Birk, A. An Exploration of the Role of Grammatical Feedback by Peers on Essay Writing in the Advanced English Language Learners' Classroom (2007)

This study investigated the role of grammatical feedback on essay writing by peers in an advanced English language learners' classroom in a high school. Eight English language learners (ELLs) from Hmong and Spanish-speaking backgrounds participated in the six-week study. Students were taught indirect and direct grammatical feedback techniques, which they used to provide peer and self-feedback on essays written in class. Questionnaires administered to the students, essays written by the students, feedback logs used by the students, and field notes recorded by the teacher-researcher provided information to answer five guiding research questions to determine if using peer feedback in the teacher-researcher's classroom was effective. The results of this study suggest that implementing grammatical feedback by peers on essay writing in the high school ELL classroom is a worthwhile activity; however, students should also be allowed to self-edit their writing instead of participating in peer feedback activities if they choose.

AN EXPLORATION OF THE ROLE OF GRAMMATICAL FEEDBACK BY PEERS ON ESSAY WRITING IN THE ADVANCED ENGLISH LANGAUGE LEARNERS' CLASSROOM

by

Angela Birk

A Capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in English as a Second Language

Hamline University

St. Paul, Minnesota

December 2007

Committee:
Susan Bosher, Primary Advisor
Betsy Parrish, Secondary Advisor

Anne Simon-DeBroux, Peer Reviewer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables ……vi

List of Figures ...……...……....viii

Chapter One: Introduction …….....1

Context…….....5

The Research Questions ……..7

Significance for Others…….……...7

Conclusion……...9

Chapter Two: Literature Review……..…….11

Introduction……...11

A Brief Review of ESL Writing Approaches and Writing Feedback……11

Definitions of Feedback…….……...…….15

The Debate and Studies Regarding Grammar Feedback on Writing…….18

Studies Examining Indirect and Direct Writing Feedback……23

Studies Examining Peer Feedback…….29

Student Perceptions, Attitudes, and Preferences on Writing Feedback…….……35

Conclusion…….39

Chapter Three: Methods……41

Research Paradigm and Rationale…….41

Setting and Participants……..45

Procedures and Materials…….……. 48

Conclusion ……...….74

Chapter Four: Results……75

Introduction……75

Research Question #1……..…..76

Research Question #2……..112

Research Questions #3 and #4…….115

Research Question #5…….…….133

Conclusion……...……146

Chapter Five: Conclusion……..……..148

Introduction……..……148

Reflections on Major Findings……....148

Implications…….……153

Limitations of My Study and Suggestions for Future Research……..154

Conclusion……...……156

Appendices……...…158

Appendix A: Student Information Questionnaire…….…….158

Appendix B: Consent Letter…….……..160

Appendix C: Consent Form……..……..162

Appendix D: Prompt P……..….164

Appendix E: Prewriting Page…….……166

Appendix F: Final Writing Page……...168

Appendix G: Questionnaire P…….…..170

Appendix H: Prompt A……..177

Appendix I: Indirect Feedback Instructions and Exercises Packet……179

Appendix J: Direct Feedback Instructions and Exercises Packet…….…..189

Appendix K: Indirect Feedback Log Directions…….……201

Appendix L: Indirect Feedback Log (Sample Essay)……...…..203

Appendix M: Indirect Feedback Log A2……..…..205

Appendix N: Questionnaire A……207

Appendix O: Prompt B……..…….213

Appendix P: Direct Feedback Log Directions……..……..215

Appendix Q: Direct Feedback Log (Sample Essay)……..….217

Appendix R: Direct Feedback Log B2……..……..219

Appendix S: Questionnaire B……..……...221

Appendix T: Questionnaire C……..…...227

Appendix U: Prompt C……..…….229

Appendix V: Direct Feedback Log C2……..…….231

Appendix W: Questionnaire F……....233

Appendix X: Prompt F……240

Appendix Y: Student Responses to QA #4 and QA #5…….…….242

Appendix Z: Student Responses to QB #4 and QB #5……..…….244

Appendix AA: Student Responses to QA #17 and QA #18……..….246

Appendix BB: Student Responses to QB #17 and QB # 18……...……248

Appendix CC: Student Responses to QP/QF #21 and QA/QB #21 Follow-up Question……...…… 250

Appendix DD: Student Responses to QP/QF #12…….253

Appendix EE: Student Responses to Questionnaire C……...…255

Appendix FF: Individual Data and Group Averages for Feedback Units Given and Feedback Units Intended to Be Used……257

Appendix GG: Individual Data and Group Averages of Accuracy of Feedback……..259

References……..……..261

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Examples of Indirect and Direct Feedback……...…….17

Table 3.1 Characteristics of Classroom Research……..43

Table 3.2 Triangulation Used in My Study……...……44

Table 3.3 Participants…….46

Table 3.4 Data Collection Cycles……..49

Table 3.5 Cycle P: Pre-testing Cycle Procedures…….……53

Table 3.6 Cycle A: Indirect Feedback Cycle Procedures……...……..62

Table 3.7 Cycle B: Direct Feedback Cycle Procedures……67

Table 3.8 Cycle C: Choice of Feedback Cycle Procedures……..71

Table 3.9 Cycle F: Final (Post-test) Cycle Procedures……...…..73

Table 4.1 Student Responses to QP/QF #1……...….78

Table 4.2 Student Responses to QP/QF #5……79

Table 4.3 Student Responses to QP/QF #5 Follow-up Question…….…..81

Table 4.4 Student Responses to QP/QF #3……82

Table 4.5 Student Responses to QP/QF #4……....83

Table 4.6 Student Responses to QP/QF #2……84

Table 4.7 Student Responses to QA/QB #1……...……85

Table 4.8 Student Responses for QP/QF #6 and QA/QB #2…….86

Table 4.9 Student Responses to QP/QF #6 Follow-up and QA/QB #2 Follow-up……...88

Table 4.10 Student Responses to QP/QF #7……..……....90

Table 4.11 Student Responses to QP/QF #9 and QA/QB #3……...…..92

Table 4.12 Student Responses to QP/QF #10……....95

Table 4.13 Student Responses to QP/QF #13……96

Table 4.14 Student Responses to QP/QF #14……..…..97

Table 4.15 Student Responses to QA/QB #14…….….98

Table 4.16 Student Responses to QA/QB #15…….…….99

Table 4.17 Student Responses to QA/QB #15 Follow-up Question……100

Table 4.18 Student Responses to QP/QF #8 and QA/QB #16……...…..102

Table 4.19 Student Responses to QP/QF #11 and QA/QB #21……...105

Table 4.20 Student Responses to QP/QF #16 and QA/QB #24……...……108

Table 4.21 Student Responses to QP/QF #17 and QA/QB #25……...109

Table 4.22 Student Responses to QP/QF #18 and QA/QB #26…….……..111

Table 4.23 Group Data for Feedback Units Given (FBU) and Intended to be Used..….121

Table 4.24 Group Data for Accuracy of Feedback……..138

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1 Indirect Feedback Log Directions……58

Figure 3.2 Indirect Feedback Log (Sample Essay) (Modified)…….……59

Figure 3.3 Key for Column Five of Direct Feedback Log (Sample Essay)……...65

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

"Will you correct this for me?" Nhia asks after hastily writing his first draft of an expository essay assigned during English language learners class. This is a common question I hear from my high school advanced English language learners (ELLs) after I give them a prompt and ask them to pre-write and then write a first-draft expository essay, which they know will eventually be turned in and graded. I ask Nhia if he has read it over himself first, to which he answers, "No." After I suggest that he look for errors on his own first, he takes his paper back to his desk, and in less than one minute, he returns to me to say he is done looking it over. He says he "couldn't find anything wrong," and asks, "Will you correct it *now*?" Nhia knows that feedback from the teacher means less work for him on the next draft and possibly a better grade on his final essay, but is he really learning from simply receiving feedback from the teacher? Could there be a better way for him and the other students to actively participate in the feedback process in order to improve the accuracy of their own writing?

In the meantime, other students have completed their writing and are lining up at my desk to ask the same question as Nhia. Fortunately, they are just as eager to receive feedback on their writing in order to make improvements. Unfortunately, there is only one teacher and ten students. Even if I had only five minutes to devote to each student

individually, the class period would be long over! As I see the line at my desk getting longer, I tell the students to turn in their drafts so I can look them over at home in order to return them with feedback tomorrow. I calculate 10 student drafts times a minimum of 15 minutes per draft is 150 minutes. Two and a half hours of correcting for me, and I am not the one who needs to learn to find and correct the errors! My estimate is even optimistic as one study found most teachers take at least 20 to 40 minutes to comment on one student paper (Sommers, 1982).

Midnight. Five hours, three large mugs of coffee, one hardly working pen (and hand and brain), and 10 essays later, I come up with a new equation: One 80-minute class period plus 10 student peer editors plus one teacher to manage and oversee the students equals job completed. I pack my schoolbag and flop into bed, reminding myself next time I will give peer feedback a try. I think to myself, maybe peer feedback can be an effective way for students to receive valuable feedback on errors in their writing and learn to become their own editors and better writers in the process while at the same time relieving the teacher of endless hours of writing feedback that may or may not be looked at or used by the students. Could the students benefit by being editors for each other?

The experience described above depicts me after my first month of teaching English language learners in a public high school six years ago. Weeks later, as I was planning my lessons for the next essay assignment, I decided I would try having students use peer feedback during class time instead of having each student hand in a draft for teacher feedback. However, having students give peer feedback in class on errors in an essay was something I had never tried, so I felt hesitant. Many questions exploded in my

head. Wasn't I, their ELL teacher, the one who could most easily and effectively find and correct grammatical errors and give the best suggestions on content and organization so that each student's writing would improve? How would I structure peer feedback in pairs or groups? How would I know students were giving accurate and helpful feedback? Would the students feel comfortable giving feedback to their peers? Would they trust each other enough to incorporate the feedback into their revisions? How would I know that the students were doing their best to give the appropriate feedback? How would I monitor the groups to stay on task, and how would I grade their participation? All of these questions weighed on my mind, but I still decided to give peer feedback a try.

I began to implement different methods of peer feedback in my classroom. My first task was to figure out how to structure peer feedback in pairs or groups. Sometimes I had students choose their partners or groups, and sometimes I organized their partners or groups for them based on my knowledge of their writing skills. Also, I had to decide what the focus of the feedback would be. Sometimes I asked students to limit their feedback to specifics, such as grammar, content, or organization. Other times, I told them simply to find and comment on whatever they thought needed work and ask them to only circle or underline what they believed to be incorrect or put a question mark by parts of the writing they did not understand. I even tried having the students use proofreading marks. Sometimes I would require students to fill out peer feedback forms for their partners and then collect them at the end of the class period for a grade. I was constantly changing my strategies to make peer feedback as productive, effective, and enjoyable as possible.

I informally observed each process and the effects of peer feedback and noticed the responses to my peer feedback plans varied greatly. Some students seemed excited about the fact that they would work with their classmates because it meant a chance to work with their friends. Others did not want to work with their peers if it meant working with someone they did not like. A few just simply preferred to work alone. Some students did not trust themselves to give feedback and constantly came to me for advice. Others did not trust the feedback they were given and constantly came to me for support. Some groups stayed on task, while others ended up talking about anything other than the essays in front of them. It seemed there were many issues to tackle regarding how to implement peer feedback effectively. I tried to accommodate the needs and requests of the students so that the peer feedback process could be a positive experience for everybody.

