

Relations among Peer Feedback, Writing Performance and Writing Improvement: Evidence from a Writing Class in China

Chunlin Lei

Shanghai Institute of Foreign Trade/The University of Hong Kong

ABSTRACT

The present study attempted to investigate peer feedback types and its relations to student writing performance and writing improvement in a tertiary writing class in China. By carefully designed three-step writing tasks and employing a mixed research method, the study first categorized peer feedback into four types regarding its helpfulness; next, a strong correlation was obtained by a regression model which showed student writing performance had been a significant predictor of peer feedback helpfulness. However, there was no significant correlation between student writing improvement and the feedback they received. Student attitudes towards peer feedback were then examined to formulate ideas on what contributed most to writing improvement. It seemed a more critical view towards peer feedback worked better than a whole-accept or non-accept view.

INTRODUCTION

Feedback has long been an important part of teaching second/foreign language writing. It has great potential for learning and student motivation (Hyland and Hyland, 2006), and it helps students understand the advantages and disadvantages of their writing, identify writing problems, and improve their writing competencies consequently (Cai, 2011). With a learning paradigm shift from individual learning to distributed, collaborative learning, peer feedback has witnessed its increased deployment in educational settings and become a popular area for research. In the second language writing context, peer feedback mainly involves students in the activity of forming pairs or groups, reading each other's compositions, and making suggestions for revisions (Mangelsdorf, 1992). Many studies have reported the benefits of utilizing peer feedback, for example, giving more autonomy to students (Mendoca and Johnson, 1994; Mo, 2005), providing a more authentic audience (Mittan, 1989; Caulk, 1994), and offering opportunities for students to evaluate their own work more critically (Cheng and Warren, 1996; Topping et. Al., 2000).

Although the value of peer feedback has been widely recognized, problems do exist. Studies have shown that students prefer teacher feedback and tend to trust their teachers rather than their classmates (Zhang, 1995; Nelson and Carson, 1998). In the L2 writing context, students were found to be selective about using peer feedback in their revisions (Mendoca and Johnson, 1994). Peterson and Irving's (2008) study in New Zealand has revealed that students regard peer feedback as unhelpful because friends may comment too positively to each other and students' ability or expertise to offer useful feedback has been questioned. Other studies have included cultural factors into feedback research. For example, in Nelson and Carson's study (1998), Chinese students have been found to be reluctant to criticize others' work and maintaining group cohesion and harmony has

become the priority. Sengupta (1998) reported that in the examination-driven and language-deficient environment students were unable to give valid feedback and were indifferent to peer feedback.

These research findings, nonetheless, have not been consistent with findings from mainland Chinese students. Although peer feedback research in mainland China has been a more recent scene and is still limited in number, the results are generally more positive. Xu (2000) reported that Chinese college students were willing to receive peer feedback and peer feedback could be a motivator. Based on empirical studies, Mo (2005) claimed that Chinese students were capable of effective peer revision and Cai (2011) found peer review could improve both content and language of students' compositions and also facilitated the building of learning communities. Despite all of these benefits, studies are needed to further capture the characteristics of peer feedback in Chinese classrooms and inform practitioners thereafter.

Since writing is a very complex task, we could also assume the conditions that influence feedback effectiveness are complex (Nelson and Schunn, 2009). Very few studies have investigated the relationship between feedback types and student writing abilities, especially in a quantitative perspective. The current study intended to focus on the relationship between peer feedback and writing performance and writing improvement. Specifically, it would examine the features of peer feedback among a group of tertiary Chinese students and link helpfulness of peer feedback to students' writing performance as well as to writing improvement. In addition, it also intended to investigate the factors that might contribute to student writing improvement, such as students' attitudes towards peer feedback.

Although there seems to be no consensus on what type of feedback is most useful (Nelson and Schunn, 2009), we argue that within a specific writing context and if perceived from a holistic viewpoint, feedback can be categorized into different levels of usefulness or helpfulness, for example, if the feedback givers are proficient in language and do the job seriously. Moreover, there are certain indicators which can be employed to examine the helpfulness of feedback, such as how specific the feedback is (Ferris, 1997), whether the feedback identifies problems, offers solutions, pinpoints the location of problems as well as gives explanations. Nelson and Schunn's (2009) study investigated extensively how various types of feedback affected writing performance. The current study, however, from a smaller and reversed angle, examined how student writing ability (as represented by their writing performances), might affect the helpfulness of the feedback they offer. It also moved on to investigate student attitudes towards peer feedback and how they might relate to student writing improvement.

