
Feedback on L2 adult learners' writing¹

Watana Padgate

Naresuan University

Abstract

This study examined the use of peer feedback and teacher-student conferencing activities in an English writing class with adult learners. It surveyed the learners' attitudes toward and their expectations from these feedback types and documented potential problems of applying these feedback activities in an adult learning situation. The participants were 108 graduate students. A questionnaire was used to collect the data. The results revealed the following: 1) the conferencing and peer feedback activities were highly valued by the majority of the learners, 2) the learners had the same expectations from both feedback activities, and 3) some problems occurring from the use of these feedback types still existed. Despite some problems, peer feedback and conferencing activities have a promising place in an L2 writing class. The problems occurring are practical or technical rather than theoretical and can be solved by better communication between the instructor and the learners and by appropriate class management.

Benefits of feedback to writing have been discussed and recognized as an important part of the writing process by many second language (L2) researchers (e.g., Arndt, 1993; Bates, Lane, & Lange, 1993; Leki, 1992; Raimes, 1983). Generally speaking, an important goal of feedback is to

help students improve their writing in an effective way and to eventually become more effective writers. Traditionally, the main source of feedback is written feedback from the teacher which often emphasizes grammar and sentence structures. Written feedback has some advantages over oral forms of

¹ This paper was presented at the 21st Annual Thailand-TESOL International Conference held in Bangkok, Thailand during January 18-20, 2001.

feedback (Arndt, 1993), but it also has drawbacks. Zamel (1985) investigated actual teacher response in writing classes and found that the teachers in her study often provided unfavorable and inappropriate feedback. For example, they misread the students' texts, were inconsistent with their comments, imposed abstract rules and standards, and responded to texts as fixed and final products. Because it can sometimes be difficult to understand exactly what the students are expressing in writing, teachers often guess, the result of which may be inappropriate response or feedback. Thus, responding to a student's paper without a clear knowledge of their intention can lead to inappropriate and ineffective feedback.

One interesting alternative to avoid the 'feedback guessing-game' is to conduct conferences between the teacher and individual students. In addition, the teacher is not necessarily the only source of feedback. Student writers can learn from their peers as well.

1. Conferencing

Conferencing, or two-way interaction through discussion between the teacher and the students, can be helpful to clarify major points or problems relating to meaning and organization (Arndt, 1993). In addition to saving the teacher's time in marking students' papers, a writing conference allows negotiation and clarification of both forms and meanings and is suitable when the teacher does not really know what the students want to communicate and, therefore, finds it hard to respond to them. Conferencing helps the teacher to avoid appropriating the students' papers.

The opportunity for negotiation and clarification during the conferencing also

reflects Vygotsky's concept of the Zone of Proximal Development. This concept implies that effectiveness of feedback on language learning depends crucially on mediation provided by other more knowledgeable individuals. In other words, learning does not take place in isolation but is constructed with another more capable individual who guides and provides assistance to the novice. Thus, expert feedback can help in learning, but the teacher must be aware of the students' current level of development. Assistance must be provided when needed and must result from negotiation between the teacher and the students. Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) applied this concept in giving feedback on errors during the teacher-student tutorials. In this study, the tutor used different levels of questions to probe the students to detect their errors. The tutor's goal was to enable the students to self-correct before giving them correct answers and grammatical explanations. Only by first assessing if students could self-correct could the tutor know how much assistance to provide and how much progress the learner made from one conference session to the next. The researchers maintain that feedback should help the students to move from other-regulation to self-regulation and to rely less on the expert.

2. Peer response

The use of peer response in L2 writing is motivated by the social constructivist theory (Lockhart & Ng, 1995). Social constructionism holds that knowledge is built through negotiation in a community of practice. It is believed that students will develop more effectively as they are engaged in the transaction over their own texts and the texts

of others. Peer assistance and collaborative activities during peer review are important in solving a task and in learning. The students use different types of strategies and negotiations that facilitate the response process and help enhance the writers' communicative power (Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996). A growing interest in the process approach to writing, which emphasizes the development of self-discovery of meaning, drafting, and revising skills, also signifies the use of peer response (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996).

