the comprehensibility of their writing to peers through comprehension checks	Role-Play Video: 1. Video of two stances 2. Elicit and discuss differences Language-Analysis Activity: Part 1: Show ambiguous sample, leads to teaching clarification request Part 2: Discrimination task between authoritative and collaborative language Pair Work: 1. Mark "?" on unclear ideas 2. * ideas you like 3. Write two questions to ask your partner to help you understand his or her ideas more.	Clarification Requests: • "I'm confused about this part. Can you explain this more to me?" • "What does this word mean?" • "What is your opinion/main idea in this part?" Comprehension Checks: • "Did you understand what I wrote here?"

Figure 1. An example of Unit 3's peer feedback scope and sequence.

qualitative surveys were given: (a) a prefeedback background survey; (b) a questionnaire just after the fourth writing assignment that was used to compare students' perspectives of the feedback they had given and received with changes that resulted in their final drafts; and (c) a final post-feedback questionnaire that asked students specifically whether or not they personally experienced the benefits touted in the propaganda-rationale phase. Final drafts and peer feedback drafts were copied and compared. Then, changes, particularly additions to final drafts, were noted. Audio recordings from students' smartphones of peer feedback sessions in Units 3 and 4 were analyzed. Selective interactions of interest were then transcribed for further, detailed analysis.

Data Findings and Discussion

Instructor Journals

Initially, students felt more comfortable writing their feedback comments, but this changed through time as students were given and

used specific speech acts to accomplish feedback tasks. In the first feedback session, most comments revolved around content, but one Chinese student, Joe, expressed great enthusiasm for and interest in a Japanese student's complex sentences and grammar forms. Such was his enthusiasm that he held a friend back during break time to show him as well. Reading his classmate's paper provided him with the opportunity to notice a near-peer's language forms through comparison and analysis. Interestingly enough, Joe's sentence structures became increasingly complicated during the course of the semester as he experimented with his interlanguage. Many other students struggled to identify an idea they liked within their partner's paper because they did not know if "idea" meant "sentence" or something else. They did not know the bounds of an idea and how to articulate it back to their partner.

As time went on, this became easier, and the language support helped students move from primarily providing written feedback to oral feedback. Note one interesting interaction from the second session's peer feedback journal, demonstrating one student's noticing of her own error through peer feedback:

One interesting development—Today "Lani" and "Adam" were working together. Lani made an important discovery about her own paper in reading Adam's paper—she had only discussed one of the 4 required topics in the prompt. She had interpreted that she should choose one to write about, rather than writing about ALL of them. Despite frequent directions and comprehension checks on this key point, she had still missed it. But peer feedback provided her with yet another opportunity to learn what was expected of her in her paper. This may be an interesting finding I hadn't thought of. It is important to note that it was HER OWN DISCOVERY, not based on her partner's comments. (3/4/2015)

In the third session, students really enjoyed the opportunity to read, watch, and then act out each scenario. They could really internalize and contrast the effects of the two modes. While their language level was limited in describing the difference, they could articulate that

1. The discovery style felt more comfortable;
2. The discovery style was more helpful to the writer;
3. The one-sided conversation was the parent style;
4. There were specific speech-act differences between the two stances, such as "you"-fronted statements in the evaluative mode versus "I"-fronted statements in the discovery mode.

An interesting finding from the fourth feedback session was based on a postclass interaction with a Japanese student. “Melanie” shared how difficult it had been for her to do the peer feedback session because she could not say what she wanted to in English (she did not have the linguistic knowledge to support expression of her ideas in English). Despite being a fairly strong writer for the class level, Melanie’s limited ability to listen to and comprehend peers’ comments was further confounded by her lack of lexical knowledge. The audio recording of her session confirmed this, and much of her interaction was uncomfortable pauses, fillers, and giggles. It appears that peer feedback at lower levels requires a certain proficiency or at least a willingness to engage in negotiation-style communication. This student’s discomfort with free, unstructured communication beyond the initial sentence starters that were provided demonstrates a “bottom” or minimum conversational skill needed for such tasks. Whereas other students became more comfortable in time having such conversations, Melanie could never accomplish them at all. Such peer feedback tasks may not be doable for all lower-proficiency learners and would need adaptation and further simplification for classes lower than the one studied here.

Surveys

Surprisingly, in the first survey, eight of 14 students reported having experience in peer feedback in their home countries. Nine of the 14 reported asking friends or family to read their papers before turning them in. Students reported various feelings about peer feedback, including shyness (1), embarrassment (1), difficulty (1), confusion (1), shame (1), and only eight of the students reported positive feelings toward peer feedback. One response could not be categorized: “It depends.”