To iterate, this study employed a mixed research method (Creswell, 2003) to answer the following three questions: (1) What types of feedback do university students in mainland China provide when assessing their peers' essay writing? (2) Is there a relationship between students' writing performance and the feedback they provide, and how is peer feedback related to student writing improvement? and (3) What are students' attitudes towards peer feedback and how are they related to student writing improvement?

RESEARCH DESIGN

Participants

The participants of the study were 51 fourth-year English majors (two cohorts, one was 25 and the other 26) from a business-and-economics-oriented university in Shanghai, China. They have practiced various genre of writing in their previous studies and obtained reasonably good proficiency in English language. All students were officially registered in a semester-long writing course, where the teacher was also the researcher. The course design including the assessment strategy were approved by the school authority and put online for students' reference. Participants were informed that part of their course assignments would be used for some research purpose; however, their names would be kept anonymous for any analysis or publication. This study was conducted during the first four weeks of the course time during the academic year of 2010-2011.

Procedures

There were three major procedures involved in the design. In step one and during the end of week one, students were given a writing assignment, which was an essay writing entitled "*My Perspectives on Bilingual Education in China*". Bilingual education has been a very controversial topic in China, therefore, it was hoped that students could be able to voice their perceptions and develop their arguments. This assignment was done out of class, i.e. students could do it any time during the following week. Meanwhile, students were told that each assignment (including step-two and step-three work) would be marked and counted (15%) towards their final grades of the course. Though the percentage was not very large, we expected the students to fulfil the series of writing tasks seriously because marks meant a lot to these Chinese students.

In step two and during week-two-class, we collected all the students' writings. Then we carefully manipulated the writing papers to make them anonymous. We photocopied all the students' writings and erased the names on the copies and put pseudonymous numbers there instead. In conducting the peer feedback, we gave cohort 1 students' papers to cohort 2 students and vice versa to ensure peer feedback was done anonymously as much as possible. We insisted on anonymous peer feedback because in the literature, studies showed peer assessments were biased by friendship (Dancer and Dancer, 1992; Peterson and Irving, 2008). By using this design, we hoped students could be more critical in giving feedback without having to consider whether they might upset a friend and peer.

In step two and in addition to a peer's essay, each student was also given a peer assessment sheet. This assessment sheet consisted of four parts (see Figure 1). The first three parts comprised "ticking" areas for an assessor to decide where the essay stands in terms of content, organization and language. The last blank area asked an assessor to comment on anything they would like to. In the classroom instruction, the teacher directed the students to write about the strengths, weaknesses, areas of improvement, and impression of a peer's essay, etc. Another salient feature of this assessment sheet is that a piece of advice is given to the student assessor: "*You may refer to or mark on the student's original writing (with a big arrow pointing to the essay being assessed)*". We did so because we also believe

specific comments can be more helpful (Ferris, 1997) and localization of writing problems is appropriate feedback to college students (Nilson, 2003). So in step two, a student was assigned a task of offering anonymous feedback to one of his/her anonymous classmates (only the teacher knew who commented on whom). This peer review activity was also conducted out of class.

Peer Assessment Criteria

1. Content

Material relevant to topic							Much material is not relevant
Fully addresses the question							Fails to address the question
Logically developed argument							Writing rambles, lacks logical continuity
Topic dealt with in depth							Superficial treatment of topic

2. Organization

Well structured through introduction, body and conclusion							Poorly structured, lacking introduction, cohesive paragraphing and/or conclusion
Well supported by evidence and examples							Inadequate supporting evidence or examples
Accurate presentation of evidence and examples							Much evidence incomplete or questionable

3. Written expressions and presentation

Fluent and succinct piece of writing							Clumsily written, verbose, repetitive
Grammatical sentences							Many ungrammatical sentences
Correct spelling throughout							Much incorrect spelling
Legible, reasonable length							Untidy, over/under length

4. Other comments

You may refer to/mark on the original writing

Figure 1: Peer feedback sheet used in the study

In step three and during week-three-class, students brought their commented-on essays to the classroom. The teacher collected all the papers and matched the anonymous scripts to their owners and therefore enabling each student to receive their own original writing,

coupled with the anonymous peer feedback. And the subsequent writing tasks for the students were to: (1) write a second version of the essay based on the peers' comments and (2) write a reflective journal focusing on how their perceptions of the relative benefits of the peer feedback activity. No word limit was set for the writing, and they were after-class assignments as well.

