UC Berkeley
L2 Journal

Title
Training Foreign Language Learners to be Peer Responders: A Multiliteracies Approach

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5k58c6fx

Journal
L2 Journal, 11(1)

Author
Turpin, Kristen M.

Publication Date
2019

DOI
10.5070/L211140673

Copyright Information
Copyright 2019 by the author(s).This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, available at
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

L2 Journal, Volume 11 Issue 1 (2019), pp. 35-60 http://repositories.cdlib.org/uccllt/l2/vol11/iss1/art3

Training Foreign Language Learners to be Peer Responders: A Multiliteracies Approach

KRISTEN M. TURPIN

Brandeis University
E-mail: kturpin@brandeis.edu

This study proposes a method for implementing trained peer response within the multiliteracies framework and then qualitatively examines its effectiveness. Three factors are considered: (1) the extent to which peer response training engaged learners in all four knowledge processes; (2) the quality of peer-to-peer feedback; and (3) students' attitudes about peer response. Findings suggest that collaborative genre analysis moves students through various knowledge processes and equips them to apply literacy-based understandings, knowledge, and skills during peer response. In general, students provided constructive, actionable comments to their peers and reported numerous benefits of both giving and receiving peer feedback. Implications for future research and practice will be of interest to instructors who want to implement peer response as well as curriculum designers who are building literacy-oriented language programs.

Collegiate foreign language programs have been reconsidering their identity and redefining their core mission over the course of the past two decades. In the context of debates about the value of the Humanities, literacy has become the predominant framework for curricular and pedagogical reform because it offers a way of integrating learning about language, literature, and culture at all levels of the curriculum (Allen & Paesani, 2010; Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010; Kern, 2000; Mantero, 2006; Paesani, Allen, & Dupuy, 2016; Swaffar & Arens, 2005). In this context, literacy is understood to refer to the creation and interpretation of meaning through texts via three context-dependent processes: (1) understanding how language forms and conventions are used to convey meaning (the linguistic dimension of literacy); (2) making inferences and thinking critically in order to construct meaning from texts (the cognitive dimension); and (3) situating textual conventions within social, historical, and cultural contexts of use (the sociocultural dimension) (Kern, 2000; Menke & Paesani, 2018; Paesani et al., 2016). These three dimensions of literacy constitute the cornerstone of a new curricular framework in which reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing overlap (Paesani et al., 2016, p. 14). The multiliteracies framework is transforming L2 curricula by redefining learning outcomes, expanding course content, and changing how learners engage with instructional materials. As teaching practices seek to integrate literary and cultural content with language instruction, the emphasis has shifted from teaching the isolated *skills* of listening, reading, writing, and speaking to developing students' capacity to *design meaning* through socially-situated presentational, interpersonal, and interpretive communication (Paesani et al., 2016, p. 23; Swaffar & Arens, 2005, p. 15).

This theoretical shift constitutes a departure from communicative language teaching and has necessitated a consideration of how to translate multiliteracies theory to practice. Researchers have investigated the implementation of multiliteracies pedagogy in lower-level

collegiate Spanish curriculum (Menke & Paesani, 2018), in a university-level advanced French grammar course that emphasized reading-writing connections (Paesani, 2016), by non-tenure track faculty (Menke, 2018), via engagement with authentic literary texts (Blyth, 2018; Thoms & Poole, 2018), and within genre-based approaches to L2 writing (Allen & Goodspeed, 2018), to name just a few examples. However, little attention has been paid to peer response. Although peer response was originally conceived within process approaches to teaching writing, it can be modified to align with the curricular aims of the multiliteracies framework. Peer response has great potential in the changing curricular landscape because it requires learners to integrate the linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural dimensions of literacy as they collaboratively construct meaning from a text.

After first reviewing relevant literature on the literacy turn and trained peer response, this exploratory study proposes a method for implementing trained peer response within a sequence of multiliteracies lessons. In order to test the viability of trained peer response in a multiliteracies curriculum, the study poses two research questions:

1. How do students apply literacy-based understandings, knowledge, and skills during peer response?
2. How do students perceive the benefits of literacy-oriented peer response?

To answer the research questions, a multi-method qualitative approach combines thematic analysis of learning artifacts and descriptive coding of student reflections. The study concludes by outlining implications for future practice and research.

BACKGROUND

Literacy and the Changing Curricular Landscape

When curriculum designers invoke the notion of literacy, they are not merely referring to a set of academic skills that individuals use to inscribe and decode words in written texts. Rather, they view literacy as involving the "use of socially-, historically-, and culturally-situated practices of creating and interpreting meaning through texts" (Kern, 2000, p. 16). Sociocultural approaches to literacy, such as Kern's, emphasize that literacy is a dynamic and variable social practice in which communities of users collaboratively make meaning through reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing (Kern, 2000; Paesani, 2018; Warner & Michelson, 2018). With this sociocultural and multimodal understanding of literacy, literacy-oriented foreign language programs define their identity as "teaching students the social and linguistic frameworks of texts and genres for spoken and written communication—across time periods, across cultures, and in multicultural frameworks" (Swaffar & Arens, 2005, p. 5). Their goal is not merely to develop learners' proficiency as readers and writers, but to enable them to participate in "socially recognized ways of generating, communicating and negotiating meanings" – the multimodal literary practices of the target culture – and analyze "the relations between language users, texts, and contexts of use" (Warner & Michelson, 2018, pp. 4-5).

There are seven principles that translate sociocultural definitions of literacy to concrete practices of foreign language teaching, assessment, and curriculum design (Kern, 2000; Paesani et al., 2016). The first three principles – language use, conventions, and cultural knowledge – constitute the "what" of multiliteracies pedagogy; they refer to the linguistic, sociocultural, schematic, and cultural content that students activate when reading, writing,

listening to, or viewing foreign language texts. The final four principles – interpretation, collaboration, problem solving, and reflection – constitute the "how" of multiliteracies pedagogy; they represent the learning processes through which students engage with content (Paesani et al., 2016, p. 13). These seven principles overlap the linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural dimensions of literacy, making learners "code breakers and code makers," "meaning makers," as well as "text users and critics" (Kucer, 2009, p. 7).

Because these principles offer various linkages between introductory communicative language teaching and advanced literacy teaching, the multiliteracies framework for curriculum design has the potential to bridge the language-literature divide that characterizes many foreign language programs (Paesani, 2018). In a curriculum driven by interaction with authentic texts, texts become "the locus of the thoughtful and creative act of making connections between grammar, discourse, and meaning, between language and content, between language and culture, and between another culture and one's own" (Kern, 2000, p. 46). Literacy-based language teaching thus responds to two of the limitations of communicative language teaching in its current form: (1) its superficial treatment of cultural and textual content; and (2) its emphasis on interactive, transactional language with singularity of meaning and intent (Paesani et al., 2016; Warner & Michelson, 2018). In communicative curricula, reading and writing tasks are often assigned to support students' comprehension and production of accurate forms; rarely does reading instruction ask students to connect forms and meaning or to critically relate meaning to various contexts, purposes, or consequences (Menke & Paesani, 2018, p. 11). In contrast, literacy-based curricula guide learners to discover form-meaning connections in order to foster "active and critical language users capable of moving beyond literal meanings and of reflecting on nuanced connections between semiotic form, meaning, context, perspective, and history" (Warner & Michelson, 2018, p. 6). By critically engaging with authentic texts and cultural content at all levels of instruction, learners within a multiliteracies approach develop the oral and written communication skills they need for academic purposes.

Although writing is just one of many modalities of meaning, it is typical to find writing-focused courses in bifurcated foreign language programs in which advanced language courses develop students' academic writing skills as they transition to upper-level literature and culture courses. This type of bridge course maintains its relevance in a literacy-oriented foreign language program by aligning writing pedagogy with sociocultural views of language learning. Within the multiliteracies framework, writing is considered "a communicative act wherein meaning is mediated and transformed, not merely transferred from one individual or group to another" (Kern, 2000; Paesani et al., 2016, p. 179). Readers and writers of texts mediate and transform meaning collaboratively as they draw upon their shared assumptions, relationships, and conventions. Additionally, writers transform meaning by purposefully and intentionally selecting from the linguistic, cultural, and social models they have for meaning design and then applying and recycling these Available Designs in fresh, reworked ways (Allen, 2018; Cope & Kalantzis, 2009; Paesani et al., 2016). In order to put this understanding of writing into practice, literacy-oriented writing instruction needs to address the linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural dimensions of meaning making. For this reason, Kern recommends that a comprehensive pedagogy of literacy incorporate features of product, process, and genre-based approaches to teaching writing. He suggests that comprehensive writing instruction define textual features (product approaches), develop writers' cognitive processes (process approaches), and consider social context (genre-based approaches) (Kern, 2000, p. 192). Allen also espouses an integrated approach to foreign language writing instruction and emphasizes the centrality of textual genres to all levels of the curriculum: "a focus on the sociocultural dimension of writing, including opportunities to interpret, reproduce, and transform textual

genres, should take place when secondary, immersion and heritage language learners enter courses as novices and continue throughout their studies" (Allen, 2018, p. 523).