In the second survey, all students reported both giving and receiving helpful feedback, but when asked about resulting changes, eight students reported making a change to Unit 4’s writing assignment. Some students reported disagreeing with their partner’s feedback, even though they had just commented that it was helpful. For example, one student wrote: “No, I don’t have any change because I think it is a good detail [his original idea].” Another student, “Jerry,” also reported receiving helpful feedback: “Yes of course. She says my writing the second paragraph need to add more example to support my detail.” Yet when asked about changes he made to the final draft, Jerry reported: “No I don’t change. It’s not [that] my partner’s opinion not good. Opposite her opinion is very nice. This is my problem. I don’t have a lot of experience to let me think a lot of example of work.”

This is not surprising because Jerry's partner was Melanie, who herself expressed frustration in not being able to articulate ideas, and in this case, supporting Jerry in finding more examples to add to his paper.

The third and final survey had asked if students experienced the benefits that the rationale/propaganda phase taught. It yielded an interesting affective discovery: All 14 of the students reported enjoying peer feedback in contrast to the eight in the prefeedback survey. One student still reported difficulty and another reported embarrassment, but they still reported enjoying the activities and viewed them as beneficial. Additionally, 100% of students reported agreement with the following three statements:

1. "I thought deeper about my paper after reading my peer's paper";
2. "Peer feedback was helpful"; and
3. "I got more ideas from my writing."

Nine out of 13 reporting students (one did not report) agreed with the statement "I could see places my writing was not clear and fix them." Because improvement in subsequent papers throughout the semester is difficult to correlate to the peer feedback activities in this course, the qualitative data provided by these surveys became an important indicator of the effect feedback might have been having on students' metacognitive processes as they engaged in analysis of peers' work and ultimately their own. Some interesting quotes that came out of the final survey strongly indicated these higher analytical functions were activated through the peer feedback activities:

1. "I could notice my mistakes and [places with] less detail. I could change sentences to better than before."
2. "I like the peer feedback. Because the peer give me some good advices, and some sentens is confused, I can rewrite it again. Make my compusition more deeper."
3. "While read peer feedback I can contrast my paper. Then, I will know what should I improve next paper."
4. "You find a new idea or words, and maybe a new strategy. No matter what the essay says, its about wht did you leane behiend this."
5. "Yes. I enjoy my classmate papers because it can let me know more information about learning English"
6. "it is good because it show me my mistake and I like to learn from my mistake"

Students also reported in qualitative data enjoying that peer feedback

provided them with the opportunity to practice speaking, which is not normally thought of as a goal or focus of a composition class. This speaking occurred in a meaningful and contextualized atmosphere, which is beneficial to SLA processes.

1. “yes, I did because I heard new idea from classmate and I could talked a lot”
2. “I like to talk friend about my papers. I like listen to partners idea.”
3. “I like peer feedback because it helps me to learner moro new word, and it helps me to do practice speaking”

Two students mentioned specific linguistic challenges associated with carrying out peer feedback activities at their proficiency level:

1. “sometime people don’t understand you or simple words than you have to explain a lot but the worst thng if you classmate don’t understand you even than explain as well”
2. “Explain is to difficult, because we have difficult thinking. If I thought it’s not good, but partner thought it’s good. I can’t explain well why it’s not good.”

Despite these challenges, these students still reported enjoying peer feedback activities and found them beneficial to their writing development.

Feedback and Final Draft Comparison

These data were perhaps the most unyielding of all. Much of what students wrote about peer feedback and discussed on recordings did not make tremendous differences in revisions to their final drafts. Many of the students said they were *going to make changes* but this only happened in three of the drafts for Unit 4. Three reasons for this may be

1. Students forgot;
2. Students wanted to be polite and so accepted the feedback with no intention of using it; or
3. Students did not know how to incorporate the feedback and so did not.

Without follow-up interviews with students in their L1, it is difficult to determine the cause. Granted, the papers were about two paragraphs each to begin with, but the lack of execution of feedback in this area highlighted the needs students have for specific training as to how

to incorporate feedback, and even whether or not to do so. Students were taught “the right of refusal” in Unit 4, and Unit 5 was designed to provide scaffolded training around incorporation of feedback, but it was unable to be executed this time because of schedule limitations.