In the fourth week, all the writing materials were collected, including the original essays, peer feedback, the second version of the essays, and students' reflective journals. These materials constituted the data for the current study.

Data analysis

As mentioned above, data sources include students' original essays, revised essays, peer feedback, and reflective journals. These four pieces of work formed a complete set of data for each student. This study started with 51 students, however, some of them asked for leave at course time and did not hand in their works properly. Finally, we collected 46 complete sets of writings. Therefore, all the analyses were based on these 46 students' written work.

In the study, student writing performance was represented by two pieces of written work from students, the original and the revised essays. We were particularly interested in the first essay because it might, to a large extent, indicate a student's writing ability. Both essays were marked by the same teacher, following a marking scheme used in the university. The teacher's marking scheme for essay writing is very similar to the peer assessment sheet given to the students. There are three assessed elements for an essay, namely, content, organization and language. In practice, the teacher gave a general mark to the three elements respectively and the final mark was obtained by averaging the three marks. For example, if a student was assigned 85, 75, and 70 respectively for the content, organization, and language of his/her essay, then this essay would be scored 77 $[(85+75+70)/3]$.

To increase the reliability of the study, a second teacher who was also an experienced teacher in the same university was invited to be an inter-rater. She doubled marked all the essays and re-rated all the peer feedback (section 3) according to the marking and coding schemes. All the discrepancies in marking and rating were recorded, and then the first teacher discussed those gaps with the second teacher. Finally they came to an agreement and the marking and rating were then adjusted accordingly. All the analyses were based on the after-adjustment marks and ratings.

The analysis of peer feedback was largely based on the 46 peer feedbacks offered by the students; we sometimes resorted to student self-reflective journals to judge the helpfulness of the feedback. Qualitative analysis, depending on a certain number of features and indicators as mentioned above, was conducted to categorize different types of peer feedback in terms of its helpfulness. We then used the method of quantifying qualitative data (Chi, 1997) and by way of SPSS, examined the relationships among different levels of feedback helpfulness, student writing performance, and student writing improvement.

Students' reflective journals were mainly analyzed qualitatively to reveal their attitudes towards peer feedback, which then were further looked into in relation to student writing improvement.

FINDINGS

What types of feedback students offer when assessing their peers' essays

Although all students were given the same assessment sheet and the teacher instructions were the same in class, the collected feedback showed a wide range of features. Simplified feedback was defined as consisting of only a number of "ticks" on the assessment sheet grids on content, organization and language; and a fruitful one might go much further in providing comments in the blank area, referring to/identifying problems on the original writing, offering explanations and even solutions. We were able to categorize four types of peer feedback by looking at the feedback holistically in terms of its helpfulness. The helpfulness was viewed across a continuum, ranging from "of little help" to "most helpful". Table 1 showed the coding scheme for the peer feedback.

Type	Description and example
1. of little help	Ticking the assessment grids only; or with some very short (usually negative) comment); no explanations provided. For example: " <i>The writing is too difficult</i> "; or " <i>not relevant to topic</i> "
2. of some help	Not just ticking the grids, but with a few general comments in the comment areas; lack of explanation and localization of problems. For example, " <i>Reasons seem to be similar, make it more logical and suggestions in conclusion are good.</i> "
3. helpful	Ticking the grids, and making general or specific comments; usually referring to the original writing to make a few corrections on spelling, punctuation, as well as structure, collocation, or organization. For example: <i>In the thesis statement, disadvantage of bilingual teaching are mentioned and compared to advantages, but in the body part only advantages are discussed; The last paragraph lacks a link word.</i> And (on the original essay, with a few corrections and question marks): providing [<i>that provides</i>], overcome its disadvantages [?], students are easier to [<i>it's easier for students</i>], help student contact English [<i>students get exposed to</i>]...etc.
4. very helpful	Ticking the grids, and making general or more specific comments; always referring to the original writing to identify or locate problems, make suggestions, and offer explanations. For example: <i>It's a fairly well-written article... if you could have a deeper thinking ...organize your thoughts more logically, ...be a much better essay.</i> And (on the original essay, with straight lines