Nevertheless, foreign language educators in the United States have been slow to incorporate genre-based approaches, which address "how certain structures and conventions are used to make meaning in situated, culturally determined ways" (Paesani et al., 2016, p. 175). With a few notable exceptions,[1] foreign language programs depend heavily on process approaches, which gained popularity with the rise of communicative language teaching in the 1990s (Paesani et al., 2016; Reichelt, Lefkowitz, Rinnert, & Schultz, 2012). Cognitive approaches to teaching L2 writing as a process move students through the stages of the composing process: invention, planning, drafting, pausing, reading, revising, editing, and publishing (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013, p. 65). Because process approaches emphasize the revision of multiple drafts, collaborative writing, and the postponement of editing until the final stages of the composing cycle (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013, p. 68), they typically implement peer response, which is defined and discussed in the next section.

Research on Peer Response

While *peer editing* asks students to correct surface concerns of grammar, mechanics, spelling, and vocabulary, *peer response* (also termed *peer review*) asks students to respond to their peers' texts as real readers who engage with questions of meaning and intent (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992; Leki, 1990). The use of peer response finds its theoretical support in learning and rhetorical theories. Specifically, Vygotsky's theory on learning suggests that peer responders with different skills and competencies can provide each other with the scaffolding needed to extend others' writing competence (Min, 2005, p. 294). Additionally, rhetorical theories, which stress the social nature of writing, favor the use of peer response, "contending that writing is derived from the 'conversation' among writers in their discourse community" (Min, 2005, p. 294). Practical justifications for peer response include its potential to enhance student learning, improve student writing, and reduce the workload of the instructor (Berg, 1999; Ferris and Hedgcock, 2013; Lundstrom and Baker, 2009; O'Donnell, 2014).

Research on L2 peer response investigates its effectiveness in a variety of instructional contexts, employing both qualitative and quantitative research designs. Generally speaking, the scholarship considers three phases of peer response: (1) *before* peer response, how students are trained; (2) *during* peer response, how learners communicate about writing, either verbally and/or through written comments; (3) *after* peer response, how learners revise their work and react affectively to the peer response process. For a variety of instructional settings, it has been established that training students *before* they encounter their peers' text enables them to give more useful and specific comments *during* peer response, and that trained peer response positively impacts student attitudes *after* the activity is complete. In comparison to peer responders with minimal or no prior training, trained peer responders are better equipped to comment on issues of meaning, content, and organization, and they less frequently give vague, superficial, or overly adulatory comments to their peers (Berg, 1999; McGroarty & Zhu, 1997; Min, 2005; Zhu, 1995). Although there is some evidence that students benefit more from giving peer response comments than receiving them (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009), it has remained a priority to measure the impact of peer response on subsequent drafts (Chaudron,

[1] Paesani (2018) notes the German Department at Georgetown, the German curriculum at Emory University, and the French program at Wayne State as three noteworthy models of literacies-based collegiate foreign language curricula. See also Allen and Goodspeed's (2018) work at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

1984; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Flynn, 1982; McGroarty & Zhu, 1997; Min, 2006; Ruegg, 2015; Tai, Lin, & Yang, 2015; Tsui & Ng, 2000; Villamil & Guerrero, 1998). Some studies have found that students who receive comments from trained peer responders incorporate more of these changes into subsequent drafts (Min, 2006). Additionally, students who participate in trained peer response tend to exhibit more positive attitudes about the writing process and the effectiveness of peer response than their untrained peers (McGroarty & Zhu, 1997; Rothschild & Klingenberg, 1990). In general, effectively training students avoids the two most common issues with peer response—that students either fail to give meaningful feedback, or they do not judge the feedback they receive as worthy of consideration during the revision process (Leki, 1990; Min, 2005; O'Donnell, 2014).

Because peer response carries a high risk of futility, suggestions abound for designing peer response tasks and training students to successfully complete these tasks: discuss students' prior experiences with and beliefs about peer response (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013; Hansen & Liu, 2005); coach students to respond to issues of meaning and authorial intention, perhaps by collaboratively examining a writing sample (Berg, 1999; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013; Min, 2005; Schaffer, 1996; Stanley, 1992); provide instruction about appropriate language to use to share feedback (Berg, 1999; Hansen & Liu, 2005; Min, 2005; Schaffer, 1996); model a constructive peer response exchange (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013; Hansen & Liu, 2005; Min, 2005; Stanley, 1992); design peer response guides that meet the unique demands of each assignment and instructional context (Byrd, 2003; Hansen & Liu, 2005; O'Donnell, 2014; Roebuck, 2001); position peers to respond from the perspective of the reader for whom the text is intended, rather than from the perspective of the teacher or an editor trying to demonstrate linguistic mastery (Min, 2005; O'Donnell, 2014); follow up on peer response tasks to hold students accountable for the feedback they have produced and received (Byrd, 2003; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013; Min, 2005, 2016); and finally, consider different modes of peer response (Byrd, 2003; Elola & Oskoz, 2016; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013; Hansen & Liu, 2005). It is important to note that these suggestions assume that peer response is implemented within one of the many process approaches to teaching writing. Although process approaches have maintained their popularity in the U.S. educational context, the conversation about the role of literacy and writing in the foreign language curriculum is rapidly changing. This article builds upon decades of research on L2 peer response in order to provide a model for implementing peer response within the post-process, literacy-oriented curricular landscape.

Instead of narrowly focusing on isolated techniques for training students to be effective peer responders, this article takes a more holistic approach and connects trained peer response to specific facets of multiliteracies curriculum design. The procedure for implementing peer response is embedded into a sequence of multiliteracies lessons whose objectives extend beyond those of simply training peer responders. Unlike established methods, which often focus narrowly on the class period prior to peer response, the proposed training procedure positions peer response as one step of a semester-long commitment to developing advanced literacy skills. This study thus puts into dialogue two conversations – one about trained peer

response, the other about multiliteracies curriculum design – that have the potential to inform one another in profound ways.

STUDY DESIGN

Context

This exploratory study was conducted at a nationally-ranked, mid-sized private research university in the Mid-Atlantic region. 15 students participated in the study as part of the standard educational practices of a writing-focused Advanced Grammar and Composition course that the researcher was teaching. The course was designed for Spanish majors and minors with intermediate-high to advanced-low proficiency levels as they transitioned to upper-level coursework in literature and culture. The department's bifurcated curriculum practiced communicative language teaching in the lower levels, so this bridge course constituted students' first exposure to multiliteracies pedagogy.

The Advanced Grammar and Composition course combined grammar review and writing instruction to equip students to examine, practice, reproduce, and transform the implicit and explicit features of texts geared toward particular audiences (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 175; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013, p. 79). Specifically, students wrote five genre-based compositions that challenged them to write for a variety of purposes and audiences: a restaurant review, a graduation speech, a fundraising letter, a professional cover letter, and an academic essay. These genres offered real-world instantiations of the four types of discourse that traditionally structure L2 composition courses and their auxiliary textbooks: description, narration, exposition, and argumentation. The sequencing of writing assignments intentionally moved students from familiar and informal writing contexts to unfamiliar and more formal ones.

Each instructional unit culminated with the presentational writing task, and individual lessons were backwards-designed to equip students with the linguistic and schematic Available Designs that they needed to successfully complete the writing task.[2] In each unit, language instruction was contextualized in relation to the communicative needs of writers in the given sociocultural context. For example, in order to give opinions about the quality of food, the author of a restaurant review not only needs to distinguish between *ser* and *estar* but also needs to appropriately place descriptive adjectives to communicate nuanced degrees of subjectivity/objectivity. Whenever possible, model texts – that is, restaurant reviews published in Spanish-speaking countries – provided examples of how language structures are used in real-world texts. In this way, the Advanced Grammar and Composition course presented grammar as "a repertoire of available choices for achieving particular purposes in particular contexts" (Hyland, 2008, p. 557). Within the multiliteracies approach of the course, grammar was no longer a list of rules to memorize and regurgitate on an exam, but rather "a system of discourse tools" that writers, including L2 learners, use "to engage in acts of meaning" (Swaffar & Arens, 2005, p. 21).