I could see that work was being done; however, I never took any formal measures to determine if peer feedback or the strategies I was giving my students were effective. Other than looking quickly at the peer feedback given on previous drafts and then looking at the subsequent or final drafts, I had no way to account for whether the feedback given by peers was being used. Except for mentally taking notes of the comments I heard expressed during the peer feedback sessions in class and the revision time in the computer lab, I had no formal record of the students' preferences or attitudes towards peer feedback. I really did not have any proof that using peer feedback was worthwhile.

The following study developed not only from the questions raised through my experiences with implementing peer feedback in the classroom, but also from the

literature I read regarding the history of writing and error correction, teacher feedback, peer feedback, and preferences, perceptions, and attitudes about error correction of both first language (L1) and second language (L2) learners.

Context

I teach English language learners (ELLs) at a high school in a small city in southeastern Minnesota. I have three 80-minute, mixed-grade (9-12) ELL classes divided by ability: newcomer/beginner, intermediate, and advanced. In one school year there are four terms of approximately nine or ten weeks. Most of my students have an ELL class for one class period per term for the entire year. If an advanced ELL shows progress in English language development, I will recommend that the student also be enrolled in the grade-level English class or classes. The goal for each student is to exit out of ELL class as soon as he or she is ready to succeed in grade-level English curriculum *without* the support of an ELL class. Exiting at the high school level is determined by a combination of success in the ELL class and other classes and standardized state test scores, including the Test of Emerging Academic English (TEAE) and the Basic Standards Test (BST)/Minnesota Comprehension Assessment II (MCAII) GRAD reading and writing tests. All students, including ELLs, must pass the reading, writing, and math Minnesota GRAD tests in order to graduate from high school.

In order to help my students pass the reading and writing GRAD tests, the focus in my intermediate and advanced classes is on academic reading and writing. Part of my curriculum teaches students to write five-paragraph expository essays. These essays are often based on a question about what they are reading in class. I teach about organization

and content in writing, as well as grammar, in order to help students improve their writing skills. In addition, I provide the students with an opportunity for impromptu essay writing modeled after the Minnesota GRAD Writing test, which consists of a prompt in English that the student must respond to with an expository essay. The preferred response for the test is a five-paragraph expository essay with an introduction, three body paragraphs, and a conclusion. After giving the students the opportunity to experience a “real testing” situation before the GRAD test, they receive feedback from me on how they can improve their essays.

With the increased pressure on the students to do well also comes the increased pressure on the teacher to ensure the students do well. I feel responsible to provide extensive feedback to my students on the essays I assign. However, giving feedback is a time-consuming and exhausting process, which often leaves me doing more of the editing work than the student. Even though it often appears the students want extensive teacher feedback, it seems as if they also feel discouraged when they receive their writing back with many marks and comments. I want my students to have confidence in themselves and their writing skills and be part of a student-centered classroom that takes the focus off the teacher as the “all-knowing editor” and places the responsibility of feedback back onto the students (Muncie, 2000).

During the past six years of teaching ELLs, I used peer feedback in addition to teacher feedback on student writing. I taught according to my inner feeling that teacher and peer feedback must be effective, and students appreciate and benefit from both kinds

of feedback. However, I was still left with unanswered questions about the effectiveness of using peer feedback in the ELL classroom, which led me to developing my study.

The Research Questions

The focus of my study is to explore the role of grammatical feedback by peers on essay writing in the high school advanced ELL classroom. My guiding research questions are:

1. What are the students' preferences, perceptions, and attitudes about writing feedback before, during, and after the implementation of peer feedback in the classroom?
2. Given the choice, do students choose to give or receive indirect or direct grammatical feedback from peers, or do they choose to self-edit their essays?
3. To what extent do students *intend to use* peer feedback in the next revision of their essays, and what reasons do they give?
4. Is *indirect* or *direct* feedback given by peers used *more* by students in preparing to revise their essays?
5. How accurate is peer feedback?

Significance for Others

Although this study is mainly to satisfy my need as a teacher to know if peer feedback is worthwhile in my advanced ELL class, the findings could be useful for others as well. If peer feedback is shown to be effective in my advanced ELL classroom, then hopefully other ELL teachers, mainstream English teachers, foreign language teachers, and maybe even content-area teachers will feel more comfortable using peer feedback in

their classes. Students may also feel more comfortable giving and receiving feedback if they have proof it is effective.

Many English teachers at the school where I teach use peer feedback as one form of feedback on writing in their classrooms. Perhaps they instinctively feel peer feedback is a worthwhile activity and they feel confident enough in their students' abilities as writers to use peer feedback in their classes. However, many ELL teachers may not feel confident in their students' abilities to give accurate feedback, and therefore, do not use it in class. They may also perceive that their students do not feel confident enough in their own abilities to provide feedback to their peers. However, ELLs who exit from ELL class into their grade-level English classes are expected to give feedback to and use feedback from their peers, most of whose first language (L1) is English; therefore, it is important for ELL teachers to teach strategies for giving and receiving peer feedback. They should show ELLs how to give peer feedback in their ELL class before they exit into their grade-level English classes, so they are better prepared to participate in peer feedback in those classes.

Foreign language teachers, especially those who teach advanced-level classes, may also benefit from my research. They may want to try the same techniques and procedures I use in my study to implement peer feedback in their classrooms.

In many content classes, writing is important. Content-area teachers might also consider using peer feedback on writing assignments in their classrooms. In order to communicate effectively, English language learners need to work on writing skills in

their content classes and need to be able to use their peers as well as themselves as resources to help improve their writing and convey their messages more effectively.

Students might also benefit from my research. If students feel they are taking an active role in the feedback process of not only their work, but the work of others, they may be more motivated and put more effort into giving and using peer feedback than if the teacher alone gave feedback. The ultimate goal of the process of peer feedback is for every student to revise and edit his or her own writing accurately. Also, if students perceive peer feedback to be effective, they may look forward to writing and the peer feedback process and become better writers by giving and receiving feedback from their peers.

Conclusion

This chapter explained how the idea for the study developed, the context of the study, the specific research questions which were investigated, and the significance of the study for others. The second chapter, the Literature Review, discusses other studies which have addressed the issues of writing feedback. A brief history of ESL writing approaches and how feedback plays a role in each is discussed in order to show how feedback methods have changed and continue to change in response to writing methods. Then, definitions of different types of feedback are clarified. Next, research pertaining to different types of indirect and direct feedback is presented, followed by a discussion of peer feedback studies. Finally, studies that examine student perceptions, attitudes, and preferences toward writing feedback are discussed. The third chapter, Methodology, describes the procedures and instruments used to gather the data to answer my research

questions. The fourth chapter, Results, describes the process of data analysis and presents and analyzes the results of the research. The final chapter, the Conclusion, discusses the results of the research and connects them to the literature review, as well as the implications of the study. It also discusses the limitations of the study and directions for future research.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I explained how I developed the idea for my study. This chapter summarizes literature relevant to my study, exploring the role of grammatical feedback by peers on essay writing in the high school advanced English language learners' classroom. First, a brief review of English as a second language (ESL) writing approaches and how feedback fits into the various writing traditions and movements is discussed. Next, definitions of types of feedback on writing are explained. Then, the debate regarding ESL and second language (L2) grammar feedback in writing is examined. Studies examining indirect and direct writing feedback by teachers follow. Next, studies examining peer feedback are presented. Finally, research regarding student preferences, attitudes, and perceptions about writing feedback is reviewed.

A Brief Review of ESL Writing Approaches and Writing Feedback

In order to better understand the philosophy behind the design of my study, a brief review of the history of ESL writing approaches and the role of feedback in each is helpful. This section focuses on ESL writing approaches and their corresponding feedback methods since 1945.

After World War II (between 1945 and 1960), writing instruction in ESL classes was not a main focus. Before 1960, most ESL classes were focused on teaching

immigrants speaking and reading skills needed to pass the citizenship exam. Most of these students had low-paying jobs in which speaking English was often necessary, but very few reading and writing skills were needed (Leki, 1992). Speaking a language was considered more important than writing for these students, so if writing was used at all, it was mainly used to reinforce speaking in the form of transcribed speech (Leki, 1992). The *audio-lingual method* (ALM), which focuses on oral language production, was dominant. Because language instruction emphasized correct and highly controlled oral language, error correction and feedback were usually given orally by the teacher to the student (Reid, 1993). Oral drill and practice of grammar was important (Raimes, 1991). Therefore, feedback on writing was not an issue. If writing was part of the ESL classroom, the focus was on teaching handwriting or filling in the blanks in sentences, rather than producing original writing (Reid, 1993).

In the 1960s, writing became more important in ESL classes because many foreign students came to study at American universities and needed to write in English for academic purposes. The methods still focused largely on grammatical perfection and were highly controlled (Leki, 1992). In 1966, Kaplan recognized that English writing is dominantly linear, unlike the writing of many other languages, so the exercises in writing became focused on imitating English paragraph or essay form by copying or making changes to an existing text (Raimes, 1991). The philosophy was that errors in writing could be prevented and writing fluency would arise out of controlled practice, which was in keeping with Behaviorist Theory. If errors were made, correction by the teacher was

believed to be necessary (Reid, 1993). This was the beginning of *form-based* (also called *language-based*) writing.

In the early 1970s, form-based writing in ESL classes continued to gain popularity. This approach used controlled composition tasks that practiced specific linguistic forms, and meaning was not important (Raimes, 1991). Students were taught guided writing in which they structured their own writing from an example of text. Dictation and sentence-combining activities were often used (Reid, 1993). Accuracy of grammar and mechanics was important, and feedback on these aspects of writing was usually given by the teacher (Reid, 1993).

By 1976, the focus of writing in ESL classes was shifting away from a form-based approach to a *pattern/product approach* because many ESL students were unprepared for writing placement exams given by universities (Reid, 1993). When using the *pattern/product approach*, teachers focused on the concepts of thesis statement, topic sentences, paragraph unity, organization strategies, and the development of paragraphs by following different patterns of writing (Reid, 1993). Form and structure were still important, but the importance of using more original ideas in writing was starting to unfold. Teachers and researchers such as Lawrence, Seale, McKay, and Buckingham initiated this approach (Reid, 1993). Feedback was given on content and organization first, although grammatical accuracy was still addressed.

The pattern/product approach soon led to the *process approach* (Raimes, 1991), which would continue to dominate into the 1980s (Leki, 1992). The goal of the *process approach* was communication rather than grammatical accuracy in writing (Leki, 1992).

Students became the creators of text rather than just mimicking or manipulating a form or pattern presented to them (Raimes, 1991). Arapoff, Lawrence, and Zamel were some of the first researchers and teachers to encourage the use of the process approach (Reid, 1993). Classroom strategies included journaling, peer collaboration, invention, revision, and attention to content before form (Raimes, 1991). Ideas, expression, discovery, and organization became the focus; multiple drafts, revisions, and feedback on ideas dominated (Raimes, 1991; Reid, 1993).

In the late 1980s, the question surfaced of whether the process approach to writing had moved too far away from the product (Reid, 1993). The process approach to ESL writing was criticized for focusing too much on the personal experience of writing, for giving the impression that accuracy was not important, and for not preparing ELLs for single-draft essay exams (Leki, 1992). Therefore, ELL teachers and researchers began to focus on aligning teaching toward content of specific fields and the requirements of writing in those fields with a specific audience in mind. English language instruction became linked to other courses through team-teaching (Raimes, 1991). Error correction and grammatical accuracy in writing became a focus again because academic writing requires accuracy as well as fluency. However, the process approach was not abandoned altogether but integrated into academic writing tasks (Reid, 1993). Raimes (1991) saw this shift to focus on academic content and audience happening around 1986.