	indicating the places): (...) <i>Simple sentences, you could write a complex one to make it more academic; (improve their ability...increase their ability) repetitive; (...) it's just a regulation of the school, what's the real bad effect on students? (...) Maybe you could add some solutions here so that it will be a more meaningful discussion; (...) Maybe you need another paragraph to talk about this or delete it ... etc.</i>
--	--

Table 1: The coding scheme for peer feedback

In the process of coding, we found not all feedback fitted neatly into these four categories. For example, some students gave a long list of comments, but those comments (sometimes corrections) were not necessarily constructive, and even embodied wrong information. In these cases, we rated the feedback as “of little help” or “of some help” instead of being “helpful”. Meanwhile, we tried to seek some evidence from the students’ reflective journals to support our rating. For example, we rated the ‘ticking-grids-only’ feedback as the least help among all peer feedback, which was confirmed by the student who wrote that the *peer feedback did not provide any specific comments and her marker just did a haste job and was not serious job at all.*

Finally, we obtained an overall picture of peer feedback in terms of its helpfulness among these 46 students. Table 2 shows that more than half (54.4%) of the students were able to offer *helpful* or *very helpful* feedback. In other words, they were thought to be able to evaluate a peer’s essay in terms of content, organization and language, and also offer specific and constructive advice on areas of strength and weakness, in particular, the localization of problems, explanations or suggestions as why and how the writing could be improved. Nearly 40% of the students offered feedback in a more general way, in which a lack of specificity might not be of direct help to the author (peer). However, even general comments might possibly push the author to ponder over and find ways to improve the second version, which therefore, might be still *of some help*. Very few students (6.5%) offered feedback in a “lazy” way, ticking the assessment grids only or writing a phrase-long, negative comment. We thought this kind of feedback was *of little value* and could not help the author meaningfully. This assumption was evidenced by students’ reflective journals, as one of the authors regarded his peer feedback as “*very obscure*”, and others felt “*very confused*” or “*find no way to improve because there is only a phrase-long comment.*”

Type	Very helpful	Helpful	Of some help	Of little help	Total
No. of students	4	21	18	3	46
Percentage	8.7%	45.7%	39.1%	6.5%	100%

Table 2: Helpfulness of feedback among the students

The relationship between feedback type and student writing performance

One interesting question then arose: given that all the students were provided with the same assessment sheet and were instructed by the same teacher, in the same way and at the same time, why were there still large discrepancies in relation to the nature of the feedback that they offered? What might have contributed to these differences? And was there a relationship between students' writing performance and the feedback they provided? A hypothesis was formulated: could students with better writing performance provide more helpful or constructive feedback to their peers?

Following the procedures of quantifying qualitative data (Chi 1997), we assigned scores to different types of feedback according to its usefulness: 1 for "of little help"; 2 for "of some help"; 3 for "helpful" and 4 for "very helpful". Then all the data, including students' original essay writing scores, students' revised essay writing scores, feedback they offer and feedback they receive, were put in SPSS for computation.

A simple regression model was conducted on the relationship between feedback type and student original essay writing score. The result indicated that one predictor explained 24.9% of the variance ($R^2=.249$, $F=14.56$ (1, 44), $p < .001$). It was found that student writing score significantly predicted feedback type ($\beta=.056$, $p < .001$). In other words, the better the students' writing performance, the more helpful feedback they could offer.

We also tried the model with students' revised essay writing score. Findings were similar in that 23.7% of the variance was explained ($R^2=.237$, $F=13.7$ (1, 44), $p < .005$) and second writing performance still was a significant predictor of the usefulness of peer feedback ($\beta=.062$, $p < .005$). This result was not surprising because students' revised writing was based on the original and there should be a strong relationship between the two versions, therefore, results on regression model run against these two scores were similar.