Nevertheless, grammatical accuracy was not the only focus of instruction, and the course followed the contemporary practice of integrating process-based and genre-based approaches to teaching L2 writing (Allen, 2018; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013; Paesani et al., 2016; Racelis & Matsuda, 2013). Consequently, writing instruction emphasized content, organization,

---

[2] Linguistic resources include vocabulary, grammar, syntax, and coherence/cohesion devices, and schematic resources include an understanding of genre, organizational patterns, and cultural and scholarly knowledge (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009; Kern, 2000).

audience, and genre in addition to issues of linguistic accuracy. (The instructional sequence that focused on schematic Available Designs will be described in continuation.) In terms of the writing process, students learned strategies for prewriting, adjusting their writing for specific audiences and purposes, and revising their own work and the work of their peers. With the exception of the academic essay, students submitted two versions of each composition, the scores of which were averaged, and each composition constituted 10% of the final grade. After writing the first draft, students received global feedback from their peers (content, organization, and style) and linguistic feedback from the professor (grammar, vocabulary, and syntax). They used this feedback to prepare the final version. Over the course of the semester, students completed peer response tasks for the restaurant review, graduation speech, fundraising letter, and cover letter, for a total of four tasks.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data considered for this study is limited to the first two peer response tasks. In order to investigate how students apply literacy-based understandings, knowledge, and skills during peer response (Research Question 1), the teacher-researcher collected and analyzed the written comments that students gave their classmates during their first attempt at peer response. This occurred during week 4 of the semester, when students were tasked with evaluating their peers' first draft of the restaurant review. Focusing on the first peer response task as opposed to subsequent tasks has the advantage of measuring the immediate impact of literacy-oriented training for peer responders, which began on the first day of the semester. The following section describes the materials that the teacher-researcher developed and used to train peer responders within the multiliteracies framework.

In order to investigate how students perceive the benefits of literacy-oriented peer response (Research Question 2), the teacher-researcher collected and analyzed student responses to an anonymous survey questionnaire that was administered online at midterm. At this point in the semester, students had completed peer response tasks for the restaurant review and the graduation speech. The survey was originally intended to help the professor assess the effectiveness of her teaching practices and make adjustments for the remainder of the semester. Although the survey elicited student feedback on various issues of teaching and learning, only the responses to the following question are considered in the study: "What do you gain during peer review? Consider your role as a peer reviewer, and as someone whose work is reviewed. What do you learn, realize or discover? What skills do you develop or reinforce?"[3]

A qualitative approach based on descriptive coding is used to analyze these two data points. In this exploratory study, the researcher was the only person developing peer response materials, instructing study participants, and coding the data. For Research Question 1, the comments of peer responders were analyzed using deductive coding (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). The list of preliminary deductive codes emerged from the conceptual framework of multiliteracies and the types of comments the instructor-researcher hypothesized that peer responders would make. Some of these preliminary codes included: content, meaning, grammar, word choice, style, audience, genre, text models, and social context. Second-cycle coding entailed categorizing the content of peer responders' comments

[3] Other survey questions included: "How can the peer review process be improved? How can peer review be more beneficial to you?" and "How helpful are [the professor's] comments on your first draft? Are there ways she can improve her feedback to you?"

in order to identify patterns of literacy-based knowledge. For Research Question 2, participants' reflections on peer response were analyzed using a combination of inductive and deductive coding. Inductive in vivo codes capture the language that various participants used to describe the benefits of peer response, and theory-driven deductive codes employ the terminology of the multiliteracies framework (Miles et al., 2014). Simultaneous coding is used in order to track how single survey responses often indicated numerous benefits of peer response (Saldaña, 2015). The thematic codes are scaled in order to quantify common attitudes about literacy-oriented peer response. For all data analysis in this study, the researcher used reflexivity to bracket areas of potential bias (Ahern, 1999).

Literacy-oriented training for peer responders

This section describes the method that the teacher-researcher used to train peer responders in a literacy-oriented curriculum. The instructional activities outlined in Table 1 were developed for the first unit of an Advanced Grammar and Composition course, at the end of which students reviewed a restaurant of their choosing on TripAdvisor. The teacher-researcher assigned the TripAdvisor restaurant review genre and designated it the focus of this study for various reasons. First, most college students are experienced users and/or contributors to TripAdvisor, and the teacher-researcher believed it to be beneficial to introduce specific practices of the multiliteracies framework within a context that was already familiar to students. Secondly, the literacy-oriented Advanced Grammar and Composition course emphasized writing for real-world audiences, not just the teacher, and TripAdvisor provides a convenient platform where students can effortlessly share their written work with global audiences. Thirdly, although TripAdvisor was founded in the United States, its contributors and readers are not limited to the Anglo-American context. It is truly a global genre; as of 2016, TripAdvisor supports 26 different languages,[4] and it offers websites specific to seven Spanish-speaking countries[5] (TripAdvisor LLC, 2016). Consequently, the TripAdvisor assignment exposes students to the linguistic Available Designs that differ slightly from country to country (e.g., names of foods and idioms used to talk about food). At the same time, the assignment asks students to analyze the extent to which Spanish speakers from different countries share similar schematic Available Designs; when students encounter different ways of organizing a TripAdvisor review, for example, they need to consider whether these differences reflect culturally-patterned styles of communication, or if the variation of textual features can be attributed to the unique purposes and motivations of individual authors.[6] The TripAdvisor assignment thus recognizes that literacy involves "practices that manifest across multiple languages, cultural contexts, and social ecologies" (Warner & Michelson, 2018, p. 4), and exemplifies teaching practices that support "the development of

---

[4] Arabic, Chinese, Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Serbian, Slovak, Spanish, Swedish, Thai, Turkish, and Vietnamese.

[5] Argentina (www.tripadvisor.com.ar), Colombia (www.tripadvisor.co), Mexico (www.tripadvisor.com.mx), Peru (www.tripadvisor.com.pe), Spain (www.tripadvisor.es), Venezuela (www.tripadvisor.com.ve), and Chile (www.tripadvisor.cl).

[6] In preparation for the second assignment, students studied graduation speeches from the U.S., Spain, and Mexico and conducted a similar analysis. The remaining three assignments (fundraising letter, cover letter, and academic essay) rooted learning about textuality and genre in a singular cultural context. If instructors preferred to consider the genre of the restaurant review within a more local context, El Tenedor (also a TripAdvisor company) primarily publishes reviews of restaurants in Spain.

critically engaged, globally aware graduates" equipped with "dynamic, variable, and relational understandings of language and culture" (Paesani, 2018, pp. 134–135).

Table 1 features two crucial moments in the unit that culminated with the TripAdvisor restaurant review: 1) the first day of class, when students first experienced the type of textual thinking that would be required throughout the semester, and 2) the second week of class, when students prepared specifically for their first peer response task. Considered together, these two moments chart the contours of a multi-day protocol for training peer responders within the multiliteracies framework.

The last column of the chart highlights the knowledge processes associated with each instructional activity. The four knowledge processes – *experiencing, conceptualizing, analyzing,* and *applying* – correspond to the four dimensions of multiliteracies pedagogy (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 184) and offer a framework for examining how students engage with teacher-generated literacy materials (Rowland, Canning, Faulhaber, Lingle, & Redgrave, 2014). *Experiencing* involves "spontaneous, immersive learning without conscious reflection"; *conceptualizing* consists of students actively "unpack[ing] the language forms, conventions, organizational features, and form-meaning relationships that characterize texts"; *analyzing* entails "relating textual meaning to social, cultural, historical, or ideological contexts and purposes"; and *applying* occurs when students "use new understandings and skills and produce language in conventional or creative ways" (Menke & Paesani, 2018, p. 4). Although the four knowledge processes constitute different kinds of knowing, they are neither hierarchical nor sequential. Consequently, the sub-processes of *experiencing the known, experiencing the new, conceptualizing by naming, conceptualizing with theory, analyzing functionally, analyzing critically, applying appropriately,* and *applying creatively* can be implemented in whatever order best meets students' literacy needs (Kalantzis, Cope, Chan, & Dalley-Trim, 2016; Menke & Paesani, 2018).[7] In contrast to the hierarchical Bloom's taxonomy, the knowledge processes (KP) framework offers a more robust and flexible tool for examining critical thinking, especially in the context of textual interaction. For this reason, the KP framework has been used to understand how students engage with authentic texts to interpret and transform meaning (Bhooth, Azman, & Ismail, 2015), to investigate instructor perceptions of multiliteracies pedagogy (Menke, 2018), to evaluate the present state of existing or revised curricula (Menke & Paesani, 2018; Rowland et al., 2014), and to analyze applications of multiliteracies and genre-based pedagogy (Michelson & Dupuy, 2014). For the purposes of this study, the KP framework serves to describe the instructional materials and highlight how the proposed training for peer responders aligns with the goals of the multiliteracies framework. As summarized in Table 1, the teacher-researcher intentionally designed instructional activities that moved students through various knowledge processes without over-emphasizing any individual one.