Peer response has several advantages (Arndt, 1993; Chaudron, 1988; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Mittan, 1989; Reid, 1993). For example, it helps the learners to realize that writing is a social process and helps enhance the idea of writing as communication. It also provides the writers with alternative feedback from other readers than the teacher. Additionally, by reading and seeing difficulties and weaknesses in their peers' writing, the students may see similar problems and weaknesses in their own writing. They may also gain confidence in their own abilities. The students can learn about the writing process as well as content and organization by reading their peers' texts critically. Socially supportive peers will help enhance the positive attitudes toward writing, and they will learn to accept reasonable reader responses and to use them constructively. Finally, the peer review process helps save the teacher's time and energy.

Although there seems to be enough theoretical ground to advocate the use of peer response in an L2 writing class (Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998), research results on its effectiveness are still questionable and, at

times, contradictory (Chaudron, 1988; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Jacobs, 1989; Nelson & Murphy, 1993). Similarly, research findings on the students' attitudes toward peer feedback also varied (Leki, 1990; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Zhang, 1995). (See Ferris and Hedgcock for an excellent review of research on peer feedback.)

Research also reveals problems involved in using peer feedback (Arndt, 1993; Grabe, & Kaplan, 1996; Leki, 1990; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Reid, 1993). However, given the non-traditional means of teacher-student conferencing and the widespread use of peer feedback in other contexts, it seemed important to investigate how these two feedback types were perceived by Thai adult learners who were teachers of English themselves. Their attitudes toward these feedback activities might be different from those of young learners and those from other disciplines. Moreover, differences among these learners in terms of age, teaching experience, and types of schools in which they worked might lead to problems during feedback activities. The objectives of this study were threefold: 1) to survey the learners' attitudes toward peer feedback and teacher-student conferencing, 2) to investigate their expectations from these two feedback types, and 3) to document problems of these two feedback activities when used with adult learners.

Method

The participants of this study were 108 graduate students (92 females, 12 males, and 4 unspecified) enrolled in the summer-only MA. (English) program of a Thai university. All participants were teachers and taught

English at different levels (74.1% in secondary schools and the rest in primary schools and colleges). Most of them (84.3%) held a bachelor degree in English while 4.6 % did not specify their major. The rest (11.1%)

held their degree in various fields namely geography, history, Thai, French, and other areas in education. Table 1 displays other aspects concerning the participants' demographic information.

Table 1
Participants' Demographic Information (N = 108)

	Number of respondents	%
1. Age (years)		
a. 30 and below	37	34.3
b. 31-40	41	48.0
c. 41 and over	29	26.8
d. unspecified	1	0.9
2. Experience in teaching English (years)		
a. 5 and below	39	36.1
b. 6-10	23	21.3
c. 11-15	16	14.8
d. 16 and over	27	25.0
e. unspecified	3	2.8
3. Self-evaluation of English proficiency		
a. Excellent	0	0
b. Good	17	15.7
c. Fair	67	62.0
d. Poor	24	22.2

The course from which the data were collected was a graduate course, English Discourse Structure, consisting of two sessions, the lecture and the lab. In the former, all learners studied together in a large class, but in the latter, the learners were divided into three sections and practiced writing essays. The learners were assigned to write three pieces of different genres (description, narration, and argumentation) over the 8-week semester. The first

assignment was individual work while the other two were group work.

During the writing process, the learners had to produce two working drafts before submitting the final draft for grading. The peer activity was conducted after the first draft. The learners were given a peer response form (see Appendix A) adapted from Ferris and Hedgcock (1998). The objective of this activity was made clear to the learners. The learners were given about 40-45 minutes to

read the paper and write feedback. After receiving the peer response form from their partner, the writers read the feedback and could ask their peer reader for clarification. Then, they had to revise their paper and produce the second draft for conferencing with the instructor.

Feedback on ideas, organization and clarity of the writing was focused on during the conference. The learners could ask for clarification whenever they did not understand the instructor's comments. They could explain, clarify, and defend their points. Although feedback on language was provided, minimal explicit corrections were given. In most cases, the instructor did not immediately provide the correct forms but would indicate the mistakes and encourage the learners to self-correct. Each conferencing session took about 15-20 minutes, and Thai was used. After the conference, the learners produced the third draft, the final one. At the end of the semester, the learners completed a questionnaire

(see Appendix B) adapted from Ferris and Hedgcock (1998). The learners were allowed to answer the questions in Thai.