Feedback and students' writing performance improvement

We then went further to ask a more probing question: could feedback type significantly explain the writing improvement between original essay and revised essay?

To answer this question, we first examined students' writing improvement by conducting a paired t-test between the original and revised essay scores. The SPSS result showed that the revised essay score ($M=78.6$, $SD=5.65$) was significantly higher than the original essay score ($M=74.6$, $SD=6.38$), $t(45) = 8.56$, $p < .001$. We also calculated the effect size in order to understand the magnitude of the feedback effect. The value of eta squared was .62, which suggested a large effect (Cohen 1988 cited in Pallant 2001). Therefore, there was a large effect, with a substantial difference in the writing performance scores before and after the feedback activity. We then tried to investigate whether the feedback students got from their peers could be a predictor of their writing improvement. A simple regression model was conducted and the result indicated there was no statistically significant relationship between feedback the student received and their writing improvement ($R^2=.02$, $F=1.01$ (1, 44), $p = .32$). In other words, although students improved their writing performance significantly after receiving peer feedback, we could not conclude that the improvement

was largely attributed to the feedback they received; more useful peer feedback did not necessarily always lead to bigger writing improvement, many other factors might come into play.

Attitudes to peer feedback and writing performance improvement

To find out more factors that might influence students' improvement in writing, we had a closer look at the student reflective journals and their essays before and after the peer feedback again. After examining the 46 reflective journals, we found students' attitudes towards peer feedback could fall into three categories: accept positively, accept with reservations, and non-acceptance, which were illustrated respectively by Table 3.

Attitude	Excerpt from reflective journal
Accept positively	<i>I do benefit from the peer assessment....by reading others' article, I can broaden my horizons...I find some mistakes in other's article, so I won't make such mistakes in my own article. I read carefully (peer's comments) and analyzed whether I should make revisions...Peer assessment is a good method...</i>
Accept with reservations	<i>Peer assessment is beneficial to me... I corrected some mistakes in structure... I disagree with (the peers' comment) that the idea should be more critical by seeing both sides of the issue...</i>
Non-acceptance	<i>(How do you benefit from the peer's assessment) Not at all! The marker just pointed out that my essay is too difficult and not clearly-structured but he/she does not provide any constructive suggestions...I think his/her remarks obscure and unreasonable...</i>

Table 3: Student attitude towards peer feedback

When we checked the students' original essay scores and their revised essay scores, no student was found to backslide in writing performance although there were two students whose second versions looked a little worse than before. However, we decided to give the student the same mark because we thought the changes, though worse in direction, were not noticeable enough to affect the overall mark. As a matter of fact, another six students followed the same pattern and achieved non-improvement in their second writing. This did not suggest that the two versions student wrote were exactly the same (in fact, it was impossible); it just indicated the minor changes happened in the second version, no matter for better or for worse, were so tiny that they could be ignored in the overall marking scheme. This was again a usual practice exercised by the teachers in the university when assessing students' written work.

We then tried to classify students' improvement in writing into three categories in order to make it easy to compare. We defined it as non-improvement when the two scores were kept the same; minimal improvement when the improved score fell in between 0 and 5 points; and substantial improvement when the improved score was 5 points or above. Table 4 showed an overall picture of student attitudes to peer feedback and their writing performance improvement.

Writing improvement	Attitudes to peer feedback			Total No. (%)
	Accept positively	Accept with reservation	Non-acceptance	
Substantial (≥ 5) (No. of students)	11	10	1	22 (47.8%)
Minimal ($>0, <5$) (No. of students)	11	4	1	16 (34.8%)
Non-improvement (=0) (No. of students)	3	3	2	8 (17.4%)
Total No. (%)	25(54.3%)	17 (37.0%)	4 (8.7%)	46 (100%)

Table 4: Attitudes to peer feedback and writing improvement

Of the 46 Chinese students, 42 of them (91.3%) have adopted a relatively positive attitude towards peer feedback. More than half of the students (54.3%), as reflected explicitly or implicitly in their journal entries, showed full agreement with the peer feedback activity. And another 37% of the students expressed at least partial agreement, although they might disagree on certain points. Only 4 students (8.7%) thought peer feedback was useless, and the reasons they gave and observed by the teacher as well mainly included that comments were too short to be useful (such as *coherence can be more natural*); gave the student no indication of what they needed to do; or too harsh with no explanation, comments (such as *too difficult, not appropriate to the topic*) made the student feel uncomfortable, leading the student to question the marking ability of the assessor.