Audio Recordings of Feedback Interactions

The data provided in the audio recordings were indispensable. For an instructor, they allowed a form of assessment not usually employed as a teacher cannot be everywhere at once. These recordings actually demonstrated learning: heightened critical thinking and verbal negotiation of ideas that led to learning. The following interesting insights were observed in students’ dialogues and transcribed. Examples of each represented insight follow:

(1) Demonstration of collaborative speech acts and conversational-style feedback taught for the discovery mode

	@0:55		Description
1	Chocolate	I have a question ... I'm confused about this sentence. (.) Could you explain this one to me?	Collaborative lang. from lesson: Clarification Request
2	Zaz	It mean, people are different in their idea, some of them like casual clothes and some of them, another not. It's like, some people, they like wear casual clothes in the work and some people, they doesn't like.	
3	Chocolate	(Back channeling throughout)	
4	Zaz	They like to wear formal clothes.	
5	Chocolate	Ooooo, “another not” is -	
6	Zaz	Yeah, formal clothes	
7	Chocolate	AHHHH I think (.) you should add , add this	collaborative lang. from lesson

Specific examples of class language facilitating the discovery mode can

be found in lines 1 and 7. Here, Chocolate uses “I”-fronted language and a questioning strategy to elicit meaning rather than interpreting meaning.

(2) *Instances of students noticing their own errors when their partner was providing feedback*

	@1:43		Description
1	Chocolate	Ah, this is “when you wear jeans or T-shirt (.) T---shirt or short you will feel rest and you will not work” (2) Feel rest, why feeee- short you feel rest?	
2	Zaz	No. Feel rest is like mean feel comfortable or relaxed. But my mistake is (.) FEEL is a verb and REST is a verb.	Finds own grammatical error (outside focus of FB)
3	Chocolate	(backchannels throughout) Ohhhh ... (laughs)	
4	Zaz	I have to change it to adjective	
5	Chocolate	Yes. And I think add (6) ahh (.) rest, why rest (2) because dttdtdtdtd ...	+detail sugg.
6	Zaz	uh huh (.) more details about rest.	

Here, in line 1, Chocolate begins to ask an elaboration request, and Zaz sees something in his paper he had not seen before—a grammatical error (line 2). Zaz analyzes it in terms of the part of speech, noting that it should be in adjective form rather than verb form.

(3) *Analysis of function of ideas within a paragraph/paper, not just the content of those ideas; and*

(4) *Inaccurate feedback resulting in reevaluation and higher metacognition*

	@ 5:10		Description
1	Walter	ah- there (.) here you are talking about , uh , that place you was job , there?	

2	Chucky	yeah yeah yeah	
3	Walter	I think it's ah , its some details it's not irrelevant (.) it's not supporting ahhh (.) it's not supporting yourrr ah main idea	analysis of function of idea within paragraph
4	Chucky	yeah yeah yeah but which one	
5	Walter	Really I- itsstaaaa , serious (.) here , ahhh (reads from paper "Harajuku has many clothing stores and also has many shoes stores and they are always struggling to sell shoes. "	
6	Chucky	yeah	
7	Walter	WHY- why did you tell me that?	clarification request (function)
8	Chucky	well, um , well because I- I was working in shoe stores	
9	Walter	I know , but why you put it here .	disagreement sequence
10	Chucky	here?	"
11	Walter	yeah. Why you explain they are a have a story for shoes they are have a story for – WHY . (.) do you think the sentence , support your main idea ?	'
12	Chucky	yeah support	'
13	Walter	HOW – tell me why	'
14	Chucky	(unintelligible) be- because.....	'
15	Walter	Here it's okay yeah here-	'
16	Chucky	- connect connect connect this sentence (.) okay , read again read again	'

17	Walter	(laughs) okay (reads previous sentence: “if we worn uncool clothes, might be our shop already closed down because the employee means of store’s reputation”) This is personal experience.	provides explanation
18	Chucky	yeah	
19	Walter	right?	
20	Chucky	Yeah	
21	Walter	that’s (okay?)	
22	Chucky	okay .	
23	Walter	But here , WHY explain about this story	clarification request- cont.
24	Chucky	- this sentence ?	
25	Walter	yeah? (.) why you , yeah	
26	Chucky	this is more- reputation (.) reputation -	
27	Walter	ah-	
28	Chucky	reputation means yeah al-	
29	Walter	-what does reputation mean.	source of miscommunication discovered
30	Chucky	oh reputation means a for example so you know Louis Vuitton?	unknown word discussed
31	Walter	yeah .	“
32	Chucky	Louis Vuitton.	“
33	Walter	Louis Vuitton? ah, ha, have expensive uhhhhh	“
34	Chucky	- yeah so when -	“
35	Walter	brand?	“

36	Chucky	Louis Vuitton, Louis Vuitton's employee wear, Louis Vuitton so cool	“
37	Walter	- yeah yeah yeah have expensive brands-	meaning co-construction
38	Chucky	- yeah suits suits and uh wow I wanna be like him or something like that, this is so important in Harajuku's stores employee, haraaaaajuku, yeah	“
39	Walter	Ahh ... now it's clear for me (.) I got it	evidence of reassessment of sentence function
40	Chucky	yeah, it's so important (.) so many many clothing-	
41	Walter	yeah yeah yeah	
42	Chucky	-stores in the main issue so we , we must wear so fashionable	
43	Walter	yeah yeah yeah I got it-	mutual understanding reached
44	Chucky	-so we have to, fashionable person everyday , very important.	