Table 1. Key Steps in Literacy-Oriented Training for Peer Responders

Learning objectives	Instructional activity	Knowledge processes
(Day 1) In the context of social media, reflect on "the relationships between textual conventions and their	1. a) Students discuss social media habits, preferences, and opinions in pairs. b) Instructor leads entire class discussion: "What is the difference between an Instagram post and a Snapchat? When do you prefer Instagram, and when do you	*Experiencing the known* – students articulate personal opinions and share lived experiences (1a)

[7] Readers are encouraged to consult the appendix of Menke and Paesani's (2018) recent article for a concise summary of these sub-processes.

contexts of use" (Kern, 2000, p. 16) Align student perceptions about what it means to write (in an L2) with the pedagogical commitments of the multiliteracies framework Establish definition of genre that will guide literacy-oriented writing tasks throughout the semester	prefer Snapchat? Do you Snapchat your parents? How do you communicate with them? Do you communicate with your professors in the same way? Why?" 2. Instructor highlights key concepts as they arise in the discussion: purpose, audience, text type, expectations and conventions, social context, relationship between writer and reader. 3. Instructor summarizes student contributions by pointing out that a Facebook post, a Tweet, a Snapchat, and an Instagram post constitute different *genres* – text types that represent "how writers typically use language to respond to recurring situations" (Hyland, 2008, p. 543).	*Conceptualizing by naming* – students draw upon their personal experiences and preferences in order to classify the individual design elements of texts (1b, 2) *Analyzing critically* – students account for the perspectives, interests, and motives of producers of texts (1b)
(Week 2) Define the characteristic features of the first assigned genre – a restaurant review on TripAdvisor Prepare students for peer response	4. First exposure to model text. Instructor shares a TripAdvisor review (written in the target language and for foreign audiences) that is short and vague. Students debate if this review would help them decide whether to visit the restaurant. Students proceed to describe what they expect from a helpful TripAdvisor review and hypothesize whether this is different for readers in other countries. Instructor divides the class into groups of 3-4 students, and each group receives a different model text. They collaborate to conduct a genre analysis. 5. Define the text's context of use: Who writes this text? Who reads this text? For what purposes? 6. Describe content and organization: Is this text descriptive, narrative, explanatory, or argumentative? A combination of various modes of expression? Why? How is this text organized? Why is it organized in this way? 7. Identify permissible variation within genre by comparing effective reviews: What features do all effective reviews share? Are there features that characterize some, but not all? Why do TripAdvisor contributors elect to exclude/include these optional features? 8. Characterize the style of TripAdvisor reviews, and then pay attention to the author's strategies for describing. What types of adjectives are used? Are they placed before or after the noun? What's the difference? How does the author make these choices?	*Experiencing the known* and *experiencing the new* (4) *Conceptualizing by naming* – students make generalizations about who writes and reads TripAdvisor reviews (5) *Analyzing critically* – students relate textual conventions to their contexts of use (6, 7) *Analyzing functionally* – students account for how TripAdvisor reviews convey meaning (6, 7) *Conceptualizing with theory* – students hypothesize about the relationship between form and meaning (8) *Analyzing functionally and critically* – students analyze how the author's perspectives and motives influence adjective placement (8)

The table details how peer responders develop their skills over the course of multiple lessons, circling through the various knowledge processes. In contrast to other

implementations of the multiliteracies framework, in which *experiencing* predominates at the expense of *conceptualizing* and *analyzing* (Menke & Paesani, 2018), this sequence of lessons interweaves the knowledge processes of *experiencing, conceptualizing,* and *analyzing* in order to prepare students for peer response. The first, crucial step of training peer responders is to establish a community of writers who believe that L2 composing is more than grammatical manipulation and vocabulary usage (O'Donnell, 2014, p. 414). The primary aim of the first day of class is to guide students to realize that effective writing in the L2 demands a critical awareness of audience and genre – that is, the ways that communities of readers and writers meet the demands of recurring communicative situations "in a highly predictable fashion" (Swaffar & Arens, 2005, p. 99).

In subsequent classes, collaborative genre analysis identifies the "horizons of expectations" that characterize TripAdvisor reviews, placing special focus on schematic Available Designs (Swaffar & Arens, 2005, p. 99). While this method has previously been used to prepare students to write genre-based compositions (Flowerdew, 1993; Kern, 2000; Maxim, 2009; Paesani, 2016; Paesani et al., 2016), it also serves to train students as peer responders. In preparation for peer response, students analyzed model texts that illustrated the variation within the genre of the restaurant review: four model texts were TripAdvisor reviews published by native speakers on country-specific TripAdvisor websites, and two model texts were restaurant reviews published in food blogs from Madrid. This selection of model texts has two objectives: first, to familiarize foreign language learners with the conventions of restaurant reviews intended for native readerships and thus prepare them to apply culturally-situated genre conventions during peer response; and second, to help students realize that there are various ways to effectively write restaurant reviews. Students begin to see the models not as "absolute (and acontextualized) examples of 'goodness of form,'" but rather "examples of a particular writer's solution to a particular communicative problem" (Kern, 2000, p. 185). Through this process, the power dynamics of the classroom shift, and the instructor no longer holds the ultimate authority in determining expectations for written assignments. By empowering students to reflect critically on the relationship between textual conventions and their contexts of use, collaborative genre analysis trains students to evaluate how their peers transform Available Designs in their own Redesigned texts. Genre analysis thus positions students as members of the intended audience who are qualified to judge the communicative effectiveness of the text – not "editors or proofreaders of a paper created to demonstrate linguistic mastery" (O'Donnell, 2014, p. 418).

In sum, collaborative genre analysis is one way of implementing trained peer response within a pedagogy of multiliteracies because it engages students in multiple pedagogical acts (*experiencing, conceptualizing,* and *analyzing*) and interweaves various principles of literacy (namely *language use, conventions, interpretation, collaboration,* and *problem solving*). The collaborative nature of this training should not be overlooked, since it emphasizes the social nature of writing and engages learners as members of a writing community (Allen, 2018, p. 527). In doing so, genre analysis offers "learning experiences through which learners develop strategies for reading the new and unfamiliar, in whatever form these may manifest themselves. Instead of simply telling learners of authoritative designs, it asks the question of design, or the relation of meaning form to meaning function" (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 177). Collaborative genre analysis thus offers a versatile tool that instructors can use to prepare their students to design meaning in

new and unfamiliar contexts—as both writers and peer responders, and regardless of the assigned genre.

RESULTS

Research Question 1: How Do Students Apply Literacy-Based Understandings, Knowledge, and Skills During Peer Response?

For the TripAdvisor assignment, peer response groups were determined randomly by the learning management system (Blackboard) so that each student submitted and then received two anonymous peer responses. Students completed peer response at home, during the week following in-class genre analysis. The peer response platform on Blackboard asked students the following questions in the target language, which the teacher-researcher designed to target the indicated knowledge processes:

1. In your opinion, what is the purpose of this text? (*experiencing the known, experiencing the new, analyzing critically*)
2. For whom does the author intend this text? How does he/she meet the needs of the target audience? (*experiencing the known, experiencing the new, analyzing critically*)
3. Identify a description that seems especially effective to you. Explain why it helped you understand what it's like to dine in this restaurant. Then, make a list of descriptions that seem vague or imprecise to you. (*experiencing the new, conceptualizing by naming*)
4. How does this rough draft compare to the models that we studied in class? Which characteristics of the genre does it exhibit? (*conceptualizing by naming, analyzing functionally*)
5. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of this draft. What suggestions would you give your peer? (*analyzing functionally*)

These questions are designed to first activate students' understanding of the social context in which TripAdvisor reviews design meaning and then prompt them to consider the text's communicative effectiveness. Following the suggestion of O'Donnell (2014), the questions intentionally exclude concerns of grammatical accuracy in order to position peer responders as members of the intended audience who read for meaning and content. By incorporating various knowledge processes and asking peer responders to participate in socially recognized ways of generating, communicating, and negotiating meaning (Warner & Michelson, 2018), this format of peer response aligns with the pedagogical aims of the multiliteracies framework.