However, no simple linear correlation between students' attitudes to peer feedback and writing improvement could be drawn. In other words, desirable improvement of writing performance did not always come from how positively a student agreed with the feedback. It was understandable in that sometimes feedback might embody some unconstructive or even wrong information; blind acceptance does not support development in relation to the second writing task. In the same vein, non-acceptance or objection to peer feedback did not necessarily result in failing or non-improvement because the author might reject some incorrect feedback and at the same time re-shape his/her own essay in a self-reflective and more constructive way. For example, one of the students did ample self-revisions on language and organization in the second version although she regarded her peer feedback *not useful at all*.

Considering the small sample size used in this study, it was still hard to generalize as to what kind of response to peer feedback would lead to large writing improvements. A temporary assumption, by comparing the percentage within the substantial improvement category, seemed that a more critical view on peer feedback such as accept with reservation (58.8%, 10 out of 17) has contributed more to substantial writing improvement than the

positive whole-accept view (44%, 11 out of 25) and negative non-accept view (25%, 1 out of 4). The scenario for non-improvement seemed even more complex since it was apparent across different attitudes to feedback, where students fully, partially agreed or did not agree at all with the peers' feedback. A closer examination of the 8 cases in this study demonstrated some interesting phenomena. For example, some of the students questioned the assessors' ability and consequently, stuck to their own writings in the second chance without any noticeable changes. However, there were at least 2 students who in the reflective journals reported peer feedback had played a beneficial role, did nothing constructively in the subsequent revisions. The inconsistency between assertions and implementation is worth of further investigation.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study took advantage of a three-step design, in which students fulfilled a series of writing tasks in a step-by-step manner. The researcher was then able to gradually capture the quality of the students' writing performances by considering performance before and after peer feedback, was able to categorize the feedback students offered, and tap into student perceptions of peer feedback. These variables were then carefully analyzed in the hope of generating interesting or important correlations, which may help us understand better about peer feedback and inform our classroom practices.

It was found that students might offer different types of feedback on peer's work even if they were given the same instructions and tools (in this case the structured assessment sheet). The peer feedback could be broadly categorized into four patterns in terms of its helpfulness. Although classifying feedback into helpfulness might be controversial (Mory 2004), we argue that in the current study, this classification was possible and reasonable. We coded the feedback in a more holistic perspective and the feedback the students offer were fundamentally helpful in nature although a small number of unconstructive feedbacks did exist. The results showed that most university students in the writing class were able to provide feedback in a helpful and constructive way, which is concomitant with findings from other studies.

A strong correlation was found between student writing performance and the feedback they offered. It indicated that students with better writing performance were able to offer more helpful peer feedback. Student writing performance was measured by the essay writing in terms of its content, language and organization. Presumably, students with high scores in essay might have developed a more advanced ability in looking at these essay elements. Therefore, when they were asked to comment on peers' work, they might exercise a corresponding good vision and be able to contribute more good ideas. A "tricky" part in the design was that students were told that all the writings, including peer feedback and reflective journals would be counted into their final grades of the course. It was, we believe, a motivator that encouraged students to shoulder responsibilities and do peer feedback in a serious manner.

No significant correlation could be obtained between usefulness of peer feedback and student writing improvement. It indicated that factors contributing to writing improvement might be very complex. Further, we examined the students' attitudes towards peer feedback in relation to writing improvement. The results, to a great extent, helped to explain why usefulness of peer feedback could not largely predict writing improvement; for writing improvement could result from too many factors. The study showed that whatever the attitudes towards peer feedback, be it positively accepted, partially accepted or not-accepted, students might improve their second writing substantially under all these circumstances. However, it suggested a more critical attitude, i.e. accept with reservations, might be the most appropriate approach to adopt in order to improve second writing substantially.