The above sample illustrates two points. In line 3, Walter first demonstrates that he is not only responding to the content of his partner's idea, but to the role that idea plays within the whole paragraph. This initial analysis is an instance of incorrect feedback, and as the dialogue unfolds, it demonstrates how both students were able to meaningfully navigate the conversation and reach consensus after the source of misunderstanding is identified in line 29. Walter then reevaluates his initial prognosis of the irrelevant idea and concludes, "I got it!" This false correction facilitated a meaningful dialogue of critical thinking, analysis, co-construction of word meaning, and a reevaluation of the function of the idea within the sentence. This was a powerful demonstration of the higher metacognitive thinking that peer feedback promotes.

(5) Accurate feedback leading to positive revisions

	@ 3:54		Description
1	Walter	But I have a question- You say (2) "I think the clothes- casual clothes at work are not a good idea because casual clothes means , to show personality.	discovery language: beginning of elaboration request
2	Chucky	Yeah	
3	Walter	WHY do you think it shows, personality?	elaboration request
4	Chucky	Show personality of (4) just mean, so if I	elaboration negotiation
5	Walter	(coughing in background)	"
6	Chucky	If I wear so dirty clothes, or like, dirt or yeah something smell -	"
7	Walter	- yeah yeah yeah	"
8	Chucky	and so- and you you think , oh-	"
9	Walter	-ahh (.) you are dirty	"
10	Chucky	you are soooooo dirty	"
11	Walter	you aren't cool	"
12	Chucky	Yeah, cool	"
13	Walter	I think-	"
14	Chucky	This is a personality	"
15	Walter	I wish you would put it in your paragraph	suggests partner incorporate new details
16	Chucky	What?	
17	Walter	I (.) I wish you are put it in your paragraph	
18	Chucky	uh-huh- -this details (2) explanation , yeah?	
19	Walter	(backchanneling throughout, then) maybe you should put plus	
20	Chucky	yeah, plus.	

In this conversation, Chucky has an interesting idea that lacks support. His partner, Walter, is able to provide an outside perspective and to indicate to Chucky what he cannot know himself about his paper: a place where his idea is unclear (line 3). Walter uses a discovery-stance position by asking an elaboration request, and Chucky and Walter then engage in an elaboration negotiation sequence (lines 3-14). In the end, Walter explicitly recommends that Chucky incorporate these ideas (line 15), which did result in positive changes in Chucky's final draft.

(6) Students noticing and appreciating things in peers' papers

@ 3:10		<i>Description</i>
Walter	There is- I like something in your, paragraph (.) this uh this topic sentence (reads) I'm very- I very agree with this sentence. I think it's (.) VERY clear. (2) and uh, what else? And I like your examplees and I like your explanaaation (.) that's VERY CLEAR to me. And use- and you use the vocabulary well (.) <u>Very Very</u> clear.	compliment noticing positive forms/content in writing

In this final example of recorded speech, Walter demonstrates a strong appreciation for the clarity of his partner's ideas. The topic sentence, the ideas, and the explanation are clear. He is thinking beyond his partner's ideas in his analysis to matters of clarity and comprehensibility. Hence, peer feedback allows Walter to notice in a peer's writing an achievable model of clarity for a nonnative speaker.

Conclusions

Overall, the data and findings point to the higher critical thinking and metacognition facilitated by peer feedback activities. Seeing students finding and addressing their own errors in the feedback session demonstrated Furneaux's 2002 findings at work and as a benefit to peer feedback activities among lower-proficiency students. The audio recordings provided evidence of meaningful and contextualized opportunities for students to practice the oral negotiation processes mentioned by Lockhart and Ng (1995) that support overall second language acquisition processes. And while students exhibited both accurate and inaccurate feedback, this drawback of inaccurate feedback that Jacobs (1989) presented seemed to be less of a problem and

more of an opportunity for critical thinking and fluency development through meaning negotiation, leading the author to conclude that framing feedback and adjusting students' expectation about the activity have a direct influence on the interpretation of what is "problematic" and what is "beneficial" in peer feedback interactions. And to quote Rollinson (2005) once more:

Once the peer response process is underway, the [student's] perception of the value ... is likely to change if she begins to receive useful feedback, or finds that commenting on essays is helping her to be more critical of her own writing. (p. 24)

This quotation seems almost prophetic to the author now in the context of this project after compiling students' comments about peer feedback on the final survey. Students were not equating teacher feedback and peer feedback, mentioned by Zhang (1995) as an important distinction, and hence were able to embrace and value the benefits that peer feedback brought to their perception of their own writing.