In the 1990s, writing trends and research focused on composing and revising processes, contrastive analysis/error analysis, coherence/cohesion, the process-product classroom, communicative competence, collaborative learning, computer-assisted

language learning (C.A.L.L.), and proficiency testing (Reid, 1993). Teaching writing to advanced ELLs became a particular focus (Reid, 1993). These methods and trends were in contrast to earlier methods. In 1996, Truscott's interest in advanced ESL writing examined the question of whether grammar correction belonged in L2 writing courses, and responses and a debate to his conclusions followed.

As we move further into the new millennium, it will be interesting to look back and see what kinds of trends in ESL writing emerged. Based on my own experience and conversations with other ELL teachers, a combination of approaches seems to be a trend today. However, with increased state testing and standards, the emphasis on accuracy and form in writing seems to be re-emerging as a significant trend. In that regard, my study explores the role of grammatical feedback by peers in the writing and revision process of advanced ELLs. In my experience, even advanced ELLs continue to make grammatical errors in their own writing despite being taught explicit grammar rules for the errors they make. However, they more often find grammatical errors in their peers' writing than in their own writing.

Definitions of Feedback

The preceding section focused on the approaches to ESL writing and their dominate feedback methods. However, the term *feedback* is a broad term that needs to be further defined. Feedback is considered to be an ongoing process that can take place from when the writing process starts (Reid, 1993). Feedback is not to be confused with *evaluation*, which may include feedback but is used to explain or justify a judgment or value, such as a grade (Reid, 1993). Teachers, peers, tutors, or even computers can

provide feedback at different stages in the writing process. This section will define and give examples of more specific terms associated with feedback on written language.

Kulhavy (1977) defines *feedback* as "any procedure used to inform a learner whether an instructional response is right or wrong" (p. 214, as cited in Lalande, 1982, p. 141). This definition assumes there is a "right" or "wrong" way of writing something, which may not always be the case. The definition of feedback has since changed. The term *feedback* is defined by Keh (1990, as cited in Reid, 1993) as "any input from reader to writer that provides information for revision (p. 218). Another word used for feedback has been *response* (Reid, 1993).

The focus of the feedback may be the content of the writing, stylistic elements, grammar, or a combination of any or all of the above. Content feedback focuses on ideas presented in the writing and the organization of those ideas. Feedback on stylistic elements includes providing suggestions for a more appropriate word or phrase, even though no grammatical error has been made. Grammar feedback is feedback given on grammatical aspects of writing.

Feedback on grammar is often given on L2 errors or mistakes. Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) define *errors* as "morphological, syntactic, and lexical deviations from the grammatical rules of a language that violate the intuitions of NSs [native speakers]" (p. 264.) Errors in second language writing are part of learning, and research on ESL errors (Kroll, 1991; Raimes, 1991; Scovel, 1988, as cited in Reid, 1993) has found they are not random, but are regular and rule-governed (Reid, 1993). A *mistake* is different from an error in that it is recognized as a "*temporary* lapse in the learner's performance"

(Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005, p. 295, italics added). Types of errors may depend on the structure of the L1 of the students and their previous learning experiences of the English language (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). L2 writers' grammatical errors tend to be different from native speakers' errors, for they have distinct problems with verbs (tenses, modals, passive construction, infinitives, conditionals), subject/verb agreement, nouns (types, plurals, possessives, articles), prepositions, and sometimes spelling (Holt, 1997).

Feedback on grammar, style, or content can be indirect, direct, or a combination of both. *Indirect* feedback is when an error or problem with the writing is indicated in some way, but the student writer is *not* provided with the correction and must correct or change it. Indirect feedback is also referred to as *implicit* or *non-specific* feedback. *Direct* feedback is when a specific correction or change is provided to the student writer. In the case of grammar, the correct form is given. Direct feedback is also referred to as *explicit* or *specific* feedback. Table 2.1 presents examples of indirect and direct feedback are presented.

Table 2.1: Examples of Indirect and Direct Feedback

Sentence with an Error	**Indirect Feedback**	**Direct Feedback**
He want to see a movie last night.	He want to see a movie last night.	He want**ed** to see a movie last night.
He played good during the game.	He played good during the game.	He played **well** during the game.
He bought CD.	He bought ___ CD.	He bought **a** CD.
He brought home pizza, and pop.	He brought home pizza, and pop.	He brought home pizza and pop.

Feedback on writing may be oral or written. Oral feedback on writing may be given through a conference with the student or as tape-recorded messages given to students to listen to at a later time while they look at their writing. Written feedback may be handwritten remarks or corrections on the original or photocopied student writing. Feedback may be presented on a separate sheet of paper for the student to read and review or attached on sticky notes to the original paper. In today's technologically advanced world, written feedback may take the form of word-processed "comments" or "revisions" on an electronic form of the original typed text and emailed to the student.

Feedback can be given in different ways depending on the desires and needs of both the writer and the responder. For example, a teacher may give direct oral grammar feedback to a student during a teacher-student writing conference. This may mean telling the student to change "I seen" to "I saw" and pointing to it in the sentence. A peer may give indirect written content feedback as part of a teacher-directed task. This may mean writing "You need to write a thesis statement" on the paper.

Because there are different ways to give feedback, the results of the studies regarding feedback on ESL writing are often difficult to compare or are even conflicting, as shown in following discussion of studies. The differing results expand when who is giving the feedback (teacher, peer, tutor, friend, or computer program) is included. The point at which the feedback is given in the writing process can also bring varying results.

The Debate and Studies Regarding Grammar Feedback on Writing

My study explores the intended usage and accuracy of indirect and direct grammar feedback by peers on advanced ELL writing. Therefore, it is necessary to

understand the debate and studies regarding the effectiveness of grammar feedback on ESL and L2 writing.

The continuing debate and research on grammar feedback, which initiated my interest in exploring grammatical feedback by peers for this study, stems from Truscott's (1996) article "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes," which is a review of L1 and L2 studies on grammar correction. He claims that most L2 writing teachers accept providing grammar feedback as necessary and do not question its effectiveness, but they are wrong in their beliefs. Truscott claims that the studies he reviewed (Cohen & Robbins, 1976; Hendrickson, 1978 & 1981; Hillocks, 1986; Kepner, 1991; Knoblauch & Brannon, 1981; Robb, Ross, & Shortreed, 1986; Semke, 1984; Sheppard, 1992) as well as other papers (Krashen, 1992; Leki, 1990; VanPatten, 1986) show that grammar correction is ineffective. He dismisses length of the study, types of instruction and assessment, and learner variables in influencing the results of these studies because in each study, the use of grammar feedback on student papers led to no improvement in student writing. Therefore, he suggests that grammar correction should not be used *at all* in writing courses.

Truscott (1996) claims that "grammar correction has significant harmful effects" (p. 328) because L1 studies (Hillocks, 1986; Knoblauch & Brannon, 1981) showed that "students who did not receive correction had a more positive attitude towards writing than those who did" (1996, p. 354). Truscott (1996) states that Semke (1984) found that uncorrected students wrote more. He notes in Kapner's (1991) study and Sheppard's (1992) study, the complexity of students' writing diminished as a result of grammar

correction. Truscott ends his argument for the abandonment of grammatical feedback by noting that although students believe in correction (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Hendrickson, 1978; Leki, 1991; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Saito, 1994), it does not mean teachers should provide students with it.

Truscott's (1996) article was controversial to those who believed in grammar correction. In response to Truscott, Ferris (1999) wrote an article claiming his ideas to be too strong. Although Truscott (1996) argues that the type of grammar correction did not matter, Ferris (1999) argues that type of feedback does make a difference in effectiveness and notes the subjects in Truscott's primary sources are not comparable. Ferris also notes the research paradigms and teaching strategies in the studies vary widely, so it is hard to make any generalizations about grammar feedback.

Ferris (1999) states that no single form of grammar correction can work for all students or texts. She cites her own analysis of diagnostic essays written by her university ESL students as containing both *treatable* and *untreatable* errors as proof of this. *Treatable* errors consist of mistakes in subject-verb agreement, run-ons, missing articles, and verb forms that can often be fixed by teaching or pointing out rules. *Untreatable* errors include lexical errors and problems with sentence structure, including missing words, unnecessary words, and word order problems, for which there is generally no set of rules that students can consult to remedy these types of errors. She suggests ESL writing teachers should give more thought on how to best approach giving feedback regarding both treatable and untreatable types of errors. Ferris (1999) argues for the continuation of grammar feedback because students expect it, and proficiency

examinations look at error as one aspect of the entire piece of writing. She notes that university professors find ESL writing errors bothersome, so to completely ignore errors with the hope that they go away or that attitudes change is unrealistic. Most importantly, she believes that students must learn to edit their own writing, and without feedback, students will not have the means necessary to do this.

Truscott (1999) continued to support his belief that grammatical feedback should be abandoned, and many researchers, including Ferris, were intent on proving his idea wrong. For example, studies by Ferris and Roberts (2001) and Chandler (2003) found groups that received indirect feedback improved in accuracy compared to groups that received no feedback.

A study conducted by Ferris and Roberts (2001) examined two types of indirect feedback compared to no feedback. Seventy-two university ESL students were randomly assigned to three feedback groups:

1. indirect feedback - errors marked with a code in five different error categories.
2. indirect feedback - errors underlined without a code (same five categories)
3. no feedback.

The results show that the two indirect feedback groups outperformed the no-feedback group on a self-editing task. However, there was no difference in performance between the two indirect feedback groups. The researchers concluded that both indirect feedback types used in the study helped the students self-edit.

Chandler (2003) conducted a two-part study, which also included a no-feedback group. The first part of the study examined whether error correction improves accuracy

in student writing, and the second part was to examine the effects of various kinds of feedback. Both parts of the study involved teacher feedback. The study included two ESL classes of 15 and 16 music majors at an American conservatory taught by the same teacher-researcher over a 10-week semester. Each class had to complete five assignments: five typed, double-spaced pages about their own life, for a total of 25 pages. The control group received no feedback on their writing until after data were collected. The experimental group received indirect feedback, underlined grammatical or lexical errors in their writing, and was required to make revisions prior to the next draft. The results showed that the experimental group (indirect feedback) increased significantly in accuracy while the control group (no feedback) did not. However, both groups showed a significant increase in fluency over the semester.

Instead of continuing to debate the issue of giving or not giving grammatical feedback, Ferris (2004) tried to describe where we were in terms of error correction. She stated that previous studies on grammar feedback are incomparable because of different methods, but the research predicts positive effects for written error correction. Ferris suggested controlled longitudinal studies that are similar and replicable. She offered teachers some practical suggestions for L2 writing including planning for error treatment and executing it consistently, providing indirect feedback in most cases, but realizing that different types of errors may require different feedback, implementing supplemental grammar instruction, and the maintenance of error charts, ideally by the students themselves.

In designing my study, I took some of these recommendations into consideration, and although my research is not longitudinal, it examined indirect and direct grammar feedback by peers and used a feedback log maintained by student writers. My classroom teaching included supplemental grammar instruction throughout the year, as she recommended. The studies examined by Truscott (1996) and Ferris (1999), as well as the studies conducted by Ferris and Roberts (2001) and Chandler (2003), examined grammar feedback given by *teachers*. However, my study focuses on grammar feedback given by *peers*. The debate about the effectiveness of grammar feedback, as well as the studies developed in response to the debate, triggered me to focus my research on English language learners giving grammar feedback to each other, rather than the teacher giving grammar feedback. The next section examines more studies specifically regarding indirect and direct writing feedback.

Studies Examining Indirect and Direct Writing Feedback

Research in L2 writing has examined indirect and direct written feedback on ESL writing. As explained previously, indirect feedback is when an error is indicated in some way, but the writer is not provided with the correction, and direct feedback is when the correct form is provided to the writer. Since my study also includes questions concerning indirect and direct writing feedback by peers in the ESL classroom, it is important to review what previous research has found. Studies examining indirect and direct feedback have had varying results because of the inconsistency of methods. I have attempted to organize this section by positive findings for indirect feedback, positive findings for direct feedback, and negative findings for direct feedback, reflecting what was found in

the research. However, since many of the studies examine many aspects of feedback, and include more than one research question, it was sometimes hard to separate the findings into these categories because of the overlap. All of the studies in this section include feedback provided by teachers, not peers.