There are certainly a number of limitations in the study. First of all, with only 46 participants the sample size is small. In addition, when we rated the peer feedback, we did not count the number of correct answers and mistakes as Mo (2005) and Cai (2011) did in their studies. We adopted a holistic perspective but it might also be beneficial to integrate Mo and Cai's methodology with ours in future studies.

In considering how we can increase the helpfulness or effectiveness of peer feedback and how students' performance in writing can be improved with constructive support, there are a number of implications from this study. Practices such as anonymous peer feedback were valuable in addressing the issue of students' having to manage personal feedback and in enabling students to be more critical in their feedback to their peers. It may be useful to go beyond the scope of the current study to consider training in the giving and interpreting of peer feedback (Berg, 1999; Hyland, 2003). In addition, we have been thinking if the "ticking grids" type of feedback does not work very well, should we remove those grids from the peer assessment sheet and replace them with something better? Since the study showed a gap between students' assertions and real implementation of peer feedback, more research is worth doing in this respect.

Acknowledgements: The author would like to thank Ms. Cai for doing the inter-rater work and Dr. Carol Evans for her valuable advice and comments.

REFERENCES

- Berg, E. (1999) The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 215–241.
- Cai, J. (2011) A contrastive study of on line peer feedback and online teacher feedback in teaching English writing to college students. *Foreign Language World*, 134 (2), 65 -72.
- Carson, J. and Nelson, G. (1996) Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5(1), 1–19.

- Caulk, N. (1994) Comparing teacher and student responses to written work. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (1), 181–187.
- Cheng, W. and Warren, M. (1996). Hong Kong students' attitudes toward peer assessment in English language courses. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6, 61–75.
- Chi, M.T. (1997) Quantifying qualitative analyses of verbal data: a practical guide. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 6(3), 271-515.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003) *Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE. Thousand Oaks. USA.
- Dancer, W. and Dancer, J. (1992) Peer rating in higher Education. *Journal of Education for Business*, 67, 306-309.
- Ferris, D. R. (1997) The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315–339.
- Hyland, F. (2003) Focusing on form: student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, 31(2), 217-230.
- Hyland, K. and Hyland, F. (2006) *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mangelsdorf, K. (1992) Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think? *ELT Journal*, 46, 274-284.
- Mendoca, C. and Johnson, K. (1994) Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly* 28 (4), 745–768.
- Mittan, R. (1989) The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power. In D. Johnson and D. Roen (eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students*. Longman: New York, 207–219.
- Mo, J. (2005) An exploratory study of conducting peer review among Chinese college students. *CELEA Journal*, 28 (6), 43-48.
- Mory, E.H. (2004) Feedback research revisited. In D.H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 745-783.
- Nelson, G. and Carson, J. (1998) ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7(1), 113–131.
- Nelson, M. and Schunn, C. (2009) The nature of feedback: how different types of peer feedback affect writing performance. *Instructional Science*, 37(4), 375-401.

Nilson, L.B. (2003) Improving student peer feedback. *College Teaching*, 51(1), 34–38.

Pallant, J. (2001) SPSS Survival Manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows (Version 10). Available on line:
<http://www.dss.dpem.tuc.gr/pdf/SPSS%20Survival%20Manual.pdf>

Peterson, E. and S. Irving (2008) Secondary school students' conceptions of assessment and feedback. *Learning and Instruction*, 18(3), 238–250.

Sengupta, S. (1998) Peer evaluation: I am not the teacher. *ELT Journal*, 52(1), 19–28.

Topping, K.E. Smith, I., Swanson, and Elliot, A. (2000) Formative peer assessment of academic writing between postgraduate students. *Assessment and Evaluation In Higher Education*, 25 (2), 149-169.

Xu, Y. (2000) A tentative study of peer revision in English writing. *Journal of China Foreign Affairs University*, 17, 86-89.

Zhang, S. (1995) Re-examining the affective advantages of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4.3, 209–222.

Correspondence

Chunlin Lei

Room 101, Hui Oi Chow Science Building,
Faculty of Education,
University of Hong Kong,
Pok Fu Lam,
Hong Kong,
China
E-mail: leichl@hku.hk