The comments that students shared during peer response can be divided into two categories:

(1) constructive, specific comments in which peer responders applied the literacy-based understandings, knowledge, and skills that they had gained through the collaborative training and
(2) unconstructive, vague comments in which peer responders did not apply their understanding of content, context, audience, and genre.

To begin with the first category, Table 2 summarizes general trends for the subset of students who applied the understandings, knowledge, and skills gained through collaborative genre analysis. Responders A, B, and C communicated two types of literacy-based knowledge in the

comments to their peers: (1) an understanding of the relationship between writer and reader and (2) a critical consideration of Available Designs. These three cases are representative of the constructive, specific comments that other students made during peer response. Responders A and B commented on the text of Author 1, and Responder C commented on the text of Author 2; limiting the data set in this way allows us to analyze how different students responded to the same rough draft, thus minimizing the possibility that the quality of the rough draft affected peer responders' ability to apply literacy-based understandings, knowledge, and skills. These two categories of literacy-based knowledge – (1) an understanding of the relationship between writer and reader and (2) a critical consideration of Available Designs – were selected because they both encompass and delineate overlapping knowledge about content, context, audience, and genre.

The first type of literacy-based knowledge was demonstrated by students who either positioned themselves as members of the target-language audience (via the use of first-person pronouns) or imagined the motivations, needs, and expectations of the intended audience. For example, Responder B wrote the following (in the target language, but translated here into English):

> I think the purpose of this review is to give me reasons why I should go to the restaurant (…) The author directs this review toward people that like Japanese food and also toward people who like to try new foods and restaurants.

A concrete understanding of audience often coincided with a clear definition of the author's purposes for writing. As Table 2 elaborates, applying their understanding of the relationship between writer and reader allowed Responders A, B, and C to evaluate the effectiveness of the text's content in relation to the given sociocultural context. To cite just one example, Responder A concluded that

> [T]he author writes this review for people that want to try something new. It is not a typical restaurant and therefore the author has to convince the reader that it is a good place to try. The author assists the reader with the use of many pieces of advice and recommendations [about] more than just the food (…) The review gives a lot of useful information to the reader in the last paragraph.

It was also common for students to explicitly or implicitly compare their peer's text with the model TripAdvisor reviews considered during collaborative genre analysis. They demonstrated their understanding of the "horizons of expectations" that define the genre of the TripAdvisor review (Swaffar & Arens, 2005, p. 99) through comments about the text's length, organization, titling conventions, introductory sentences, conclusions, word choice, and style. To use the terminology of the multiliteracies framework, constructive peer responders activated their understanding of schematic Available Designs and then evaluated whether their peer's selection, application, recycling, and transformation of Available Designs was effective or not. Peer responders typically made neutral or positive comparisons between the Available Designs and their peer's Redesigned text; for example, Responder C complimented his peer that "this rough draft is much more descriptive and organized. The other [models] that we have read were not as effective and don't do a good job describing the

experience of the diner." Responder B's negative comparison, in which he states that the peer's draft "is worse than the models that we studied," is an anomaly in the data.

Table 2. Types of Literacy-based Knowledge that Students Applied during Peer Response

Type of literacy-based knowledge	Examples from student peer responses (unedited but anonymized)	Analysis
An understanding of the relationship between writer and reader Note how some peer responders use first person pronouns to position themselves as members of the intended target-language audience. Others simply imagine the perspective of the intended audience.	Responder C to Author 2: "Creo que el proposito de este texto es para convencerme comer en el Café. Usando adjetivos muy descriptivos, el autor trata darme un buen sentido de la experiencia en el restaurante para que yo me siente que estuviera allí." Researcher's translation: "I think that the purpose of this text is to convince me to eat in the Café. Using very descriptive adjectives, the author tries to give me a good sense of the experience in the restaurant so that I feel as if I were there."	This comment relates textual conventions ("using very descriptive adjectives") to the author's purpose ("convincing me to eat in the Café") and rhetorical strategies ("making me feel as if I were there").
	Responder B to Author 1: "Creo que el propósito de este reseña es para darme razones porque debo ir al restaurante (…) El o la autor(a) dirige este reseña a personas quien le gusta comida japonés y también a personas quien le gusta probar nuevas comidas y restaurantes. Una reseña como esa necesita dar mucha información sobre la comida, pero también información sobre el ambiente y los empleados del restaurante. Creo que su reseña hace un buen trabajo explicando la comida que sirve, pero puede poner un poco más información sobre el ambiente del restaurante y debe comentar sobre el servicio también." Researcher's translation: "I think the purpose of this review is to give me reasons why I should go to the restaurant (…) The author directs this review toward people that like Japanese food and also toward people who like to try new foods and restaurants. A review like that needs to give a lot of information about the food, but also information about the ambience and the employees of the restaurant. I think his/her review does a good job explaining the food that is served, but it can put a little bit more information about the ambience of the restaurant and it should comment about the service too."	Imagining the perspective of a specific type of TripAdvisor user (one who "likes Japanese food" and "trying different foods and restaurants"), Responder B communicates their expectations about the review's content to the writer. Responder B suggests that the needs of the target audience were not completely met. The resulting recommendation is specific enough to be helpful because it is based on a shared understanding of the sociocultural context in which TripAdvisor writers and readers interact.

	Responder A to Author 1: "El autor escribe esta reseña para personas que quieren tratar algo nueva. No es un restaurante típico y por eso el autor tiene que convencer el lector que es un buen lugar para probar. El autor atiende al público con el uso de muchos consejos y recomendaciones más que solamente la comida (…) La reseña da mucho información útil al lector en el párrafo final." Researcher's translation: "The author writes this review for people that want to try something new. It is not a typical restaurant and therefore the author has to convince the reader that it is a good place to try. The author assists the reader with the use of many pieces of advice and recommendations more than just the food (…) The review gives a lot of useful information to the reader in the last paragraph."	Responder A identifies a similar target audience as Responder B, yet has a different evaluation of the review's content. A clear understanding of the author's purpose for writing and the reader's purpose for searching on TripAdvisor allows Responder A to evaluate the text's content in relation to this specific context of use.
A critical consideration of Available Designs Peer responders critically consider how their peers select, apply, recycle, and transform Available Designs.	Responder A to Author 1: "Pienso que tú incluyes todas las características obligatorias sino el uso de los 5 sentidos. Como un lector, quiero más descripciones de la comida por ejemplo con el uso de metáforas. Pienso que la organización y todas las recomendaciones son fantásticos. Solamente quiero más información detallada sobre la comida usando los sentidos diferentes (…) Esto puede ser mejor si incluyes más detallas sobre la comida para transportar el lector hasta este lugar, así que el lector tiene una experiencia de comer en el restaurante por la mente." Researcher's translation: "I think that you include all of the obligatory characteristics except the use of the 5 senses. As a reader, I want more descriptions of the food for example with the use of metaphors. I think that the organization and all of the recommendations are fantastic. I just want more detailed information about the food using different senses (…) This can be better if you include more details about the food in order to transport the reader to this place, so the reader has an experience of eating in the restaurant in his/her mind."	**Neutral comparison** between Available Designs and the Redesigned. Responder A praises their peer for understanding Available Designs and then invites the writer to transform them in order to more effectively "transport the reader to this place."
	Responder B to Author 1: "Este es peor de los modelos que estudiamos porque no tiene información sobre los sentidos, y también porque los modelos fueron escritos por	**Negative comparison** between Available Designs and the Redesigned. The views of Responders A and

	personas fluentes en español y por eso los suyos son más fácil y agradable a leer. Tiene las características del género, pero no es escrito en una manera muy agradable a leer." Researcher's translation: "This is worse than the models that we studied because it doesn't have information about the senses, and also because the models were written by people fluent in Spanish and therefore theirs are easier and more enjoyable to read. You have the characteristics of the genre, but it is not written in a very pleasurable way to read."	B once again diverge. In contrast to Responder A's neutral comparison, Responder B criticizes Author 1 of misemploying Available Designs, even suggesting that the L2 learner corrupted Available Designs established by native speakers.
	Responder C to Author 2: "Este borrador es mucho más descriptivo y organizado. Los otros borradores que hemos leído no eran tan eficaces y no hacen un gran trabajo describiendo la experiencia de comedor." Researcher's translation: "This rough draft is much more descriptive and organized. The other [models] that we have read were not as effective and don't do a good job describing the experience of the diner."	**Positive comparison** between Available Designs and the Redesigned. The emphasis on intentional, purposeful transformation of meaning suggests a view of writing that is consistent with the multiliteracies approach.