Many studies have found positive results for indirect feedback (Chandler, 2003; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; LaLande, 1982; Sheppard, 1992). As previously discussed, Chandler's (2003) research found that giving indirect feedback by underlining errors and requiring students to revise each draft resulted in increased accuracy. Similarly, Ferris and Roberts' (2001) study found two different indirect feedback types helped students self-edit their texts.

Fathman and Whalley's (1990) study of 72 intermediate ESL students in college composition classes examined whether indirect grammatical feedback was effective in improving student writing. The results of the study suggest underlining grammatical errors increases grammatical accuracy in revisions. The study also suggests focusing on grammar does not negatively affect content, and rewriting is necessary to improve writing skills.

Lalande's (1982) study investigated the effects of indirect and direct error feedback on the writing of 60 students taking German as a foreign language at the intermediate level at a university. The control group of 30 students received direct feedback on their essays. Teachers wrote all corrections (direct) onto students' essays, and then required the students to incorporate the corrections into their revisions. The experimental group of 30 students received indirect feedback on their essays with an

error correction code. The students had to interpret the code in order to correct their mistakes for their revisions. The revisions for both groups were completed within a 50-minute class period. The group given indirect feedback was required to track their errors on an Error Awareness Sheet, with the hope that it would make them more aware of the types of errors they made to help them avoid making the same errors in the future. The results of the study show that the experimental (indirect) group made significantly fewer errors and wrote grammatically superior compositions compared to the control (direct) group (Lalande, 1982). A comparison of the pretest and posttests within each group found that the direct feedback group actually increased in errors, while the indirect feedback group had a slight reduction in the amount of errors. It appears that indirect feedback had more positive results than direct feedback. However, Lalande also notes that it is possible that the indirect group used error avoidance strategies in order not to have mistakes to correct, and therefore their compositions appeared to have fewer errors. He also notes that it is possible that the direct feedback group had more errors because the direct feedback that the students received could have been faulty or incomplete. The researcher also speculates that not keeping track of errors on a log could have also contributed to more errors in the long term by the group that received direct feedback. Because of his research, Lalande (1982) believes students should be allowed to consult peers during revisions, and rewrite activities are worthwhile in the classroom.

Shepard's (1992) study examined the effects of two feedback methods on the writer's grammatical accuracy and complexity by comparing the first and last compositions in a sequence of nine written over a ten-week period. This study consisted

of two groups of college freshmen ESL students at an upper-intermediate level. One group received indirect feedback (code and location of error) and a conference with the teacher that included only discussing the errors, not the content of the writing. The second group received indirect feedback (general requests for clarification of intention) and a conference with the teacher that included only discussing content, not grammatical errors. The results showed that those in group one did *not* improve in grammatical accuracy as much as those who received general requests for clarification. Group one also regressed in complexity of their writing. Shepard (1992) concluded that perhaps drawing attention to every grammatical error rather than talking about the intent of the writing was not as effective in producing grammatical accuracy and complexity.

In contrast, two studies found more positive results for direct feedback (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005; Chandler, 2003). A study by Bitchener, et al. (2005) investigated whether the type of feedback given on three different types of errors resulted in improved accuracy in four new pieces of writing. This study involved 53 adult migrant students at the post-intermediate level over a 12-week period. The students were divided into three groups. One group was given direct written feedback and a student-researcher 5-minute conference. The second group was given direct written feedback only. The third group received no feedback. The research focused on three error types: prepositions, the past simple tense, and the definite article, errors that occurred most frequently during the first writing task (a 250-word informal letter). The study found direct written feedback with a conference resulted in significantly greater accuracy of the past simple tense and the definite article in new pieces of writing. However, when the

three targeted error categories were examined as a single group, the type of feedback (including “no feedback”) provided did not have a significant effect on accuracy. The overall accuracy of the participants varied significantly across the four writing tasks, which the researcher attributed to individual differences and personal circumstances of the learners. In this study, direct written feedback with a conference had a greater effect on improved accuracy over time than direct written feedback only.

Chandler’s (2003) study found not only positive results for indirect feedback, as discussed previously; it also found positive results for direct feedback. The second part of the aforementioned study included four different types of feedback (one direct and three indirect) to determine which type of feedback was best. The feedback types were:

1. *correction* - writing the correct text (direct)
2. *description of type only* - writing a brief description of the error type in the left margin of the line where the error occurred (indirect)
3. *underlining* - underlining the incorrect text (indirect)
4. *underlining with description* - underlining the incorrect text and writing a brief description of the error type in the left margin. (indirect)

The results of the study showed that accuracy (errors per 100 words) and fluency (time to write 100 words) improved overall in the semester because of receiving feedback, regardless of type. *Correction* (direct) was found to be the best for later accuracy, but there was no statistically significant difference between *correction* (direct) and *underlining of errors* (indirect) in terms of overall accuracy. This suggests that both direct and indirect feedback were effective in producing increased accuracy. However,

Chandler (2003) speculates that direct feedback may be best because ESL students may begin to internalize the correct forms they see written on their papers and use them again in future writing. He also believes that students should use the feedback instead of simply receiving it to improve their writing. Based on the findings of Chandler's (2003) study and his speculations, my study has students record which feedback they intend to use or not use on a feedback log for their subsequent revisions, write in the corrections they intend to make, and circle the reasons why they intended to use or not use the feedback they were given by a peer.

On the other hand, two studies on direct feedback given by teachers had more negative than positive results (Sommers, 1982; Zamel, 1985). Sommers' (1982) study of teacher feedback on student drafts found teachers' comments can make students feel they need to change their writing according to what the teacher wants, rather than what they want as writers. The same study (Sommers, 1982) found teachers tend to give vague recommendations for change on student essays, leaving the student confused about what to do to make their writing better. On the other hand, if students are not given any feedback on their writing, students may not change something they had otherwise thought about changing. In other words, students may not want to risk making their own changes if the teacher did not suggest a change previously. Students often believe that teacher feedback is absolute and therefore give up responsibility for their writing (Reid, 1993).

Similarly, Zamel's (1985) study of 15 university level teachers' responses to student writing concluded direct feedback was not helpful to student writers because even though the teachers intended to mark all errors, they often missed errors and ignored

problems with content altogether. In addition, the study found the teachers misread student texts, were inconsistent and vague, and responded to texts as fixed and final products. Therefore, Zamel (1985) suggests that teachers be consultants, assistants, and facilitators rather than authorities and develop a collaborative relationship with student writers. I took this information into consideration when developing my study, so my role in the feedback process for this study was as a facilitator who taught students how to give indirect and direct feedback to their peers. Instead of being an authority, I acted as a consultant who answered questions, but did not give answers to grammatical questions, during the peer feedback process.

This section examined some studies concerning indirect and direct grammatical feedback given by teachers. To summarize, the use of indirect feedback was found to be largely positive, for it resulted in increased accuracy of student texts, an increase in the complexity of student writing, and helped students self-edit. The use of direct feedback was found to be mostly positive. It also contributed to increased accuracy and fluency of texts. However, direct teacher feedback in two studies (Sommers, 1982; Zamel, 1985) was found to be vague and inconsistent. The next section examines studies concerning peer feedback in the ESL classroom.

Studies Examining Peer Feedback

Peer feedback was first used in first language (L1) writing classrooms, and in the 1970s and 1980s, scholars pointed out the advantages and benefits of peer feedback based on their own research (Brannon & Knoblauch, 1981; Elbow, 1973, Hairston, 1986; Knoblauch & Brannon, 1982; Moxley, 1989; Sommers, 1982; Sperling & Freedman,

1987, as cited in Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). Second language research also supports using peer feedback (Allaei & Connor, 1990; Braine, 1989; Carson & Nelson, 1994; De Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Freedman, 1992; Keh, 1990; Leki, 1990; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Mittan, 1989; Olson, 1990; Tang & Tithecott, 1999; Vataloro, 1990). On the other hand, using peer feedback in the ESL, L1, L2, and FL classroom has been challenged and criticized (Allaei & Connor, 1990; Carson and Nelson,1996; Linden-Martin, 1997; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Reid, 1993; Tang & Tithecott, 1999; Zhang, 1995). Studies on peer feedback have also examined if students use the feedback they are given (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Rollinson, 1998; Tang & Tithecott, 1999; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998). Other studies have examined the accuracy of peer feedback (Caulk, 1994; Rollinson, 1998, as cited in Rollinson, 2005).

Benefits of Using Peer Feedback

One benefit of peer feedback is students begin to recognize problems in their peers' writing and may begin to recognize the same problems in their own writing. As students work in peer groups on writing, they can more easily identify problems with organization and clarity in their peers' writing (Allaei & Connor, 1990). They are then able to see similar problems in their own writing (De Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Leki, 1990; Mittan, 1989) and can begin to ask for more specific feedback from their peers (Braine, 1989; Keh, 1990, as cited in Reid, 1993).

Another benefit of the peer feedback process is it allows students to have an interactive relationship with their readers and gives students immediate contact with real

readers of their writing (Reid, 1993), who can give them reactions, questions, and responses (Mittan, 1989). De Guerrero and Villamil's (1996) study concludes peer feedback groups use an extremely complex interactive process. Within this process, both less and more proficient students can benefit from peer feedback sessions (Tang & Tithecott, 1999). An L1 study (Olson, 1990) concluded that peer feedback may help students anticipate audience.

Peer feedback also allows students to gain respect for negotiation, cooperation, responsibility, respect, and trust (Freedman, 1992; Vataloro, 1990, as cited in Reid, 1993). A sense of classroom community is built through peer feedback activities (Ferris, 2003; Hirvela, 1999; Liu & Hansen, 2002; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994).

Using peer feedback in the ESL classroom may help with second language development and cognitive development. For example, Long and Porter (1985) found the interaction used in peer feedback activities helped with second language development. Studies have found that social interaction in peer feedback groups supports cognitive development (Carson & Nelson, 1994; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Tang & Tithecott, 1999).

Challenges of Using Peer Feedback

Although studies on peer feedback have shown it can be an effective and positive experience for ESL students, peer feedback groups can be challenging as well (Reid, 1993). It may be difficult for ESL students to share their writing or give feedback to and accept feedback from others. For example, Tang and Tithecott's (1999) study found students thought it was difficult to give negative feedback and they did not want to give

useless feedback to their peers. Issues with giving and accepting feedback may occur because of cultural expectations of members of the group. For example, two studies (Carson & Nelson,1996; Nelson & Carson, 1998) found Chinese students were hesitant to give feedback because they did not want conflict with their peers, needed to have group consensus, and did not want to embarrass the writer or claim authority as readers.

Another challenge in using peer feedback in the classroom is that students may not be used to the process of peer feedback or may not trust their peers' feedback (Allaei & Connor, 1990; Linden-Martin, 1997; Reid, 1993; Zhang, 1995). Therefore, Reid (1993) stresses the teacher needs to instruct students in how to work in peer feedback groups.

Studies Examining the Use of Peer Feedback in Revisions

In addition to looking at how peer feedback benefits or is challenging for the students in the writing process, research has examined if students *use* peer feedback in revisions (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Rollinson,1998, as cited in Rollinson, 2005; Tang & Tithecott, 1999; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998). Studies that examine whether or not students use writing feedback from their peers have had conflicting results. However, most of the studies on the subject have found students use the majority of the feedback given by their peers (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Rollinson,1998, as cited in Rollinson, 2005; Tang & Tithecott, 1999; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998). Only one major study (Connor & Asenavage, 1994) found that students do not use the peer feedback they receive.