Critical to the gains of this project were the framework constructed by Rollinson (2005) and the admonition of Min (2006) that feedback challenges could be mitigated or even resolved through careful, intentional, explicit, and scaffolded instruction. Lockhart and Ng's (1995) study also provided the pivotal framework that made all the difference in steering students away from the threatening feedback practices of the evaluative mode and toward collaborative, supporting feedback interactions of the discovery mode. While this project revealed additional steps of instruction that could be taken to further support students in using peers' feedback, overall the project made many improvements to the curriculum's former feedback activities.

Pedagogical Implications

For ESOL instructors who wish to use peer feedback in their low-proficiency composition classes, explicit instruction (Kasper & Rose, 2002) using models for role-play, analysis, and to teach speech acts and language sequences (Min, 2006; Rollinson, 2005) are highly beneficial. Students can experience firsthand the affective, pragmatic, and interactional differences between feedback modes, leaving a lasting impression and strong rationale for using the discovery mode.

It is useful to provide students with strong rationales that promote buy-in to feedback activities and serve as the propaganda Rollinson (2005) described. I chose to execute the rationale phase in different ways in each unit, for example, an animated PowerPoint demonstrating the problem of attempting to interpret a classmate's meaning rather than asking about it, a story about the findings of the Lundstrom

and Baker study (2009), a true-false activity, and so forth. Intentional follow-up with students as to whether or not they were experiencing any of these said benefits was also particularly interesting for the author and motivating to the students.

Surprisingly, for peer feedback in this lower-proficiency context, the data suggest that the real benefit to students in peer feedback is not primarily in the comments that students provide their partners; it is in what peer feedback allows students to bring into their own writing and proficiency development. Thus, it was very important to steer students' expectations of feedback away from teacher-feedback outcomes (i.e., my classmate will tell me my mistakes and I will reciprocate), in which students are passive receivers, to peer feedback as an activity that promotes active learning that supports students as autonomous, analytical learners who must evaluate feedback received (Zhang, 1995). The author believes much disappointment and frustration in feedback sessions can be avoided through this shift in rationale and expectations.

Limitations

The level of students' linguistic proficiency limited the feedback that could be gathered around students' perspectives of their interactions with their peers. A student who struggled not only to express her frustration over not having language to express her feedback also struggled to complete her open-ended questions on the postfeedback survey. This could have been avoided with L1 postfeedback interviews, which could also have provided other insights to the researcher from other students.

Limited proficiency also made following directions on some activities and in filling out surveys difficult for some students. For instance, a few students did not record their second feedback session conducted in Unit 4, limiting the sample size. Another student was unable to participate in feedback in class for lack of a draft because of a previous absence. Another student was unable to provide a peer feedback draft in her final submission because she had not followed the instruction to bring a printed copy of her draft on peer feedback day. Thus, a comparison of drafts could not be conducted.

Another limitation is the absence of data from a control group. Although the author taught the class for two semesters before developing and piloting this feedback framework, specific data that could be used in contrasting the outcomes and students' responses were not collected and therefore cannot be analyzed. The author was left to reflect on her own impressions of the differences and thus was unable to concretely report on this.

Future Directions

Given the reported limitations, a future direction could include repeating the study with a control group. A second direction would be to repeat the study and include qualitative postfeedback interviews from students in their L1. This could bring a considerable wealth of information. A third option that has been expressed and supported by colleagues is to adapt and use the feedback model in other contexts, specifically in the oral skills class that complements the composition class in which this study was conducted. Students are also expected to give feedback after oral presentations in a group setting, but the instructor has reported challenges such as

1. Students do not know what to say and can only select and read a comment option off the board;
2. Students appear to be too shy; and
3. Students struggle to ask questions because they either were not engaged in or not able to comprehend their classmates' speech.

Thus, a thorough needs analysis and situation analysis could be conducted and a new series of lessons and support materials developed to address these challenges and explore the effect oral feedback may have on students' critical-thinking and presentation skills.

Author

Lindsey Sivaslian earned a BA in Education from Concordia University Chicago. Having always been interested in different cultures and languages, she accepted an English teaching position in Japan, where her love for teaching English to nonnative speakers was born. Upon returning to the US, she pursued a master's degree in TESOL at San Francisco State University and taught at the American Language Institute at SFSU. Lindsey graduated in 2015, earning the top graduate student award for academic excellence from SFSU's College of Creative and Liberal Arts. Lindsey just began a new venture in motherhood and plans to pursue a teaching position in an academic context in Silicon Valley, where she lives with her husband and son.