Results and Discussion

Learners' attitudes toward peer feedback and teacher-student conferencing

The results on the students' attitudes showed positive reactions toward the use of peer feedback and conferencing. The majority of the learners (95.4%) reported that they benefited from the peer feedback activity as both the readers and writers. These results supported the findings of previous studies (Leki, 1990; Mangelsdorf 1992; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994). As writers, the learners found peer feedback helpful in improving the papers in the following areas ranked from the most to the least useful: ideas, language, organization, clarity, and style. As readers, the learners found the feedback activity useful in the areas shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Areas Which Learners, as Readers of the Papers, Found Peer Feedback Useful

	Frequency	%
1. Help to realize my own mistakes when seeing the same kind of mistakes in other learners' paper	103	95.4
2. Help to learn how to organize or arrange my own paper more effectively	103	95.4
3. Help to look at my own papers more critically	99	91.7
4. Help to get more ideas about what I was writing	96	88.9
5. Borrow some good expressions for my own papers	70	64.8
6. Borrow some interesting styles for my own papers	64	59.3
7. Make me more confident in my own writing feeling that I could write better	44	40.7

This group of learners also highly valued conferencing with the teacher. All of them, except for one who did not answer this question, stated that they found this activity useful. The areas of feedback during the conference reported as most useful for improving the students' writing are rank-ordered as follows: 1) ideas, 2) organization, 3) language, 4) clarity, and 5) style.

The results also showed that the vast majority of the respondents (94.4%) wanted to receive both peer and teacher feedback on their writing. Additionally, conferencing with the teacher was preferred over traditional written feedback by most learners (91.7%). The advantages of two-way communication were strikingly obvious in qualitative findings. Almost all of the respondents who answered this open-ended question commented that they preferred the conferencing because this activity allowed them to ask questions for clarification and to defend and explain their viewpoints immediately and interactively with the instructor.

Learners' expectations of peer feedback and teacher-student conferencing

The results showed similar learners' expectations for peer feedback as for teacher feedback during writing conferences. Based on frequencies of responses, the areas of feedback that the writers expected to receive from both their peers and teacher were ranked as follows: 1) ideas, 2) language, 3) organization, 4) clarity, and 5) style.

The fact that the feedback on language was ranked second should not be surprising. This expectation might have resulted from the learners' confusion between responding and editing (Leki, 1990). This finding supported what Leki (1990) and Mangelsdorf (1992) have observed. Learners might have been accustomed to what they had traditionally practiced in their own classroom as teachers. The expectation of language feedback might have also arisen from the realization of their limited English proficiency. Although most respondents were English majors, only 15.7% rated themselves as "good" in English and none rated themselves as "excellent," as reported in the previous section. Their writing samples confirmed this fact. Many learners demonstrated problems in various aspects of language, namely grammar, sentence structure, expressions, and vocabulary. The fact that the instructor did not correct ungrammatical phrases or sentences during conferencing but asked the writers to rephrase those sections caused frustration to some learners.

Problems of peer feedback and conferencing

Although both peer feedback and conferencing were highly valued and desired by most students, these activities were not without problems. Table 3 shows the areas that the learners perceived as problems during the peer feedback activity, beginning with the problem reported the most frequently.

Table 3
Perceived Problems on the Peer Feedback Activity

	Frequency	%
As providers of the feedback		
1. I was afraid that my comments might have been incorrect because I was an inexperienced writer and did not know what good writing should look like.	84	77.8
2. It was hard for me to comment on other learners' papers because I was not proficient in reading.	63	58.3
3. I was afraid to comment on the papers or to point out the mistakes for fear that the writer(s) might have been offended.	31	28.7
As receivers of the feedback		
1. Not sure whether or not I could rely on peer comments because some readers might have been afraid to point out weak points in my papers directly	58	53.7
2. The readers usually edited my papers, that is, correcting grammatical or spelling mistakes, more than responded to other aspects of writing.	55	50.9
3. Comments were usually vague or not clear.	39	36.1
4. Not sure whether or not I should consider peer comments for my final draft because the readers might have been inexperienced.	38	35.2
5. The language was hard to understand.	21	19.4
6. Some criticisms were too harsh.	8	7.4

As seen in Table 3, what seemed to be the most serious problem for the students as providers of feedback was their lack of self-confidence. They felt that as inexperienced writers and readers themselves, they were not qualified to give feedback. The feelings of unequal English proficiency and the lack of self-confidence were prevalent during the peer feedback activity. In fact, the instructor sporadically reminded them during the

semester that there was no right or wrong feedback and that reaction from another reader, no matter who he/she was, could be another valuable source of feedback. However, some learners could not help feeling inferior to their peers. This feeling might have resulted from their performance in previous courses, and it made these learners afraid to comment on their peers' papers. One student said, "During the peer feedback

activity, I was worried that my comments or criticism might have been incorrect whereas that piece of writing might have been perfectly correct. This might cause confusion to the writer or make her lose confidence.” (Translated)