Many studies conclude that students use the majority of peer feedback given to them. For example, Mendonca and Johnson's (1994) study of 12 advanced international graduate students showed they used oral peer feedback in 53% of their revisions. Only 10% of the feedback was not incorporated into revisions because students did not trust the feedback given by their peers. A study by Nelson and Murphy (1993) concludes that students make changes based on peer feedback. However, the study only included four students and these students were asked *not* to give grammatical feedback. (The teacher gave the grammatical feedback in that study.) Another study using peer feedback (Tang & Tithecott, 1999) found 58% (7 of 12) of the students in the study made revisions based on peer feedback. Rollinson's (1998) study found 65% of the feedback given was accepted (as cited in Rollinson, 2005). Similarly, Villamil and De Guerrero's (1998) study of 14 Spanish-speaking ESL college students revealed that 74% of the peer feedback given was incorporated into later drafts of writing.

On the other hand, one study did find students *do not use* the majority of peer feedback. Connor and Asenavage's (1994) study found peer feedback only contributed to five percent of the total revisions. Although there is this low percentage as to what extent L2 students use peer feedback, overall at least some peer feedback was used in all revisions in this study.

Studies Examining the Accuracy of Peer Feedback

Since studies have found that students do use at least some, if not the majority of, feedback given to them, the next area to explore is how accurate the feedback given is. Studies have shown positive results for accuracy of feedback. Rollinson (1998, as cited

in Rollinson, 2005) found 80% of the peer feedback in his study was valid. Caulk (1994) found 89% of his intermediate and advanced level foreign language students gave useful feedback, and he found that very little of it was bad (only 6%). Although peers do sometimes give inaccurate feedback, I did not find a study in which the peer feedback was more inaccurate than accurate overall.

In summary, research has shown there are many benefits to using peer feedback in ESL and L2 classrooms. By using peer feedback, students begin to recognize problems in their own writing, are able to have an interactive relationship with real readers, and learn how to negotiate and cooperate with other students. In addition, using peer feedback helps with second language development and cognitive development. On the other hand, using peer feedback in the ESL or L2 classroom may be challenging because students may not want to share their writing or give or accept feedback from their peers for cultural reasons, or they may not trust their peers' feedback. Most of the studies examining the use of peer feedback in revisions conclude that the majority of peer feedback is used by students in revisions. Studies that examined the accuracy of peer feedback have found the majority of peer feedback to be accurate.

I feel a gap exists in the ESL research that focuses on high school students finding grammatical errors in their peers' writing. As the literature review shows, most of the research concerning peer feedback has been done at the post-secondary level. There is also a gap in the research examining the accuracy of grammatical feedback by peers in the ESL classroom. My study reflects the need to investigate if grammatical feedback by peers on essay writing in the ESL classroom is effective. The types of grammatical errors

ELLs make stand out to L1 readers. Even if the content and organization of the writing of an ELL is outstanding, an L1 reader might overlook the message because of an abundance of L2 errors that are distracting. By conducting my own classroom research, I hope to begin to fill in the gap which exists regarding grammatical feedback by peers on essay writing in the high school ELL classroom and add to the research base of ESL approaches to writing feedback.

Student Perceptions, Attitudes, and Preferences on Writing Feedback

How effective a type of feedback is for students may be dependent on students' perceptions, attitudes, and preferences about it. What students think and feel about writing feedback depends on many factors, such as what kind of feedback students expect, want, and what they actually receive. A summary of findings in various studies examining these topics is presented.

Several studies show that students prefer indirect feedback of some kind (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Leki, 1986, as cited in Leki, 1990; Semke, 1984). Leki's (1986) research found that students wanted every error marked indirectly, so they could correct the errors themselves (as cited in Leki, 1990). Ferris and Roberts' (2001) study found all participants wanted some kind of feedback rather than no feedback at all. The most popular feedback method (48%) was to have the teacher mark the error and label it with an error code (indirect). Second most popular (31%) was to have the teacher correct all errors (direct). Third (19%) was to have all errors marked but not coded (indirect). Therefore, the majority (67%) of the participants in that study wanted *indirect* feedback rather than *direct* feedback from the teacher.

In another study (Semke, 1984), which involved North Americans learning German, found students expressed hostility towards pointing out every error in their writing. The same study found supportive comments without indication of errors affected students' attitudes positively.

Chandler's (2003) study shows direct feedback in a favorable light. The study examined learner preferences in addition to investigating the effectiveness of direct and indirect feedback. Twenty-one students were interviewed about their feedback preferences at the end of the semester (and end of the study). The results found direct feedback (correction) was preferred by 10 of the students (almost half), while seven of the students preferred indirect feedback (underlining with description). Underlining alone (indirect) was the least preferred method of feedback (one student). These preferences are interesting, however, because nearly half felt that underlining with description (indirect) was the easiest way to see what kind of errors they had made. They also felt that they learned the most from underlining with description, and they felt it helped them the most with future writing assignments. However, correction (direct) and underlining only (indirect) were found to be more effective at reducing error in subsequent writing than underlining with description. In other words, the students' *perceptions* of what worked best for them were not consistent with the researcher's analysis of *actual* error reduction.

As part of the same study, questionnaires were also given after each feedback method asking if the students felt discouraged after receiving a certain type of feedback. (This time only 16 students filled out questionnaires instead of 21, a discrepancy that was

not clearly explained.) The majority of students (94%) said they were not much or not at all discouraged by correction or underlining alone. Five of the 16 students (31%) felt "mostly" discouraged by underlining and description, and four students (25%) felt "mostly" discouraged by description alone. Most of the students felt they learned the most from underlining with description, so it is surprising that almost a third felt "mostly" discouraged by this type of feedback.

Lalande's (1982) study of intermediate German students asked students on questionnaires whether they considered the direct and indirect feedback they received from their teachers to be "sound, desirable, and effective" (p. 145) in developing their German writing skills. Seventy-two percent of the students who received direct feedback and 86% of the students who received indirect feedback felt that their writing skills had improved significantly by the end of the course. In addition, 86% of the students who received indirect feedback supported the concept of rewrite activities because they felt their writing had improved because of them, while only 24% of the students who received direct feedback felt that rewriting after receiving direct feedback improved their writing. Seventy-six percent of the students who received indirect feedback felt keeping track of their errors helped them become aware of recurring errors. Despite the results of the study being more favorable towards indirect feedback, Lalande recommends teachers correct all written errors since doing so did not adversely affect the disposition of the students.

Preferences for Teacher or Peer Feedback

Studies have examined whether students prefer teacher or peer feedback. A number of studies have shown students prefer teacher feedback to peer feedback (Freedman, 1987, as cited in Weaver, 1995; Linden-Martin 1997; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Sengupta, 1998; Tang & Tithecott, 1999; Zhang, 1995). A study by Nelson and Carson (1998) of 11 students found students preferred teacher feedback over peer feedback because the teacher was considered the expert. Sengupta's (1998) study found that the six ESL students involved in the study believed there was not any value in peer evaluation and that giving feedback is the teacher's job. The students in Linden-Martin's (1997) study mistrusted peer feedback and had a fear of being ridiculed by their peers and therefore preferred teacher feedback. Some students in Tang and Tithecott's (1995) study also addressed their preferences for teacher feedback over peer feedback. An L1 survey study by Freedman (1987, as cited in Weaver, 1995) found that students found teacher feedback more helpful than peer feedback.

Zhang's (1995) study asked 81 college and university ESL writers this very specific question: "Given a choice between teacher feedback and nonteacher feedback—that is, feedback by peers or yourself—before you write your final version, which will you choose?" (Zhang, 1995, p. 215) and found 94% of students preferred teacher feedback to nonteacher (peer or self) feedback.

In response to Zhang's (1995) study, Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, and Huang (1998) conducted another questionnaire study with 121 undergraduate ESL students because they believed Zhang's study presented an unfair choice of only teacher or nonteacher

feedback. Therefore, students were given two options: "1. I prefer to have feedback from other students as one type of feedback on my writing." or "2. I prefer not to have feedback from other students on my writing." (p. 311). Students were also asked to write a brief explanation of their choice. Ninety-three percent of the students wanted peer feedback as one type of feedback on their writing and gave explanations which indicated they felt their peers gave them ideas and found problems they had missed. Only 7% preferred not to receive any peer feedback because they felt their peers did not have the knowledge to provide useful feedback.

Zhang's (1999) response to that study claimed that their research does not mean that peer feedback should be used in the ESL classroom just because it is preferred over teacher feedback. However, an L1 study of low-achieving tenth-grade students (Karegianes, Pascarella, & Pflaum, 1980) found peer feedback to be at least as effective, if not more effective, than teacher feedback. Although this study was not conducted with L2 students, it does strengthen the argument for using peer feedback despite the preferences of students.

In summary, preferences for indirect or direct feedback varied in individual studies; however, in the majority of studies reviewed, indirect feedback was preferred. In general, students prefer teacher feedback to peer feedback, but peer feedback was also preferred in some cases.

Conclusion

This chapter reviewed literature relevant to my study. First, a brief review of English as a second language (ESL) writing approaches and how feedback fits into the

various writing traditions and movements was presented, followed by definitions of types of feedback on writing. Feedback on writing has continued to change since World War II based on the trends to writing approaches at a particular point in time. The emphasis on accuracy in writing has re-emerged, but focus on the content of the writing is also important; and therefore, feedback on writing has also focused on these elements. The debate regarding ESL and L2 grammar feedback in writing started by Truscott (1996) and Ferris (1999) triggered other researchers to examine indirect and direct writing feedback by teachers, peer feedback, and student preferences, attitudes, and perceptions about writing feedback. The use of indirect feedback and direct feedback were found to be largely positive; however, direct teacher feedback in two studies (Sommers, 1982; Zamel, 1985) was found to be vague and inconsistent. Research has shown there are many benefits to using peer feedback in ESL and L2 classrooms. On the other hand, using peer feedback in the ESL or L2 classroom may be challenging. Most of the studies examining the use of peer feedback in revisions conclude that the majority of peer feedback is used by students in revisions. Studies that examined the accuracy of peer feedback have found the majority of peer feedback to be accurate. Preferences for types of feedback varied according to the study, but teacher feedback was usually preferred to peer feedback. The following chapter explains the methodology used in this study to explore the role of grammatical feedback by peers in the advanced high school ELL classroom.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

This chapter explains the methods used in this study to explore the role of grammatical feedback by peers on essay writing in the high school advanced English language learners' classroom. First, the research paradigm and rationale for this paradigm are explained. Then, the setting and participants of the study are described. Next, the procedures and instruments designed for the study are described.

Research Paradigm and Rationale

The research paradigm I used for this study was classroom research, collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. Classroom research is defined as "ongoing and cumulative intellectual inquiry by classroom teachers into the nature of teaching and learning in their own classrooms" (Cross & Steadman, 1996, p. 2). The focus is on observing and improving the learning of the students rather than on the performance or teaching of the instructor, although it is hard to separate the two. Classroom teachers as researchers want to find out what works and why it works (or what does *not* work and why it does *not* work) for *their* students in *their* classrooms. By using classroom research, teachers as researchers are encouraged to use a variety of measures and even invent their own methods to collect data to answer their questions. They know that it is often hard to generalize findings for a larger community because the results could differ depending on the students involved. Classroom researchers conduct their research in

order to have a better understanding of the teaching situation they are in at the moment. Although the results of their studies might appeal to a larger audience, the information gathered is mainly to benefit the individual teachers and their students.