References

- Bender, C. (1989). A study of teacher and peer comments in the revision process of college writers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54(02), 437A. University Microfilms No. 90-18, 666.
- Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of

- ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5(1), 1-19.
- DiPardo, A., & Freedman, S. (1988). Peer response groups in writing: Theoretical foundations and new directions. *Review of Educational Research*, 58(2), 119-149.
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (2005). Theoretical and practical issues in ESL writing. In *Teaching ESL composition purpose, process, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 1-29). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Furneaux, C. (2002). Teaching writing using peer feedback checklists. *ESL Magazine*, 5(3), 16-17.
- Hinkel, E. (2014). Culture and pragmatics in language teaching and learning. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton, & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed., pp. 394-408). Boston, MA: National Geographic Heinle Cengage.
- Jacobs, G. (1989). Miscorrection in peer feedback in writing class. *IRELC Journal*, 20, 68-78.
- Kasper, F., & Rose, K. (2002). The role of instruction in second language learning. In *Pragmatic development in a second language* (pp. 237-273). Malden, MA and Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Lane, T., & Potter, B. (1998, March). *Teaching collaborative feedback strategies in intermediate writing*. Paper presented at the 32nd annual meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Seattle, WA.
- Lockhart, C., & Ng, P. (1995). Analyzing talk in ESL peer response groups: Stances, functions, and content. *Language Learning*, 45(4), 605-651.
- Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 30-43.
- Mendonca, C., & Johnson, K. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 745-769.
- Min, H. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(2), 118-141.
- Newkirk, T. (1984). How students read student papers: An exploratory study. *Written Communication*, 1, 283-305.
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417-528.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59, 23-30.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language

- learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.
- Silva, A. (2003). The effects of instruction on pragmatic development: Teaching polite refusals in English. *Second Language Studies*, 22(1), 55-106. Retrieved from <http://www.hawaii.edu/sls/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Silva.pdf>
- Tang, G., & Tithecott, J. (1999). Peer response in ESL writing. *TESL Canada Journal*, 16(2), 20-38.
- Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 209-222.

Appendix A Scope and Sequence

Unit (with dates)	Writing Assignment	Rationale & Focus	Objectives	Activity (Goal, Role)	Classroom Language
1: Music & Moods Start Day 3: Feb. 16 EB Day 8: Feb. 24	pg. 28-29 Response Paper: write about your own ideas, feelings, and opinions about what you just read. Answer one of the prompts: 1. Think about a special time when music really affected you. 2. Think about a time that happens regularly and how music affects you. Think about why music has not helped you.	1. Make sharing ideas and writing with classmates a positive experience and motivating. Focus: Giving Compliments on writing	SWBAT: use compliment language in reacting to partner's paper SWBAT: see value of new ideas from peer's paper and discussing topic w/ peer	(no PF in 42RW text) Share papers w/ partner and give compliments using pre-taught language	Compliments: • Wow, you really put a lot of time into this. • Your ideas are interesting/good. • I really like what you wrote here because ... One thing I like is ...

Unit (with dates)	Writing Assignment	Rationale & Focus	Objectives	Activity (Goal, Role)	Classroom Language
<p>2: Money & Shopping</p> <p>Brainstorm strategy</p> <p>Start Day 9: Feb. 25</p> <p>Lang. Day 12: Feb. 3/3</p> <p>FB Day 13: March 4</p>	<p>pg. 53</p> <p>Response Paper: <i>write about:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the kind of shopper that you are. Explain some of the reasons that you go shopping. Describe what you like, or don't like about shopping. <p>Do you ever go shopping to feel good or to change your mood?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Peer Feedback is one way to get MORE ideas and make your writing more INTERESTING. comp check @ end of the activity: <i>"Did you get more ideas from reading your partner's paper? from talking to your partner?"</i> <p>Focus: Get Ideas *** Low-stakes, positive feedback only on idea generation. Strong focus on collaborating to get more ideas: 1st w/ partner, then class. Ss can use ideas from partner OR whole class discussion.</p>	<p>SWBAT: identify and affirm classmate's interesting ideas in response papers</p> <p>SWBAT: utilize collaborative language in group work when sharing ideas to develop more ideas</p> <p>SWBAT: build positive community and affirm classmate's writing in selecting their partner's most interesting idea and sharing with the class</p>	<p>Positively Responding to Peer's Ideas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students read partner's paper and choose their favorite/ most interesting idea to write on board; when all students have shared 1 idea from their partner, allow Ss to vote for BEST/MOST INTERESTING Idea 	<p>Collaborative Language: during idea phase (pre-writing)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "What do you think?" "Do you have any more ideas?" "How about ..." "What about ..." <p>"I like this idea because ..."</p>