Table 3. Examples of Failures to Apply Literacy-based Knowledge During Peer Response

Absent types of literacy-based knowledge	Evidence (unedited but anonymized)	Analysis	Effect on quality of peer response
A lack of understanding of the relationship between writer and reader	Responder D to Author 2: "La autora no especifica a una gama de edades, pero dijo que es 'perfecto para un grupo de personas que tiene dificultades' con decisiones. Describe como una persona en su grupo quería el desayuno al mismo tiempo que otra persona quería el almuerzo. Entonces, es un lugar con un gran variedad de comida para un gran variedad de gustos." Researcher's translation: "The author doesn't	When asked to describe the target audience of the text, Responder D conflates the target audience with the group of people who may enjoy dining at the reviewed restaurant. They assume that a text explicitly states its target audience and cannot imagine the expectations and needs of this group of people, let alone position themself as a member of the target audience.	This leads the Responder to **focus on surface errors instead of rhetorical issues.** Responder D to Author 2: "'Mira como una casa?' No estoy seguro si quieres decir la estructura o (en ingles) 'homey,' como es un lugar cómodo." Researcher's translation: "'It looks like a house?' I'm not sure if you want to say the structure o (in English) 'homey,' which is like a comfortable space."

	specify a range of ages, but he/she said that it is 'perfect for a group of people that have difficulties' with decisions. He/she describes how a person in her group wanted breakfast at the same time that another person wanted lunch. So, it's a place with a wide variety of food for a wide variety of tastes."		
	Responder E to Author 3: "Es para decir a las personas sobre un experiencia bueno que tiene la autora y decir a ellas que deben ir allí, pero no es un lugar perfecto (…) Se dirige a los americanos y también los cubanos." Researcher's translation: "It's to tell people about a good experience that the author has and tell them that they should go there, but it's not a perfect place (…) He/she writes to Americans and also Cubans."	Responder E over-generalizes the target audience to include all Americans and all Cubans. The description of the target audience lacks specificity, as does the description of the author's purpose.	This leads Responder E to give **contradictory feedback**: "la descripción de la vaca frita es una poca vaga, pero es bastante bueno." Researcher's translation: "the description of the fried cow is a little vague, but it's pretty good." Responder E also gives **vague feedback**: "Los frases últimos son un poco confusos." Researcher's translation: "The last sentences are a little confusing."
A lack of consideration of Available Designs	In contrast to Responder C, Responder D never references the model texts when commenting the work of Author 2.		Consequently, Responder D gives **vague, contradictory feedback** that lacks justification. Responder D to Author 2: "También, es un poco larga. Es posible que debes eliminar unas frases? No sé si hay una máxima para palabras. En general, es una

		reseña muy buena." Researcher's translation: "Also, it's a little long. Is it possible that you should eliminate some sentences? I don't know if there is a maximum for words. In general, it's a very good review."

While many peer responders communicated literacy-based knowledge in similar ways to Responders A, B, and C, a few students did not demonstrate an understanding of the reader-writer relationship nor a critical examination of Available Designs. As evidenced in Table 3, Responder D (who commented the same rough draft as Responder C) and Responder E (who commented another author's work) failed to imagine the specific interests, motives, and perspectives of the target audience. Responder D could not imagine the text's target audience and instead described the patrons of the restaurant ("it's a place with a wide variety of food for a wide variety of tastes"), and Responder E's description of the target audience ("he/she writes to Americans and also Cubans") was an abstract generalization. Consequently, their peer response comments focused on surface errors instead of rhetorical issues, and they were vague and/or contradictory. In the case of Responder D, the inability to comment on Author 2's work from the perspective of the intended audience was coupled with a lack of critical examination of Available Designs. In contrast to Responders A, B, and C, who depended on shared expectations about the relationship between textual conventions and their context of use in order to evaluate the work of their peers, Responder D lacked this literacy and thus deferred to the authority of the instructor. It appears that Responder D did not benefit from collaborative genre analysis in the same way that Responders A, B, and C did; instead of embracing the multiliteracies belief that communities of text users define horizons of expectations, Responder D reverts to an isolated view of writing in which the instructor dictates textual requirements.

In sum, Responders D and E represent the small subset of peer responders who did not apply their literacy-based understandings and knowledge. However, Responders A, B, and C represent the overall trend in the data of demonstrating literacy-based knowledge; in general, peer responders offered constructive, actionable comments that were based on their understanding of the relationship between writer and reader and the schematic features of the Available Designs. Interestingly, the occasional instance in which students did not receive helpful feedback from their peers did not significantly influence their attitudes about peer response, which are discussed in continuation.

Research Question 2: How Do Students Perceive the Benefits of Literacy-Oriented Peer Response?

At midterm, students anonymously responded to a survey questionnaire about peer response and the writing process. One question targeted students' perceptions of peer response by asking "What do you gain during peer review? Consider your role as a peer reviewer and as someone whose work is reviewed. What do you learn, realize or discover? What skills do you develop or reinforce?" Students reported various benefits of peer response, which can be

divided into two categories: benefits of receiving feedback and benefits of giving feedback. Table 4 summarizes the most common themes that emerged in student responses (n = 15). Twelve responses articulated the benefits of receiving as well as giving feedback; two responses solely mentioned the benefits of *giving* feedback and one response solely mentioned the benefits of *receiving* feedback.

Table 4. Reported Benefits of Literacy-oriented Peer Response

	% of students that reported benefit	Number of students that reported benefit
Benefits of receiving feedback		
Gain "different perspectives"	67%	10
Determine appropriate content	33%	5
Learn how reader interprets meaning	27%	4
Gauge clarity	27%	4
Benefits of giving feedback		
Consider other Available Designs	53%	8
Identify common "mistakes"	47%	7
Evaluate content of own writing	47%	7
Notice "strengths and weaknesses"	33%	5

The most commonly reported benefit of receiving peer response feedback was gaining "different perspectives" on the rough draft (n = 10). This was the broadest code, and therefore has the highest frequency and often co-occurred with other codes. For example, one student stated that "I think that reading peer reviews of my own compositions are helpful because they give me an idea of what's unclear or what's missing from someone who's writing with the same or a similar goal as I am." According to this student, it is helpful to consider the perspectives of other members of the discourse community—other contributors to TripAdvisor. The writer assumes that the peer responders share the same "horizons of expectations" (Swaffar & Arens, 2005, p. 99) about the genre of the TripAdvisor review, so they trust them to evaluate appropriate content ("what's missing") and gauge whether meaning is designed clearly ("what's unclear"). This comment thus exemplifies how the theme of "gain 'different perspectives'" converged with other themes in the data. Additionally, it highlights the sense of community among peer responders, an idea that surfaces in another student's response:

> Peer review both helps me to notice mistakes that I could be making as well as gives me feedback from other students who, as learning Spanish themselves, might relate to making. It also provides feedback from various sources, so that if the students and the professor point something out, I know it's something I need to focus on and really pay attention to.

This student, like the first, grants authority to his peers to provide additional perspectives on his work. When student responses did not cite gaining "different perspectives" as a benefit of *receiving* peer feedback (n = 5), their responses tended to focus on surface issues ("mistakes that I make," n = 2) or the benefits of *giving* feedback (n = 3).

The most commonly reported benefit of giving peer response feedback was that it offered the opportunity to consider additional Available Designs (n = 8). For example, one student

reported the following: "It is also nice to see other people's work and use some of the good things that I've seen in their compositions in my own, such as the structure of the composition." Exposure to additional Available Designs often prompted students to explore the various ways in which TripAdvisor reviews can be structured:

> During peer review, I feel I gain a lot of insight as to ideas in structure, along with ideas of what is working and not working in other people's papers. This then allows me to pull from these ideas in order to improve my own papers.

In these survey responses, the verbs "use" and "pull from" suggest that students apply, adapt, and transform the Available Designs provided by their peers when they revise their own drafts. As one student summarizes, responding to peers' work "helps my creativity because I see how other people approached the assignment." By considering a variety of Available Designs, peer responders expand the possibilities for their own Redesigned texts.

Although considering other Available Designs was the most frequently cited benefit of giving feedback, all codes for this category were used with similar frequency across the participants. This can be explained by the fact that all responses (n = 15) articulated the same general benefit of giving feedback: the ability to critically evaluate their own writing and make appropriate revisions. The individual codes – consider other Available Designs, identify common grammatical "mistakes," evaluate content and structure of own writing, and notice "strengths and weaknesses" – are specific manifestations of this general trend. As one student eloquently synthesized, giving feedback to peers developed participants' ability to edit and revise their own work:

> I think the most useful skill I developed was being able to more critically review my own work before submitting it. After doing the peer-reviews, I now have a better understanding of how to edit my own papers more effectively.