The characteristics of classroom research (Cross & Steadman,1996) are that it is learner-centered, teacher-directed, collaborative, context-specific, scholarly, practical, relevant, and continual. Table 3.1 summarizes and describes these characteristics of classroom research and how my study incorporated each.

The characteristics of classroom research lent themselves well to my particular teaching situation and research questions. I wanted to focus on how and why or why not peer feedback worked in my classroom with my advanced ELLs. I often teach some of the same students more than one year, so understanding what works for them is important to know in order to help them be the most effective editors of their classmates' writing and ultimately of their own writing. I did not necessarily want to focus on my teaching and what works for me as a teacher (although that was hard to ignore), but I wanted the focus to be on the learning of peer feedback skills and editing skills of the students. Although I would like to be able to make broad generalizations about the results of my research, I realize that with only eight students in my study, this was impossible to expect. More important to me was understanding my students and teaching situation with the hope of being able to apply some of that knowledge to the same group and possibly other groups of students I may teach in the future.

Table 3.1: Characteristics of Classroom Research (Cross & Steadman, 1996, pp. 2-4)

Characteristics of Classroom Research	Description of Characteristics	How My Study Incorporated the Characteristics
Learner-centered	• The focus is on observing and improving students' learning. • Learners respond to teaching. • Students learn to assess and improve their own learning.	• Students were observed giving, receiving, and using peer feedback on their writing. • Learners responded spontaneously (orally during class) and via questionnaires. • Students assessed their own learning through questionnaires and feedback logs.
Teacher-directed	• Teachers are active investigators. • Teachers use their own students.	• I prepared and conducted my own research. • I used my advanced ELLs.
Collaborative	• Students are partners in the research. • Students are free to discuss the research with the teacher.	• Students willingly signed agreements to participate in the research. • Students expressed their thoughts about the research with me.
Context-specific	• Specific questions are developed for a specific classroom. • The group of students is familiar to the teacher/researcher. • Sampling and statistical inferences are not important.	• Questions on peer feedback in my advanced ELL class were developed. • I knew the students in my classroom. • The small group of eight students was not a sample nor big enough to make statistical inferences or generalizations.
Scholarly	• Classroom research builds on a base of research. • It identifies a researchable question. • It uses an appropriate research design.	• A literature review examined previous research on types of feedback. • My study includes five main research questions. • Triangulation of data, both quantitative and qualitative, was used.
Practical and relevant	• The questions developed are useful for the teacher. • The research deepens personal understandings. • The measure of quality is the increased knowledge and practice of the teacher.	• I developed the questions based on my experiences with my students. • I now understand more about using peer feedback with my students. • My knowledge of using peer feedback in my classroom has increased because of the study.
Continual	• The research raises new questions that may be investigated later. • The teacher continues to evaluate and change practices based on the research.	• New questions about using peer feedback emerged. • I will continue to evaluate and change my practices of using peer feedback based on my study.

The method of classroom research encouraged me to create my own research instruments to collect multiple sources of data in order to cross-validate my findings and

make my research more credible. I decided to use *triangulation*, using multiple sources of information to gather data for research (Brown & Rodgers, 2004). Nat Bartels (2005) distinguishes four categories of data: observations, documents, reports and introspection, and tasks. Table 3.2 displays the triangulation of data and methods, a definition of each, and how I used each in my study.

Table 3.2: Triangulation Used in My Study

Triangulation Form	Definition	How I Used in My Study
Observation	Conducted by the teacher or another person	Observations of classroom activities and students' comments (recorded in my journal)
Documentation	Includes lesson plans, teaching materials, and student work	Lesson plans: Procedure charts Teaching materials: instructional packets, prompt (writing) packets Student work: feedback logs, essays
Reports and Introspection	Includes interviews, questionnaires, journals, metaphors, narrative and biographic methods, stimulated recall think alouds, and repertory grids	Questionnaires Journal (personal reflections on the process)
Tasks	Includes problem solving tasks, sorting tasks, and concept maps.	Essays and feedback logs
Time	Uses multiple occasions to gather data	Questionnaires, essays, and feedback logs were collected throughout the study in five cycles.

While using triangulation, I collected both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data is information gathered that can be turned into numbers and statistics, while qualitative data is information gathered that is not simple to turn into numbers and statistics (Brown & Rodgers, 2004). It is important to collect both kinds of data because each allows for different perspectives, which may or may not show the same results. The materials in my study allowed me to look at the same data both quantitatively and qualitatively. For example, the questionnaires in my study included Likert scale and

closed-choice questions, which I could count quantitatively, and also included open-ended questions, which were examined qualitatively. The essays the students wrote in my study were examined quantitatively for accuracy of feedback units and qualitatively as I made observations about their writing and giving feedback. Those essays were paired together with the feedback logs, which were examined quantitatively by counting feedback units to determine intended use and accuracy. The feedback logs were also examined qualitatively as I made observations about how the students used the logs. My journal of field notes included qualitative data of observations about student comments, reactions, and behavior while completing tasks in the study.

Setting and Participants

My research focuses on advanced ELLs at a public high school (grades 9-12) with a student population of approximately 1,300. The number of students enrolled in at least one term of ELL class in 2006-2007 was approximately 2% of the total school student population. The eight students who participated in this study were enrolled in the only advanced ESL class offered during the fourth term of the school year and were not assigned randomly but were part of an existing class. Placement in this class was based on a combination of the middle school ESL teacher's recommendations before registration for the 2006-2007 school year (for the freshmen), my recommendations as their high school ESL teacher (if they had me as a teacher the previous year), grades in all classes from the previous year, and standardized test scores. Standardized tests used to help in placement included the Test of Emerging Academic English (TEAE), the

Minnesota Basic Standards Writing Test (BST Writing), and the Minnesota Basic Standards Reading Test (BST Reading).

All of the students were in an ELL class during one class period of the school day for the entire school year. Seven of the participants spoke Hmong as a first language, and one student spoke Spanish as a first language. Three of the participants were in ninth grade, two were in tenth grade, and three were in eleventh grade. There were no twelfth grade students participating in this study. Six participants were boys and two were girls. All but one of the students (Antonio) were born in the United States and had lived here their entire lives. Table 3.3 lists the self-reported information about the participants, which was collected from the Student Information Questionnaire (Appendix A). I changed the participants' names to protect the students' identities.

Table 3.3: Participants

Participant	**First Language**	**Grade**	**Age**	**Years in ELL class**
Antonio	Spanish	9	15	8
Will	Hmong	9	15	7
Chia	Hmong	9	15	11
Sheng	Hmong	10	16	10
Xou	Hmong	10	16	10
Meng	Hmong	11	16	10
Kao	Hmong	11	16	10
Cheng	Hmong	11	17	9

The advanced ESL class met for 80 minutes every school day. The first semester of the year included interviewing classmates, giving speeches about partners, and writing short biographies about the partners which were published in the class "English Language Learners Yearbook", which each ELL received at the end of the year. The class read

various short stories and discussed and wrote reflections about these stories. They also read a play (*The Diary of Anne Frank*) aloud in class, listened to a tape-recording of the play, and watched a movie based on the play. After that unit, the students read *Daniel's Story*, a historical fiction book based on World War II and the Holocaust. Because these texts focused on real historical events, the students also learned and presented information about specific people, places, and events relating to World War II and the Holocaust. They also watched movies about these topics. Both units also included writing activities such as review questions, thought-provoking journal questions, diary entries about the students themselves, and vocabulary exercises, using words from the texts correctly in sentences.

Besides these theme-based reading and writing units, students wrote "Laws of Life" essays for a writing contest, which were graded for class. There were no assigned prompts for these essays, and students were encouraged to "write from the heart" about their experiences, values, and goals in life. In addition, time was spent instructing students about paragraph and essay organization, transitions, style, and content. Grammar mini-lessons with practice exercises were presented when needed based on the errors I saw in the students' drafts. However, direct teacher feedback on writing or grammar was limited as per contest requirements. Feedback from peers was allowed, but students did not often spontaneously ask each other for feedback.

Since many of the students would be taking standardized state tests in reading and writing in the spring, I gave the students short reading texts and questions in order to

prepare and practice for these tests. Similarly, time was spent writing expository essays from a prompt in order to practice for the standardized state writing tests.

My study took place during fourth term of the 2006-2007 school year (April and May). Students were informed that if they and their parents or guardians consented, they would be participating in a research study about peer feedback based on data collected from their writing samples and writing feedback completed in their ELL class. They were also told they would be completing questionnaires and I would be observing and making notes throughout the process. Students were told that no extra out-of-class work would be required of them to participate in the study because all work would be completed during regular class time. All students brought the consent letter (Appendix B) home and translated it for their parents. Each student had the attached consent form (Appendix C) signed by a parent or guardian and signed it themselves. Follow-up phone calls were also made to the parents to confirm participation. All members of the class participated in the activities described in the study, and all questionnaires, essays, and feedback logs were collected from all students. Students were given participation credit based on the completion of each activity in order to motivate them to actively participate.

Procedures and Materials

This section will describe the procedures, materials, and timeline used to gather data for the study. This research project consisted of five cycles (P, A, B, C, F). Table 3.4 displays the cycles.

Table 3.4: Data Collection Cycles

Cycle	Description
P	Pre-test
A	Indirect Feedback
B	Direct Feedback
C	Choice of Feedback (indirect, direct, self)
F	Final-test (post-test)

Cycle P was a pre-test cycle to collect an essay and questionnaire *before* instruction and implementation of peer feedback began in Cycles A, B, and C. After Cycle P, three cycles of essay writing and peer (or self) feedback were implemented. Cycle A consisted of writing and typing an essay, instruction and practice in students giving indirect feedback, implementation of indirect feedback given by peers on essays, feedback logs for writers to record errors and intended use of feedback, revisions of essays, and a follow-up questionnaire about giving and receiving indirect feedback. Cycle B was similar to Cycle A, but instead of *indirect* feedback, the instruction and activities were for giving and receiving *direct* feedback, and peer editors provided corrections of errors on the essays themselves. Cycle C consisted of writing and typing an essay, a questionnaire as to which kind of feedback each student wanted to give and receive in that cycle, implementation of the choice of feedback by either peers or self, feedback logs, and revisions of essays. Cycle F was the final cycle and like Cycle P included an essay and questionnaire *after* instruction and implementation of peer feedback in Cycles A, B, and C. Each cycle's materials were printed on different colors of paper for organizational purposes. Tables 3.5 through 3.9 display timelines of

procedures for each cycle. Each table gives the day and date of instruction, the place of instruction, the students' procedures, and the teacher's procedures.

Cycle P: Pre-testing Cycle

Cycle P was designed to collect data before the implementation of peer feedback in the classroom. This cycle took two days to complete. The procedures for each day in the cycle are first described, and then condensed into Table 3.5.

Day 1. Students filled out the Student Information Questionnaire (Appendix A), which collected background information about each student. Data collected included name, age, grade, the number of years living in the United States, and the number of years in ESL classes, as self-reported by the students. This information is included in Table 3.3.

Next, I told the students they would be writing an essay in class. Students were already familiar with writing a five-paragraph essay for a given prompt, so I reminded them that was what they would be expected to write.

In order to collect data on student writing, I designed prompt sheets and writing pages stapled into packets for each of the five cycles. These essay writing packets were modeled after the Minnesota State Basic Standards Test (BST) Writing booklets. Ideas for the prompts chosen for this study came from past BST prompts found on the Minnesota Department of Education website. All the prompts I chose required students to use the past tense. Each prompt page contained the directions for writing the essay, the prompt, and a checklist of writing reminders as on the actual BST.

Prompt P (Appendix D) was the first prompt used and read: "Tell about one challenging experience you had in your past. Explain why it was challenging for you and what you learned from the experience. Include details so your reader will understand your experience." I read the directions for writing the essay, the prompt, and the reminders aloud.