The Thai concept of *kreeng jai*, “a mingling of reverence, respect, deference, homage, and fear” (Moore cited in Gebhard 1996: 114), was also a source of problem among this group of learners. Feeling *kreeng jai* might have prevented some (28.7%) from providing honest comments to their peers’ papers for fear that their peer writers would lose face and get angry. However, it was rather ironic that while the readers were afraid to provide straightforward comments, more than half of the writers (53.7%) reported that they wanted to receive truthful feedback. These writers reported that they were not sure if their peer readers had provided honest feedback. One learner stated, “I want my peers to comment without having to be *kreeng jai* so that I will know what is good or bad in my writing (Translated).” Another commented, “Traditionally, Thai people always feel considerate. They dare not express their real feedback to the others. Therefore, some feedback may be fake.”

Another problem of the writers illustrated in Table 3 was their doubt about the validity of peer response. Some students (35.2%) were not sure if they should incorporate peer comments in their later drafts due to the peer readers’ lack of experience as writers. This problem corresponds to what Leki (1990) has observed. She notes that many ESL students wonder, “How can an inexperienced ESL writer know what to accept and what to reject from among the

comments made by another inexperienced ESL writer/reader?” (p. 11). At the same time, those who were confident and viewed themselves as more proficient than their peer readers tended not to accept peer comments. The answers to an open-ended question reflected their concerns as shown below:

- ♦ “If the reader is experienced, she can give comments, but if she is inexperienced, her comments may not be right to the point or even irrelevant.” (Translated)
- ♦ “Mostly, the peer readers dare not criticise directly probably because they were not sure if they were right. So, they didn’t want to give any comments for fear that this would make the writing deviate from the original draft.” (Translated)

Some writers were defensive in their own writing and put the blame on the readers for not understanding it. One stated, “It (peer feedback) would have been more useful if the reader had been more accurate in grammar and had understood the content the writer had presented (Translated).” Another commented, “Sometimes the readers didn’t get the ideas in my paper. They misinterpreted them, and I couldn’t make use of the feedback. Sometimes it made me confused and the feedback was incorrect or irrelevant to what I was writing. It would have been better and more useful if the readers had tried to read without mainly using their prejudice.” (Translated)

Another problem that many learners reported in another open-ended question was time constraint. As readers, they complained that they did not have enough time to read their peer’s paper thoroughly. Some writers

doubted that the feedback they received was reliable because they assumed that the peer reviewers might have had to rush to finish the task within the time limit and, thus, might not have given good feedback.

As the results show, this group of learners had problems as feedback providers more than as feedback receivers. However, one can notice that while some learners perceived the areas reported in Table 3 as problems, others did not. For example, item 1 of the writer's problem, which seemed to be the most problematic area, was checked by only a little over half of all students (53.7%). This result may imply that these problems are not too serious and should not discourage teachers to use peer feedback activity in their class.

Problems occurring during conferencing were drawn from responses to an open-ended question. Only 50 students had something to say about this issue. A summary of the problems can be classified according to their gravity from the learners' perspectives as follows.

1. Time. This problem was raised the most by the respondents. They commented that there were too many students but too little time. They had to wait for a long time before their turn, and the conferencing time, which was about 15-20 minutes, was too short. They could not ask for in-depth clarification because their peers were waiting. Limited time also made the teacher speak fast, which effected the clarity of the comments and student comprehension.

2. Need for explicit feedback on mistakes. As stated in the method section, the main aim of the conferencing was to help the student writers with the ideas, clarity and

organization. Language issues were dealt with only when they obstructed misunderstanding. In most cases, the teacher only underlined incorrect parts in the paper and pointed out problems, such as lexis, sentence structure, or grammar, without giving corrections. The writers had to make their own corrections or to rephrase the incorrect parts. Nine respondents raised this issue as a problem and expressed the desire for the teacher to explicitly provide them with corrections.

3. The nature of the teacher's feedback. Five out of fifty students complained that the teacher spoke too fast, and sometimes they did not understand the feedback.