Unit (with dates)	Writing Assignment	Rationale & Focus	Objectives	Activity (Goal, Role)	Classroom Language
3: Work & Job Satisfaction <u>Start Day</u> 14: March 5 FB Day 18: March 12	Response Paper: Describe your ideal job 1. What are the qualities of the job? 2. Why are these qualities important? 3. Use <i>details and examples</i> so your <i>classmates can clearly understand WHY you would be satisfied with the job.</i>	1. Enhance clarity (help partner know what can't be understood and clarify) 2. meaningful language negotiation- great communicative practice! <u>Focus:</u> Ask Questions ~ Collaborate stance (through questions) vs. Authoritative stance (judgment statements) Peer review: - teacher/student relationship? (authoritative) - friend/friend relationship? (collaborative) Beware of interpreting meaning- ASK for clarification.	SWBAT: identify areas in peers writing that are unclear SWBAT: ask peers clarification requests that invoke writer elaboration of ideas SWBAT: discover the comprehensibility of their writing to peers through comprehension checks	Role-Play (video?) 2 short FB dialogues: #1 from authoritative stance (shuts down conversation); #2 from collaborative response (facilitates discussion). Quick discussion about which session helped the writer GET MORE IDEAS to improve their paper. Language Analysis Activity Part #1: show ambiguous sample. Elicit guesses about meaning. Ask: What's the BEST WAY to know? (ask) → lead into teaching clarification req. Part #2: short discrimination task choosing stance of sentences: which is authoritative, which is collaborative language? → language taken from 208 needs analysis Pair Work: Write a "2" on your partner's paper where you feel confused about an idea, a word, or meaning. * ideas you like. Write 2 questions to ask your partner to help you understand their ideas more.	Clarification Requests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "I'm confused about this part. Can you explain this more to me?" "What does this word mean?" "What is your opinion/main idea in this part?" Comprehension Checks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did you understand what I wrote here? Does it make sense?

Unit (with dates)	Writing Assignment	Rationale & Focus	Objectives	Activity (Goal, Role)	Classroom Language
<p>4: Clothes</p> <p>Detail work pg. 114-115</p> <p>relevant vs. irrelevant pg. 116-118</p> <p>Start Day 19: March 16</p> <p>FB Day 30: April 13</p>	<p>pg. 103</p> <p>Response Paper: <i>Write about one of the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Do you think it is all right to wear casual dress at work? Why or why not? Do you think it is all right to wear casual dress to school? Why or why not? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Get more details through elaboration- idea expansion FB on relevant vs. irrelevant information <i>Giving</i> PF results in more learning than <i>receiving</i> PF <p><u>Focus:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add different kinds of details use explanations, examples, and personal experiences to make writing more specific Details SUPPORT the paragraph's topic sentence 	<p>SWBAT: identify places to affirm interesting ideas, ask for clarification, and solicit more details from partner/writers</p> <p>SWBAT: use elaboration elicitations to provoke partner/writers to give more information or clarification of ideas</p> <p>SWBAT: incorporate new ideas from feedback discussion into writing draft</p>	<p>T/F PowerPoint Rationale Review Quiz</p> <p>Model Paragraph: After Ss prepared part. T facilitates conversation around how to comment on paper- where to ask questions, and ask for more details.</p> <p>Feedback in Pairs- use color-codings, marking where to add different KINDS of details(+); clarification and irrelevant ideas (?); and places to give compliments (*)</p>	<p>Elaboration Elicitations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you have any PERSONAL EXPERIENCE you could share? Can you think of an EXAMPLE to add here? <p>I think I know what you mean, but can you EXPLAIN more?</p>