Stapled after the prompt page were six writing pages, which were also modeled after the BST booklets. These pages were the same for each cycle. A prewriting page (Appendix E) contained 27 lines in an outlined box. The prewriting pages are not scored on an actual test and are to be used for outlines, webs, notes, and ideas to plan and practice the final essay. A final writing page (Appendix F) was designed identical to the prewriting page. Three final writing pages were included in each packet. The final writing pages are scored for an actual test. Students must not write more than three pages for the final scored essay. For the state writing tests, students must not write outside the box or those words may not be looked at by the scorers, and their scores on a real test could be lowered. The pages I designed for my study allowed students to have practice and be familiar with this test format. For my study, the same limitations as the actual test were also used to allow students to understand the expectations for an actual test. I explained the prewriting and final pages to the students and allowed them to ask questions.

Before students began writing, I explained they would need to use a number 2 (wooden) pencil since it is required for state tests. Mechanical pencils (plastic) were not

allowed for writing the essays because they are not allowed for state tests, and I wanted students to get used to writing these essays with wooden pencils.

Furthermore, before writing, I asked the students to think of this opportunity as an important testing situation and write their best. In order to get the students to take the writing seriously, I also reminded them they were receiving participation points for their work. I informed them that they would have unlimited time for the state writing test, but for my study, the writing time would be limited to the rest of the 80-minute class period.

Students were given about 70 minutes to write an essay for Prompt P, but actual time spent writing varied for each student. The time each student spent writing was not recorded, however, because specific time spent on each essay by each individual student was not examined for this study. Initially, I intended to use P essays as a pre-test measure of students' accuracy on selected structures, but by the end of the study and after administering the post-test essays (F), I realized that this was beyond the scope of my research questions, and therefore I dropped this aspect of the study.

Day 2. I handed out Questionnaire P (Appendix G) and asked students to answer the questions on their own, which took about 20 minutes during class. Questionnaire P was designed to collect data on the students' preferences, perceptions, and attitudes about writing feedback *before* the implementation of peer feedback. Some of the questions in Questionnaire P were taken from studies in my literature review. (See Literature Review and Results chapters for specifics about questions.) I wrote the other questions based on my own curiosity about the preferences, perceptions, and attitudes of my students about

writing feedback. As the students finished the questionnaires, they were collected. Table 3.5 summarizes the procedures for Cycle P.

Table 3.5: Cycle P: Pre-testing Cycle Procedures

Day	**Date**	**Place**	**Students' Procedures**	**Teacher's Procedures**
1	April 4	classroom	Students filled out Student Information Questionnaire. Students used Prompt P packets to write P essays.	Teacher collected Student Information Questionnaire. Teacher collected P essays.
2	April 5	classroom	Students answered Questionnaire P.	Teacher collected Questionnaire P.

Cycle A: Indirect Feedback Cycle

Cycle A collected data on indirect feedback and took seven days to complete. The procedures for each day in the cycle are first described in paragraphs, and then condensed into Table 3.6.

Day 3. Students were given the Prompt A packet. Prompt A (Appendix H) was: "Who did you admire when you were younger? Tell about that person and explain why he or she was special to you. Include details so your reader will understand your choice." I read the directions, prompt, and reminders aloud and told the students they would have the rest of the class period to write, which was approximately 70 minutes. Time spent writing for each student varied but was not specifically recorded. Students turned in the Prompt A packets as they finished.

Day 4. Students went to the computer lab to type their handwritten essays (A1). Because of my past experience in peer-editing activities using handwritten work, I decided peer feedback would need to be given on typed essays since many students

cannot read the handwriting of their peers. Students were required to type their own work and could change (correct, add, or delete) their original handwritten copy (A1) as they typed. They were allowed to use any Microsoft Word tools (spell-check, thesaurus, grammar-check) that they wished to use. They could also use the Internet if needed. Since these tools were available for their use, and I had always encouraged students to use them in the past, I considered it the first step in the editing process. (The effects of using computer editing tools were not examined in this study, as they did not relate to the research questions of this study.) However, the students were asked not to get help from peers in the lab. I told them that they would have the chance to get and give peer feedback in another class period, but that the work up until that point should be theirs only. I also told them that I would not help them with any writing or grammar questions, but I would help them with computer or formatting questions.

Before this class period, I made a list of the students and created five-digit codes for each of them. At the end of the class period, the students typed the following information in the upper right-hand corner of the first page of their essays: 1) Writer: followed by the code I gave them, 2) Editor: with a blank space to be filled in by me later when making peer matches, 3) ESSAY A2, and 4) the date. The students saved their work and each printed one copy and handed it in with their handwritten A1 essay packet.

Day 5. Because I was unable to schedule computer lab time for the beginning of the period and felt that students had rushed through typing and revising their A2 essays the previous day, I had them spend about 30 minutes editing their own A2 essays (still in

progress) in red pen. I told them that they needed to work alone. When our scheduled lab time arrived, I brought them to the lab to continue typing and revising and reminded them to use the copy they had just revised as well as their handwritten A1 if they were not finished typing.

At the end of the class period, students printed one copy of their essay to hand in to me. After class, I put the essays in a pile and randomly drew papers to make matches for peer editing. I wrote an editor code on each essay and recorded each writer and editor match in my journal. I held onto the students' essays until the first peer feedback session.

Day 6. Students were told they would be giving two different kinds of peer feedback on grammar (indirect and direct) for my study, so they would need to learn how to give both kinds of feedback. First, they would be learning how to give indirect feedback.

In order to teach the indirect and the direct feedback methods, I created two instructional packets. The Indirect Feedback Instructions and Exercises Packet (Appendix I) was used for Cycle A, and the Direct Feedback Instructions and Exercises Packet (Appendix J) was used for Cycle B. The instructional packets for each cycle were organized in the same way and included the same examples. Both included a cover page (page 1), which included a definition of either indirect or direct feedback and an explanation of the procedures for learning how to give either indirect or direct feedback.

Following the cover page were examples of errors that might be made and directions on how to give appropriate feedback. Types of errors included grammar,

punctuation, spelling, and capitalization. Enough space was provided for students to write in the feedback above the example sentences.

The last two pages in each packet contained a sample essay in response to Prompt A. This was an actual response from a sophomore student, which I found on the Minnesota Department of Education website. I typed the original handwritten response so it would be easier for the students to read and give feedback on. I kept the original errors made by the student, but I also added the types of errors I used for peer feedback training in the instructional packets.

On Day 6, students were given copies of the Indirect Feedback Instructions and Exercises Packet (Appendix I). I read the cover page aloud to the class and then led them through the directions and examples while soliciting answers from the students. Each page was projected on an overhead screen. Students were told to listen and mark the examples as explained by the teacher.

Then students were told to turn to the sample essay at the end of the packet. A copy of the essay was projected on the screen. I explained that the students would be giving and receiving indirect feedback on the essays they had just completed typing (A2) by following the directions in the packet, but first they would need some practice on a sample essay before they gave feedback to their peers. They were told that they would not be focusing on content or organization for this exercise, but would only be focusing on the types of errors included in the packet. I read the first sentence of the sample essay aloud and asked students to identify any errors. I modeled how to circle those errors on the sample essay projected on the overhead, while the students did the same on their

copies of the sample essay. Then I read the next sentence and elicited responses from the students about how each error should be marked with indirect feedback, and I wrote their suggestions on the overhead.

Next, I gave the students time in class to continue giving indirect feedback on the sample essay while I monitored their work and answered questions. When they were finished marking the sample essay, I asked the students to number the errors (circles) starting at the beginning of the essay. Each numbered and circled error counted as one "feedback unit" and would be recorded on the feedback logs. We went over the errors on the sample essay and how to mark each error before class ended.

Day 7. Students were given a copy of an A2 essay belonging to one of their classmates. The essays were randomly assigned and matches recorded by me. Only code numbers were on each essay; no student names were on the essays. Students were asked not to talk once the essays were handed out, and they were also asked not to try and figure out who wrote the essay and exclaim whose essay they had received. Students were told that they needed to work by themselves on the A2 essay they were given using the indirect grammar feedback method presented and practiced the day before. I reminded them to use their packets if they were unsure of what to do. As they finished, they went back and numbered each circled error. As each student finished giving indirect feedback, the essays were collected.

After all essays were collected, the students learned how to use an indirect feedback log. They were given the Indirect Feedback Log Directions (see Figure 3.1 and Appendix K) and an Indirect Feedback Log (Sample Essay) packet (see Figure 3.2 and

Appendix L). Figure 3.2 has been modified from the actual document used with the students because the original document was horizontal and did not fit on the page. Students were instructed to put the two pages side-by-side in front of them in order to understand the procedure for using the log.

Figure 3.1. Indirect Feedback Log Directions

INDIRECT FEEDBACK LOG DIRECTIONS

Column 1: Feedback Unit Number

Your peer editor circled each error he/she believes you made in your essay and numbered each feedback unit for you.
Write the number your editor wrote above the circled feedback unit in your essay in the column labeled "**Feedback Unit Number**."

Column 2: Write the correction you will make.

Your peer editor gave you indirect feedback on your essay by circling and/or drawing arrows where he or she thinks errors are.
Write the correction you will make for each Feedback Unit Number.
Write "No correction" if you will not correct anything for that Feedback Unit Number.

Column 3: Describe the correction you will make.

If you decide to make a correction based on your peer editor's indirect feedback, describe the correction you will make and describe what is incorrect. (Why are you making the correction?)

Column 4: Did I use the feedback in my revision?
Circle Yes or No.

Yes = I used the feedback.
No = I did not use the feedback.

Column 5: Circle the reason for using or not using the feedback.

1 = I used the feedback because I agree there was an error.
2 = I did not use the feedback because I do not believe there was an error.
3 = I did not use the feedback because I did not know how to correct the error.

I read the Indirect Feedback Log Directions aloud to the students and the Indirect Feedback Log (Sample Essay) was projected onto the overhead screen. I told them to find each column on the log as I read about it on the directions page. I had them take out their sample essays from the instructional packets in order to use them with the log. The Indirect Feedback Log (Sample Essay) was created with four examples of errors from the sample essay already typed in with corrections and descriptions. (See Figure 3.2 for the first two of these examples.) I asked them to circle "Yes" in the fourth column and "1" in fifth column for the four examples given because these were all errors the class had agreed they would use in a revision.

Figure 3.2. Indirect Feedback Log (Sample Essay) (Modified)

Feedback Unit Number	Write the correction you will make.	Describe the correction you will make. (Why are you making the correction?)	Did I use the feedback in my revision?	Circle the reason for using or not using the feedback.
1	did you	Wrong word order for a question	Yes No	1 2 3
2	?	Need question mark, not a period	Yes No	1 2 3
KEY for LAST COLUMN:		1 = I used the feedback because I agree there was an error. 2 = I did not use the feedback because I do not believe there was an error. 3 = I did not use the feedback because I did not know how to correct the error.		

I asked them to continue using their sample essays to fill in the log. I monitored the students to make sure everyone understood the procedure. When I felt the students had had enough practice filling in the sample feedback log and understood the procedure, I handed back the A2 essays to the writers along with an Indirect Feedback Log A2 packet (Appendix M), which consisted of five copies of the same page stapled together.

Students took the indirect grammar feedback given by their peers on the A2 essays and recorded on the logs the feedback unit numbers, corrections they would make, and descriptions of each correction. I told them to wait to fill in the last two columns until the next class period. I collected the A2 essays and logs from each student at the end of the period.