4. Miscommunication or conflicts between the teacher and the learners. A possible reason accounting for this problem was inappropriate use of language. The writers' lack of precision in their language use often resulted in conveying a meaning other than the one they intended. Thus, the writers' limited English proficiency might have led to these conflicts. Part of this problem might have been due to limited conferencing time. There was not enough time for the teacher to probe and for the writers to clarify.

5. Unequal student-teacher status. The emergence of this problem, reported by only three students, was rather surprising given that the learners were all teachers. This attitude can be linked to the kreeng_jai concept as discussed earlier. This finding indicates that the teacher may have to be more careful and aware of this problem when using this technique with learners younger than the participants in this study. Here are some of the respondents' comments.

Sometimes some of us are shy or not confident to give an idea; the teacher should try to make us feel confident to speak or share our ideas with others. ≡

I feel kreeng jai to the teacher and dare not ask. ≡ (Translated)

6. **Other problems.** These problems included such issues as classroom environment, such as noise, and learners' change of topic resulting from the teacher's comments.

Conclusions

The results of this study reflect previous criticisms and problems of peer feedback and conferencing including the students' lack of understanding of the real purposes of peer feedback and conferencing activities, conflicts among the learners and between the learners and the teacher due to different expectations, the social dynamism among the peer group members, and the issues of face and of "good" and "poor" students. Despite the instructor's attempt to communicate with the learners about the objectives of these feedback activities, some learners seemed to have difficulty adjusting to this new approach to writing. It is clear that more communication and negotiations between the teacher and the students are needed.

Cultural issues are another point worth consideration. Learners sharing the same L1 or staying in the same country are often viewed as "homogeneous." These learners are not necessarily identical, however. They have their own identity, past learning experiences, cultural beliefs, and expectations. These individual differences may impede the effectiveness of peer feedback and

conferencing activities. Conflicts among the students from different cultures can occur in a writing group (Carson & Nelson, 1994, 1996), and conflicts between the students and the teacher may arise due to different values and expectations (Jordan, 1992). Many L2 learners value teachers' error correction more highly than self-discovery of their own errors (Leki, 1992; Nunan, 1991). When these conflicts occur, negotiation and clarification are the keys to mitigate or to solve conflicts. Objectives and virtues of classroom activities need to be made clear so that the learners will know what they are doing and why they should do it. The teacher cannot be too assertive about a teaching approach if the students are not prepared for it. The teacher may try to convince the students about the advantages of the approach but must, at the same time, be aware of their individual differences and needs. As Richards and Lockhart (1994) suggest, greater awareness of the nature of these conflicting expectations will help minimize misunderstandings. Both the teacher and the students will then be able to adjust their roles accordingly.

As the instructor who provided feedback to the learners in this study, I found my attempt to deal mainly with ideas and organization of the learners' papers during a conference rather unrealistic. At times, it was impossible to ignore grammar, since the papers of some students consisted of many mistakes rendering their papers incomprehensible. Moreover, their errors and the lack of clarity often prevented me from providing well-tuned feedback on content and organization. At the same time, I resisted the urge to supply all the language the learners needed to avoid the risk of appropriating their ideas and writing the

paper for them. This fact may imply that conferencing may not be suitable with L2 learners with limited English proficiency. In addition, this summer program was rather intensive, covering only eight weeks. Both the instructor and the students did not have sufficient time for learning this process of revision and conferencing. Writing teachers interested in applying conferencing in their class may have to take the issues of time and the number of students into consideration.

Despite the problems presented above, it must be kept in mind that the innovation was a success in the view of the teacher and the students. These problems are identified here as a way for teachers to be aware of what issues they need to deal with when

incorporating writing conferences and peer feedback activities into their courses. Essentially, this study helps to inform us that these two feedback types have a promising place in an L2 writing class. Teachers should not be discouraged to apply these feedback approaches in their writing class when learning and teaching contexts allow since these problems are technical or practical (Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998) rather than theoretical. They can be solved by more communication between the teacher and the students, good class management, and experience of both the teacher and the students with the procedure. Like good writing, this process takes time, reflection, and revision.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank Dr. Richard Donato of the University of Pittsburgh for his valuable comments on the content of the first draft of this paper.

The Author

Watana Padgate is currently Head of the English Division, Naresuan University, Phitsanulok, Thailand. He holds a B.A. in English (Chulalongkorn University), an M.A. in Applied Linguistics (Mahidol University), and a Ph.D. in Rhetoric & Linguistics (Indiana University of Pennsylvania). His interests include second language writing and second language acquisition.