The following section considers these findings in relation to the paper's research questions.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore how students perform during and respond to trained peer response within the multiliteracies framework. Because existing models for trained peer response are rooted in process approaches to teaching L2 writing, literacy-oriented courses that employ post-process instructional approaches need to redefine the rationale for peer response and reconsider best practices for implementation. Consequently, the study broached the three phases of peer response that are typically addressed in the literature: (1) *before* peer response, the literacy-oriented training that students complete; (2) *during* peer response, how learners communicate literacy-based understandings and knowledge; (3) *after* peer response, how learners react affectively to the peer response process.

Collaborative genre analysis was used as a means of providing literacy-oriented training for peer responders, and it moved students through the knowledge processes of *experiencing, conceptualizing,* and *analyzing*. Although this study focused on the narrow objective of preparing peer responders to evaluate restaurant reviews, the teacher-researcher also implemented collaborative genre analysis to prepare students to write and evaluate other genres throughout the semester. Consequently, Spanish instructors in the U.S. could adapt the sequence of

multiliteracies lessons outlined in "Study Design" to teach their students to write according to the academic conventions of a university in Mexico City, Buenos Aires, or Madrid; comparing models of academic essays from the U.S. and other Spanish-speaking countries could highlight the culturally-situated nature of textual conventions and prepare students to meet the academic requirements of study abroad. Whether collaborative genre analysis is used to prepare students to write in different contexts and/or train them as peer responders, it is crucial that they *apply* the understandings, knowledge, and skills gained through textual interaction after the training protocol is complete.

After completing the training, most (but not all) students *applied* their literacy-based knowledge during peer response. The students who effectively imagined the intended audience and/or compared their peer's text with the models studied during peer response training communicated two types of knowledge during peer response: (1) an understanding of the relationship between writer and reader and (2) a critical consideration of Available Designs. Because these peer responders primarily referenced schematic Available Designs, they offered specific, appropriate suggestions about content, organization, and style that their peers could implement in their revisions. The peer responders who focused their attention on schematic Available Designs during genre analysis and peer response saw Available Designs as "tools for expressing themselves creatively through the act of meaning design" (Paesani, 2016, p. 279). However, schematic Available Designs were not evident to all peer responders, and some reduced them to linguistic forms to be mastered (Paesani, 2016). The peer responders who fixated on linguistic Available Designs tended to comment on surface errors instead of rhetorical issues, and their feedback was vague, contradictory, and generally of minimal use to their peers. These are common issues with peer response (Cumming & So, 1996; Faigley & Witte, 1981; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013; Leki, 1990; Mittan, 1989; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996) and can be attributed to students' inconsistent ability to "see Available Designs as both meaning-making resources and language forms to be mastered" (Paesani, 2016, p. 283).

Despite the disparate quality of some peer responses, the results of Research Question 2 determined that students perceive various benefits of literacy-oriented peer response and generally indicated positive attitudes about both giving and receiving peer feedback. Additionally, the combined findings of Questions 1 and 2 suggest that literacy-oriented peer response offered a means of interrogating and destabilizing the native speaker standard. Although Responder B assigned native-speaker prestige to the model texts encountered during genre analysis ("This is worse than the models that we studied (…) because the models were written by people fluent in Spanish"), all other study participants did not operate with this bias and never mentioned native/non-native speaker debates in their evaluation of their peers' work. In fact, the data collected from the survey questionnaire indicated that students began to see the TripAdvisor reviews written by their peers as additional, equally valid Available Designs. While the collaborate genre analysis exercise used for training peer responders depended on model texts written by native speakers, peer response exposed students to the ways in which L2 learners can effectively design meaning through texts – even texts with readerships of foreign native speakers.

Considered in dialogue with the findings of other researchers, the results of this study suggest various implications for classroom practice. First, instructors may consider modifying composition prompts so that students can work with real-world genres that circulate in an authentic social context. Decontextualized assignments such as "write a 2-3 paragraph description of your favorite restaurant" not only preclude the possibility of conducting a genre analysis of model texts, but they also prevent students from responding to peers' work as members of the target audience.

Second, training for peer responders should not only target the type of comments that students make and the language they use to make them (Berg, 1999; Min, 2005). It also needs to develop students' understanding of the relationships between textual conventions and contexts of use, and position them to read as informed and trustworthy members of the intended discourse community. Peer response needs to shift the authority of the classroom so that the instructor is not the only one defining expectations for effective written communication. The results of this study confirm the finding that peer response is more effective when students do not assume the role of a teacher or editor and instead communicate their ideas from the perspective of the intended readership (Min, 2005; O'Donnell, 2014). When students see themselves as active participants in the negotiation of meaning, they reference the schematic Available Designs identified during genre analysis to comment issues of meaning, content, and organization in their peers' work.

That said, collaborative genre analysis in itself does not ensure that all peer responders appropriately apply literacy-based understandings and knowledge, and it should be combined with other training protocols that have been empirically tested. For example, modeling a constructive peer response exchange would improve the quality of peer feedback (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013; Hansen & Liu, 2005; Min, 2005; Stanley, 1992). Furthermore, collaborative genre analysis does not include instruction about appropriate language to use to share feedback (Berg, 1999; Hansen & Liu, 2005; Min, 2005; Schaffer, 1996), and this would benefit students who unintentionally frame their feedback in harsh or overly critical ways. Although the training protocol did not incorporate all of these suggestions, students still responded relatively positively to peer response. Unlike in some implementations of peer response within process approaches, students in this study did not report a sense of "discomfort" or "uneasiness" with peer response (Amores, 1997, p. 519). Instead, students saw both the value and pleasure of engaging in peer response and did not merely consider it a requirement of the instructor (Amores, 1997, p. 521). The benefits they reported confirm the findings that giving feedback may be just as beneficial—if not more beneficial—than receiving it, since peer responders learn to critically evaluate their own writing in order to make appropriate revisions (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; O'Donnell, 2014; Rollinson, 2005).

This study thus proposes a model for trained peer response that achieves the primary pedagogical commitments of the multiliteracies framework. First, as a way of training peer responders, collaborative genre analysis embodies Kern's vision for a comprehensive pedagogy of literacy that addresses the linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural dimensions of meaning making (2010, pp. 25-39). It does so by including an appropriate mix of knowledge processes—a curricular characteristic that has been deemed essential when implementing multiliteracies pedagogy (Kalantzis et al., 2016; Menke & Paesani, 2018; Michelson & Dupuy, 2014; Rowland et al., 2014). Second, as students move through the stages of the writing process (collaborative genre analysis, pre-writing, drafting, peer response, revision, and publication), they participate in "socially recognized ways of generating, communicating and negotiating meanings" and analyze "the relations between language users, texts, and contexts of use" (Warner & Michelson, 2018, pp. 4, 5). Finally, the pedagogical activities proposed in this article align with the sociocultural views of writing that characterize the multiliteracies framework. During genre analysis, students observe how Available Designs are negotiated by readers and writers with shared assumptions, relationships, and communicative purposes. Additionally, students explore the creative possibilities for meaning design; they observe how Available Designs are recycled, adapted, and transformed by native speakers and L2 learners alike as they prepare for and then complete peer response. Not only were pedagogical materials designed in accordance with these beliefs about making meaning, but students adapted this

view of writing as well. When they reflected on the benefits of receiving and giving feedback to their peers, students articulated beliefs about writing that are consistent with the multiliteracies framework. The proposed model for trained peer response thus offers one way of translating the theory of multiliteracies to concrete classroom practice.

In order to further confirm the effectiveness of literacy-oriented peer response, additional research is needed. This was an exploratory study with a small sample size. Furthermore, the researcher was observing her own students and performed the descriptive coding, so her preconceived notions about the effectiveness of peer response may have caused bias during qualitative analysis. Additional research will need to consider whether these results are generalizable in different educational contexts. This study, like many studies on peer response, did not use experimental research methods to quantitatively compare two groups or examine the types of revisions that students made after participating in peer response (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009). It assumed that the benefits reported by students were true without investigating whether or not students' perceptions of peer response were accurate (Min, 2005). Therefore, future studies may want to investigate the impact of literacy-oriented peer response on the content, organization, and style of subsequent drafts. It may be relevant to compare how students view the relative authority of peer responders and the professor in literacy-oriented and process approaches to peer response. Furthermore, it would be important to study how students decide what peer feedback to implement during the revision process. For example, students could be asked to write a formal response to the comments of their peers. By studying student justifications for incorporating or rejecting peer feedback, researchers may gain additional insight into how students continue to build literacy-based knowledge *after* participating in peer response. Finally, in order to continue to articulate the value of collegiate foreign language study, it will be important to investigate how students transfer literacy-based knowledge to other contexts—personal, professional, or academic—in which they are expected to write a text type with which they are unfamiliar.