Unit (with dates)	Writing Assignment	Rationale & Focus	Objectives	Activity (Goal, Role)	Classroom Language
<p>5. How to be a Successful Language Learner</p>	<p>pg. 122 Persuasive Essay: <i>Advice Essay</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Write a paper, giving future L42 Students some advice about how to succeed in Level 42. <p>Must have intro, body, and conclusion</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Giving peer feedback makes students more critical readers and self-reliant writers engage in higher metacognitive skills in determining whether to incorporate FB into future drafts (than teacher feedback) <p><u>Focus:</u> Right of Refusal- you don't have to use the feedback- but justify why for pieces you don't want. "Will this information make my point stronger/clearer?"</p> <p>How to politely make suggestions to classmate and probe for meaning (<i>flirting with authoritative stance</i>)</p>	<p>SWBAT: offer feedback on ideas as before, but on multiple drafts; and receive feedback on multiple drafts</p> <p>SWBAT: make suggestions on peers' papers using pragmatically accurate language</p> <p>SWBAT: compare feedback from different sources and choose which feedback to incorporate from peers supported by a rationale for why</p> <p>SWBAT: Reflect on their overall experience doing peer feedback in an academic writing context</p>	<p>Group Feedback Feedback groups of 3-4 (blind feedback where 2-3 students respond to Ss paper, on separate copies. Ss can review all feedback and choose what to take, and what to not take.)</p> <p>- Ss should # lines of paper for easy referencing during group discussion. Potentially assign reading and marking (?*+) for homework for prepared participation.</p> <p><i>PF in text pg. 145 (rubric style)</i></p>	<p>Probing Language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Did you mean ___ instead of ___?" "How does this detail support/connect to your main idea?" <p>Suggestions w/Soft Modals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You might want to add/take out _____. I wonder if _____ would be good.

Appendix B Role-Play and Script

Goal of Feedback = Collaboration (working together to make something better)

Directions:

1. *Read the first role-play and look up any new words.*
2. *Then, watch a video of the role-play.*
3. *Think: Did the reader help the writer? Why or why not?*
4. *Read the role-play with a partner.*
5. *(Repeat steps with role-play #2.)*

W=Writer, gets feedback
R=Reader, gives feedback

Feedback Style #1:

R= Are you ready?

W= Yeah, yeah.

R= Do you want to go first?

W= Ah ... sure, okay. So, what did you think of my paper? Does it make sense?

R= Well, you have some very difficult words. Here. And that makes your writing hard to understand. And, you say your ideal job is a pilot, but you did not explain WHY. And you wrote only ONE QUALITY. That's a problem.

W= But here I (trails off and is not allowed to speak)

R= HIGH SALARY... that's the only quality you say. And you don't EXPLAIN. Another problem is your paper is not clear and your ideas are not good. I think you should make this paragraph into 3 paragraphs and add more ideas.

W= Actually, I was trying to say

R= And this last part, you should take out because it's not clear, and honestly, boring.

Feedback Style #2:

W= Okay, um ... do you want to do mine first?

R= Sure, yeah.

W= So, what did you think of my paper? Does it make sense?

R= Well, it was really interesting, but this word was unclear to me. Can you explain it?

W= Oh, sure, it's AVIATION. It means "the business of flying airplanes or helicopters."

R= Ah, I understand.

W= Did you understand what I wrote here ... this sentence?

R= Actually, I was a little confused. What is your opinion in this part?

W= Well, I think flying could be freeing; like I would see the whole world and feel peaceful looking down on it.

R= Interesting! Why do you think you'd like that?

W= Hmm ... I think it could lower my stress and relax my mood.

R= That sounds good. Write that in your paper!!!

W= Oh, okay, cool!

R= Hmmmm So, another question: For qualities, I only saw "high salary."

W= Well, actually, I could only think of one.

R= Hmmmmm What about travel?

W= Oh, yeah, good thinking! Opportunity to travel is a good quality of a pilot, and um let me think. Hmmmm ... maybe opportunity for advancement.

R= Oh, yeah, write those! They're really INTERESTING!

W= Yeah, good ideas. Thank you.

R= Yeah, you're welcome.

W= Your feedback was really helpful.

R= Good, good. Let's switch!

Appendix C

Language-Discrimination Task

A. Notice Peer Feedback Language

Directions: Look at the reader's statements below. Decide if each statement is parent style (mark P) or discovery style (mark D). Underline the words that help you decide.

1. P "You are off topic. You should change this part." (Example)
2. "I wrote a question here because I couldn't understand. Can you explain this?"
3. "You should write about the quality "high salary" because it is better for your paper."
4. "You should explain more. You need a better example."
5. "I have a little confusion in this part. What do you mean?"
6. "I can't understand what this part is about. Can you explain it again?"
7. "I think you should use a different word here. I found many of your grammar errors."
8. "I'm happy to help you. Which part do you feel is weakest?"

B. Your Turn: Read and Give Feedback

Directions:

1. Exchange papers with your partner.
2. Read your partner's paper. Put a * by 2 or 3 ideas you like. Put a ? by ideas that are unclear or are missing information. (5 minutes)
3. Discuss the paper with your partner. Share your compliments and questions. (5 minutes for each partner; 10 minutes total)

C. After Feedback: Now What???

Directions: Answer the questions below.

1. What did your partner like about your paper?
2. What will you change in your paper after talking to your partner?