References

- Aljaafreh, A. & Lantolf, J. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the Zone of Proximal Development. The Modern Language Journal, 78, 465-486.
- Arndt, V. (1993). Response to writing: Using feedback to inform the writing process. In M. N. Brock & L. Walters (Eds.), Teaching composition around the Pacific rim: Politics and pedagogy (pp. 90-116). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bates, L., Lane, J., & Lange, E. (1993). Writing clearly: Responding to ESL composition. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Carson, J. G. & Nelson, G. L. (1994). Writing groups: Cross-cultural issues. Journal of Second Language Writing, 3, 17-30.
- Carson, J. G. & Nelson, G. L. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. Journal of Second Language Writing, 5, 1-19.
- Chaudron, C. 1988. Second language classroom: Research on learning and teaching. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, U. & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? Journal of Second Language Writing, 3, 257-276.
- Ferris, D. R. & Hedgcock, J. S. (1998). Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gebhard, J. G. (1996). Teaching English as a foreign or second language. Ann Arbor, MA: The University of Michigan Press.
- Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). Theory and practice of writing. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Jacobs, G. (1989). Miscorrection in peer feedback in writing class. RELC Journal, 20, 68-76.
- Jorden, E. H. (1992). Culture in the Japanese language classroom. In C. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), Text and context: Cross disciplinary perspectives on language study (pp. 156-167). Lexington, MD: Heath & Company.
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: issues in written response. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom (pp.57-68). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Leki, I. (1992). Understanding ESL writers. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Lockhart, C. & Ng, P. (1995). Analyzing talk in ESL peer response groups: Stances, functions, and content. Language Learning, 45, 605-655.
- Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think? ELT Journal, 46, 274-284.
- Mendonça, C. O. & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. TESOL Quarterly, 28, 745-769.

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: Longman.

Nelson, G. L. & Murphy, J. M. (1993). Peer response group: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts? TESOL Quarterly, 27, 135-141.

Nunan, D. (1991). Language teaching methodology. New York: Prentice Hall.

Raimes, A. (1983). Techniques in teaching writing. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reid, J. M. (1993). Teaching ESL writing. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1994). Reflective teaching in second language classroom. New York: Cambridge University Press.

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, 51-75.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 79-101.

Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the effective feedback in the ESL writing class. Journal of Second Language Writing, 4, 209-222.

Appendix A

Peer Response Form (Description)

Writer's name(s): _____

Reviewer's name: _____

Essay title (if there is any): _____

1. What are the topics or issues that the writer describe?

2. Are there sufficient details for each topic? What information should be added?

3. Do you think the writing flows? If yes, what do you think makes it flow? If not, what could be possible reasons?

4. Are there any points that you find hard to understand or confusing? Please specify.

5. If you wrote this story, how would you make this piece of writing better?

Peer Response Form (Narration)

Writer's name(s): _____

Reviewer's name: _____

Essay title (if there is any): _____

1. What is this essay about? Try to write it in one sentence _____

2. Check (/) in front of the statements that you agree with.

_____ a. The essay has a main idea or a thesis statement.

_____ b. There are enough details to support the main idea.

_____ c. The details in the essay are convincing.

_____ d. All paragraphs (if there is more than one) are appropriately connected to each other.

_____ e. Each paragraph discusses only one idea, and everything in that paragraph is related to that specific idea.

_____ f. The essay is easy to follow because it is well-organized.

_____ g. The essay is confusing in that it is not quite clear about what actually happened in the story.

3. Choose one or two things that you like most in this essay.

a. _____

b. _____

4. List the two most important ways in which you think the essay should be improved.

a. _____

b. _____

Peer Response Form (Argumentation)

Writer's name(s): _____

Reviewer's name: _____

Essay title (if there is any): _____

1. What is the topic that the authors argue about? _____

2. Check (/) in front of the statements that you agree with.

_____ a. The essay has a topic sentence or a thesis statement.

_____ b. There are enough details to support the main idea.

_____ c. The details in the essay are convincing. (If you find that they are not convincing, explain why.)

_____ d. The reasons used by the writers are logical.

_____ e. All paragraphs are appropriately connected to each other.

_____ f. The essay is easy to follow because it is well-organized.

_____ g. The essay is clearly written.

3. Can you counter-argue the points in the essay easily? If yes, specify those points and say how you will argue against them.

_____4. Choose one thing that you like the most in this essay.
_____5. What is one most important way in which you think the essay should be improved?