CONCLUSION

This study presented a method for implementing peer response within the multiliteracies framework. Specifically, it investigated the effectiveness of trained peer response in a literacy-oriented and writing-focused foreign language course by considering two factors: the quality of peer-to-peer feedback and students' attitudes about peer response. The proposed method – collaborative genre analysis – embeds trained peer response in a sequence of literacy-oriented lessons and ensures that students engage in an appropriate variety of knowledge processes. This training equips students to apply literacy-based knowledge and provide their peers with high-quality and actionable feedback. In both intellectual and affective terms, students responded positively to this implementation of trained peer response. Although research on peer response has remained largely separate from research on literacy-based curricula, this study suggests the need for increased inter- and intra-disciplinary dialogue as we tackle the theoretical and practical questions of the changing curricular landscape.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my students for their enthusiastic participation, Seth Matthew Fishman for his perspective on study design, and the editors and anonymous reviewers for elevating the article to its current form.

REFERENCES

Ahern, K. (1999). Ten tips for reflexive bracketing. *Qualitative Health Research, 9*(3), 407–411.

Allen, H. W. (2018). Redefining writing in the foreign language curriculum: Toward a design approach. *Foreign Language Annals, 51*(3), 513–532.

Allen, H. W., & Goodspeed, L. (2018). Textual borrowing and perspective-taking: A genre-based approach to L2 writing. *L2 Journal*, *10*(2), 87–110.

Allen, H. W., & Paesani, K. (2010). Exploring the feasibility of a pedagogy of multiliteracies in introductory foreign language courses. *L2 Journal, 2*(1), 119–142.

Amores, M. J. (1997). A new perspective on peer-editing. *Foreign Language Annals, 30*(4), 513–522.

Berg, E. C. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3), 215–241.

Bhooth, A. M., Azman, H., & Ismail, K. (2015). Investigating the reading practices of EFL Yemeni students using the learning by design framework. *TESOL Journal, 6*(3), 418–446.

Blyth, C. (2018). Designing meaning and identity in multiliteracies pedagogy: From multilingual subjects to authentic speakers. *L2 Journal, 10*(2), 62–86.

Byrd, D. R. (2003). Practical tips for implementing peer editing tasks in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 36*(3), 434–441.

Byrnes, H., Maxim, H. H., & Norris, J. M. (2010). Realizing advanced foreign language writing development in collegiate education: Curricular design, pedagogy, assessment. *The Modern Language Journal*, *94*(Supplement), i–235.

Chaudron, C. (1984). The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. *RELC Journal, 15*(2), 1–14.

Connor, U., & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*(3), 257–276.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). "Multiliteracies": New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 4*(3), 164–195.

Cumming, A., & So, S. (1996). Tutoring second language text revision: Does the approach to instruction or the language of communication make a difference? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*(3), 197–226.

Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2016). Supporting second language writing using multimodal feedback. *Foreign Language Annals, 49*(1), 58–74.

Faigley, L., & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision. *College Composition and Communication, 32*(4), 400–414.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2013). *Teaching L2 Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice* (3rd ed.). New York/London: Routledge.

Flowerdew, J. (1993). An educational, or process, approach to the teaching of professional genres. *ELT Journal, 47*(4), 305–316.

Flynn, E. A. (1982, November*). Effects of peer critiquing and model analysis on the quality of biology student laboratory reports*. Paper Presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Washington, D.C.

Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 31–38.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*(3), 255–276.

Hyland, K. (2008). Genre and academic writing in the disciplines. *Language Teaching, 41*(04), 543–562.

Kalantzis, M., Cope, B., Chan, E., & Dalley-Trim, L. (2016). *Literacies* (2nd ed.). Port Melbourne, VIC, Australia: Cambridge University Press.

Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kucer, S. B. (2009). *Dimensions of Literacy* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Leki, I. (1990). Potential problems with peer responding in ESL writing classes. *CATESOL Journal, 3*(1), 5–19.

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.

Mantero, M. (2006). Applied literacy in second language education: (Re)framing discourse in literature-based classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals, 39*(1), 99–114.
Maxim, H. H. (2009). "It's made to match": Linking L2 reading and writing through textual borrowing. In C. Brantmeier (Ed.), *Crossing Languages and Research Methods: Analyses of Adult Foreign Language Reading* (pp. 97–122). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
McGroarty, M. E., & Zhu, W. (1997). Triangulation in classroom research: A study of peer revision. *Language Learning, 47*(1), 1–43.
Menke, M. R. (2018). Literacy-based curricula in university foreign language instruction: Perceptions from non-tenure-track faculty. *L2 Journal, 10*(2), 111–133.
Menke, M. R., & Paesani, K. (2018). Analysing foreign language instructional materials through the lens of the multiliteracies framework. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 1*, 1–16.
Michelson, K., & Dupuy, B. (2014). Multi-storied lives: Global simulation as an approach to developing multiliteracies in an intermediate French course. *L2 Journal, 6*(1), 21–49.
Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: a methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
Min, H.-T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics, 33*(2), 293–308.
Min, H.-T. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*(2), 118–141.
Min, H.-T. (2016). Effect of teacher modeling and feedback on EFL students' peer review skills in peer review training. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 31*, 43–57.
Mittan, R. (1989). The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in Writing: Empowering ESL Students* (pp. 207–219). New York: Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd.
O'Donnell, M. E. (2014). Peer response with process-oriented, standards-based writing for beginning-level, second language learners of Spanish. *Hispania, 97*(3), 413–429.
Paesani, K. (2016). Investigating connections among reading, writing, and language development: A multiliteracies perspective. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 28*(2), 266–289.
Paesani, K. (2018). Researching literacies and textual thinking in collegiate foreign language programs: Reflections and recommendations. *Foreign Language Annals, 51*(1), 129–139.
Paesani, K., Allen, H. W., & Dupuy, B. (2016). *A Multiliteracies Framework for Collegiate Foreign Language Teaching*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
Racelis, J. V., & Matsuda, P. K. (2013). Integrating process and genre into the second language writing classroom: Research into practice. *Language Teaching, 46*(3), 382–393.
Reichelt, M., Lefkowitz, N., Rinnert, C., & Schultz, J. M. (2012). Key issues in foreign language writing. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*(1), 22–41.
Roebuck, R. F. (2001). Teaching composition in the college level foreign language class: Insights and activities from sociocultural theory. *Foreign Language Annals, 34*(3), 206–216.
Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 23–30.
Rothschild, D., & Klingenberg, F. (1990). Self and peer evaluation of writing in the interactive ESL classroom: An exploratory study. *TESL Canada Journal, 8*(1), 52–65.
Rowland, L., Canning, N., Faulhaber, D., Lingle, W., & Redgrave, A. (2014). A multiliteracies approach to materials analysis. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 27*(2), 136–150.
Ruegg, R. (2015). The relative effects of peer and teacher feedback on improvement in EFL students' writing ability. *Linguistics and Education, 29*, 73–82.
Saldaña, J. (2015). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles/London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
Schaffer, J. (1996). Peer response that works. *Journal of Teaching Writing, 15*(1), 81–90.
Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*(3), 217–233.
Swaffar, J. K., & Arens, K. (2005). *Remapping the Foreign Language Curriculum: An Approach Through Multiple Literacies*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
Tai, H.-C., Lin, W.-C., & Yang, S. C. (2015). Exploring the effects of peer review and teachers' corrective feedback on EFL students' online writing performance. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 53*(2), 284–309.
Thoms, J. J., & Poole, F. J. (2018). Exploring digital literacy practices via L2 social reading. *L2 Journal, 10*(2), 36–61.
TripAdvisor LLC. (2016, December 1). TripAdvisor for Developers: Supported Languages [informational

website]. Retrieved from https://developer-tripadvisor.com/content-api/supported-languages/

Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do Secondary L2 Writers Benefit from Peer Comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(2), 147–170.

Villamil, O. S., & de Guerrero, M. C. M. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Social-cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*(1), 51–75.

Villamil, O. S., & de Guerrero, M. C. M. (1998). Assessing the Impact of Peer Revision on L2 Writing. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(4), 491–514.

Warner, C., & Michelson, K. (2018). Introduction to the special issue. *L2 Journal, 10*(2), 3–15.

Zhu, W. (1995). Effects of training for peer response on students' comments and interaction. *Written Communication, 12*(4), 492–528.