Appendix B

Questionnaire surveying learners' attitudes toward and problems of feedback on writing

Instructions: Please answer the questions honestly.

Part I Demographic information

1. Sex (circle one) a. Male b. Female
2. Age _____ years
3. Undergraduate major _____
4. Experience in teaching English _____ years
5. The level at which you teach English (circle one)
 - a. primary level
 - b. lower-secondary level
 - c. upper-secondary level
 - d. college level (beyond upper-secondary)
 - e. others (please specify) _____

Part II Attitudes toward and problems of feedback on writing

Peer feedback

As a reader of the paper

1. Did you find reading other learners' paper useful for you to improve your own paper?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No (If you answer "No", please skip to answer question 3.)
2. In what way did you find reading other learners' papers during peer response activities useful for you? You can check (/) more than one.
 - _____ a. It helped me to realize my own mistakes when I found the same kind of mistakes in the other learners' papers.
 - _____ b. It made me more confident in my own writing ability.
 - _____ c. It helped me to learn how to organize or arrange my own papers more effectively.
 - _____ d. It helped me to look at my own papers more critically.
 - _____ e. I could borrow some good expressions and use them in my own papers.
 - _____ f. I could borrow some interesting style and use them in my own papers.
 - _____ g. It helped me to get more ideas about what I was writing.
 - Others (Please specify)
 - _____ h. _____
 - _____ i. _____

3. What were the problems that you encountered when responding to other students' papers? You can check (/) more than one.

- _____ a. It was hard for me to comment other learners' papers because I was not proficient in reading.
- _____ b. I was afraid to comment the papers or to point out the mistakes for fear that the writer(s) might have been offended.
- _____ c. I was afraid that my comments might have been incorrect because I was an inexperienced writer and did not know what good writing should look like.

Others (Please specify)

- _____ d. _____
- _____ e. _____
- _____ f. _____

As a writer of the paper

4. Did you find peer feedback useful for you to improve your papers?

- a. Yes
- b. No (If you answer "No", please skip to answer question 6.)

5. In what area did you find peer feedback or comments useful for you to improve your papers?

Please rank according to its usefulness.

- _____ a. ideas
- _____ b. organization
- _____ c. language (e.g. vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, expressions)
- _____ d. style
- _____ e. clarity

Others (please specify)

6. What were the problems that you encountered when you read comments or feedback from your peers? You can check (/) more than one.

- _____ a. Comments were usually vague or not clear.
- _____ b. I was not sure whether or not I could rely on peer comments because some readers might have been afraid to point out weak points in my papers directly.
- _____ c. I didn't know whether or not I should consider peer comments for my final draft because the readers might have not been experienced.

_____ d. The readers usually edited my papers, that is, correcting grammatical or spelling mistakes, more than responded other aspects of writing.

_____ e. Some criticisms were too harsh.

Others (please specify)

_____ f. _____

_____ g. _____

7. What kind of feedback do you really want to get from a peer reader? (Please rank according to your preference.)

_____ a. on ideas

_____ b. on organization

_____ c. on language (e.g. vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, expressions)

_____ d. on style

_____ e. on clarity

Others (please specify)

8. Other comments and suggestions on peer feedback

Teacher feedback (conferencing)

9. Did you find conferencing with the teacher useful for you to improve your paper?

a. Yes

b. No (If you answer "No", please skip to question 11.)

10. In what way did you find teacher feedback during conferencing useful for you to improve your papers? Please rank according to its usefulness.

_____ a. ideas

_____ b. organization

_____ c. language (e.g. vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, expressions)

_____ d. style

_____ e. clarity

Others (please specify)

11. What kind of feedback do you want to receive from the teacher? Please rank according to your preference.

_____ a. on ideas

_____ b. on organization

_____ c. on language (e.g. vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, expressions)

_____ d. on style

_____ e. on clarity

Others (please specify)

12. What problems did you encounter during the conferencing with the teacher?

13. Which one do you prefer between conferencing with the teacher and traditional written feedback from the teacher? (Circle one)

a. conferencing

b. written feedback

14. Check the one statement that *best* expresses your opinion about receiving feedback on your papers.

_____ a. I prefer to receive only teacher feedback.

_____ b. I prefer to receive only peer feedback.

_____ b. I prefer to receive both teacher and peer feedback.

_____ d. I prefer to receive no feedback (and to revise on my own).

15. Other comments and suggestions on conferencing with the teacher