Day 8. Writers were given back their A2 essays and logs along with a red pen. They were told to use their logs to transfer corrections in red pen from their logs to their typed A2 essays so the changes would be easy to find when they revised their essays in the computer lab later in the period. I modeled this procedure on the overhead with the sample essay. As they corrected each error, I asked students to answer the questions in the fourth and fifth columns of their A2 logs regarding whether they incorporated the feedback from their peers and why or why not. I did not analyze whether or not the students actually incorporated the feedback units in essays A3, B3, and C3, so “used” on the logs actually means “intended to use”. That wording would have confused the students since at the time of recording the feedback units on the logs, they considered themselves “using” or “not using” the feedback. I also reminded them to use the key for the fifth column of the indirect feedback log.

When students were finished transferring corrections in red pen and filling in their logs, they returned to the computer lab. Before they started revising their A2 essays, I asked them to check and write down or type their word counts on their essays. When they finished typing revisions, they changed the heading in the upper-right hand corner to ESSAY A3, added the editor's code (which I had written on the A2 essays for them), and changed the word count if needed before printing three copies of the A3 essay to give to me. Originally I had intended to use the word counts in order to determine accuracy per 100 words of writing for each student. However, this was beyond the scope of the research questions. All essays and feedback logs were turned in at the end of the class period.

Day 9. Students took about 30 minutes to answer Questionnaire A (Appendix N), which asked questions about giving and receiving indirect feedback. Many of the questions used in this questionnaire were modeled after questions in Questionnaire P, but were targeted specifically to *indirect* writing feedback instead of feedback in general. All the questionnaires were collected. Table 3.6 summarizes the procedures for Cycle A.

Table 3.6: Cycle A: Indirect Feedback Cycle Procedures

Day	Date	Place	Students' Procedures	Teacher's Procedures
3	April 9	classroom	Students used Prompt A packets to write A1 essays.	Teacher collected A1 essays and held until next class.
4	April 10	lab	Students typed A1 essays. Students saved as ESSAY A2 on computer and printed one copy.	Teacher collected A1 and A2 essays (in progress) and held until next class.
5	April 11	classroom lab	Students self edited A2 essays (in progress) with pen. Students continued typing and revising A2 essays. Students printed one copy of A2 essays to give to teacher.	Teacher collected A1 and A2 essays. Teacher randomly assigned peer editors for essays and recorded matches in journal.
6	April 12	classroom	Students read Indirect Feedback Instructions and Exercises Packet aloud with teacher. Students practiced giving indirect feedback on sample essay.	
7	April 13	classroom	Students gave indirect feedback to peers on A2 essays. Students practiced recording feedback on the Indirect Feedback Log (Sample Essay). Writers recorded feedback for A2 essays on A2 logs.	Teacher collected peer-edited A2 essays and A2 logs.
8	April 16	classroom lab	Writers used red pen and logs to correct A2 essays and finish logs. Students revised A2 essays on computer. Students saved as ESSAY A3 on computer and printed three copies to give to teacher.	Teacher collected A2 essays, A2 logs, and three copies of A3 essays.
9	April 17	classroom	Students answered Questionnaire A.	Teacher collected Questionnaire A.

Cycle B: Direct Feedback Cycle

One week (five class days) elapsed between Cycle A and Cycle B because two students in the class were on a field trip out-of-state. Cycle B repeated almost the same procedures as Cycle A. However, Cycle B used direct feedback.

Day 10. Students were given the Prompt B packet. Prompt B (Appendix O) was: "Think of your favorite place to play when you were a child. Describe this place and explain why it was your favorite. Include details so your reader will understand your choice." As I did for Prompt A in Cycle A, I read the directions, prompt, and reminders aloud and told the students they would have the rest of the class period to write, which was approximately 60 minutes. This was ten minutes less writing time than for Prompt A because students had a hard time settling down after lunch on this day (for reasons unknown.) As in Cycle A, time spent writing for each student varied but was not specifically recorded. Students turned in the Prompt B packets as they finished.

Day 11. Students were given their handwritten essays (B1) and brought to the computer lab to type those essays. Procedures continued as in Day 4 of Cycle A except they labeled their essays "ESSAY B2".

Day 12. Only three students were present in class on this day because of a bomb threat that was made on the school. Because it was encouraged that teachers proceed with class as normal, I decided to go on with the original plan for the day with those three students. I had the students stay in the classroom for about 30 minutes to self-edit their own B2 essays in red pen and told them to work alone. Then they went to the computer

lab to continue typing and revising, using both the handwritten B1 and the B2 copy edited in red pen. Students each printed one copy of their essays to hand in to me.

Day 13. The five students that were absent on Day 12 repeated what the other three students had already done. The other three students were allowed to continue working on their essays if they wished, but none of them did. The five students each printed one copy of their essays to hand in to me.

Day 14. Students were given copies of the Direct Feedback Instructions and Exercises Packet (Appendix J). As on Day 6 in Cycle A, I read the packet aloud to them and elicited answers as we went through the instructions and exercises together. As in Cycle A, students used the same sample essay in packet B to practice giving direct feedback. I allowed the students to work on the sample essay alone or with the help of their classmates since students were very talkative that day. Because I felt some of the students were being lazy during the practice time and not taking the exercise very seriously, as noted in my journal, at the end of the class period I collected the packets and reviewed the feedback given on the sample essay by each student to check for understanding and to give participation points based on effort.

Day 15. I handed back the instructional packets and sample essays and reminded students to mark each error carefully and to circle and number each error when finished since I had noticed some students had done very sloppy work and had not numbered the feedback units on the sample essay. Before class I matched the students randomly and recorded the matches, as I had done in Cycle A. I told the students that they would be giving direct feedback on a peer's B2 essay. Again, I reminded them not to talk or

exclaim whose essays they had received if they think they had figured it out. The students gave direct feedback on the B2 essays and handed them back to me.

When all students finished giving feedback, I handed out the Direct Feedback Log Directions (Appendix P) and Direct Feedback Log (Sample Essay) (Appendix Q) and told them to read it quietly to themselves and note the changes in the key for column five (see Figure 3. 3) for the last column, which was a bit different from the log they had used for Cycle A because another option (number 2) was added.

Figure 3.3: Key for Column Five of Direct Feedback Log (Sample Essay)

KEY for column five:
1 = I used the exact feedback my peer editor wrote because I agree there was an error.
2 = I did not use the exact feedback my peer editor wrote, but the feedback was helpful and I corrected the error in my own way.
3 = I did not use the feedback because I do not believe there was an error. (I believe the feedback was incorrect.)
4 = I did not use the feedback because I did not know how to correct the error. (I believe there is an error, but I just did not know how to use the feedback to correct it.)

Students insisted that they understood the difference between indirect and direct feedback and begged not to fill out the log for the sample essay again. I agreed to this request, as the results would have been similar to the log they had already filled out for Cycle A, and handed out the B2 essays and a Direct Feedback Log B2 (Appendix R) to the writers after all the editors finished giving direct feedback. Each Direct Feedback Log B2 was a packet of five of the same pages stapled together.

Since each B2 essay already had feedback (errors marked and corrected) given by the peer editor written on it, each writer had to determine if he or she would use the direct feedback given by the peer editor. The writers would have to use the key to circle the

reason for using or not using the feedback they were given for each error. Students did not finish filling in the B2 logs, so they were told they would complete them the next day in class. I collected the essays and logs at the end of the class period.

Day 16. Students used about 30 minutes to complete the B2 logs. As the students finished, I instructed them to use pink highlighters to highlight the feedback they decided to use so they could find revisions easily when we went to the computer lab. I had them use pink highlighters because the feedback was already written on the essays by the editors, and if they used the feedback, they would not need to rewrite it on the B2 essay. However, I told them if they had other corrections or changes they wished to make that were different from the feedback the editors had given them, they should write the corrections in red pen first and then highlight those as well. As they examined each feedback unit and highlighted the ones they would use, I asked students to answer the questions in columns four and five of their B2 logs regarding whether they used the feedback from their peers and why or why not. As in Cycle A, "used" is actually "intended to use," since students had not yet revised the B3 essays. I reminded them to use the key for the last column.

The students went to the computer lab and revised their essays using their B2 essays. When they were finished typing corrections, they changed the heading in the upper-right hand corner to ESSAY B3, added the editor's code (which I had written on the B2 essays for them), and changed the word count if needed before printing three copies of the B3 essay to give to me. All essays and feedback logs were turned in at the end of the class period.

Day 18. The students were very hyper and off-task on this day, as noted in my journal. I think they were tired and hot from playing outside after lunch and could not concentrate. They would not stop talking, so I offered to read Questionnaire B (Appendix S) aloud while they answered the questions, which they gladly accepted. Questionnaire B asked questions about giving and receiving direct feedback. The questions were similar to Questionnaire A, but were specific to *direct* writing feedback instead of *indirect* writing feedback. This consistency in questioning allowed me to discover similarities and differences between students' preferences, perceptions, and attitudes about indirect and direct writing feedback from peers. All the questionnaires were collected. Table 3.7 summarizes the procedures for Cycle B.

Table 3.7: Cycle B: Direct Feedback Cycle Procedures

Day	**Date**	**Place**	**Students' Procedures**	**Teacher's Procedures**
10	April 25	classroom	Students used Prompt B packets to write B1 essays.	Teacher collected B1essays and held until next class.
11	April 26	lab	Students typed B1 essays. Students saved as ESSAY B2 on computer and printed one copy.	Teacher collected B1 and B2 essays (in progress) and held until next class.
12	April 27	classroom lab	Students self-edited and revised B2 essays (in progress) with red pen. (Only three students in class.) Students continued typing and revising B2 essays. Students printed one copy of B2 essays to give to teacher.	Teacher collected B1 and B2 essays.
13	April 30	classroom lab	Students (the other five) self-edited and revised B2 essays (in progress) with red pen. Students continued typing and revising B2 essays. Students printed one copy of B2 essays to give to teacher.	Teacher collected B1 and B2 essays. Teacher randomly assigned peer editors for essays and recorded matches in journal.

Day	Date	Place	Students' Procedures	Teacher's Procedures
15	May 2	classroom	Students gave direct feedback on B2 essays. Writers recorded feedback on B2 essays on B2 logs, but some students did not finish.	Teacher collected peer-edited B2 essays and B2 logs.
16	May 7	classroom lab	Writers finished B2 logs and used pink highlighters to mark corrections they planned to use. Students revised B2 essays on computer. Students saved as ESSAY B3 on computer and printed three copies to give to teacher.	Teacher collected B2 essays, B2 logs, and three copies of B3 essays.
18	May 10	classroom	Students answered Questionnaire B.	Teacher collected Questionnaire B.

Cycle C: Choice of Feedback Cycle

Cycle C proceeded in the same way as Cycles A and B but without the training on how to give feedback. Students chose what kind of feedback they wanted to receive and give on their essays in this cycle.

Day 17. Students were given Questionnaire C (Appendix T), which was a one-page checklist to record what kind of feedback each student preferred to receive and give on the next essay (C2). First, the questionnaire offered the choice of *receiving* indirect feedback from a peer, direct feedback from a peer, or no feedback from a peer (self-edit). Then the questionnaire offered the choice of *giving* indirect feedback to a peer, direct feedback to a peer, or no feedback to a peer (self-edit). If a student chose to self-edit, he or she needed to choose it for both options because of the time spent giving feedback in class.

The students were given the option to self-edit in case they really did not believe the previous two cycles (A and B) of peer feedback had helped them improve the accuracy of their writing. I was interested to see if any students would choose this option after having the opportunity to use peer feedback. In case some students thought that the no feedback/self-edit option meant less work for them, Questionnaire C also explained that they would still be doing all the assigned work as everyone else. In other words, they would be required to edit their own work and fill out a feedback log like the other students using peer feedback. The results of this questionnaire were then used to assign peer editors for the C2 essays. Naturally, those who chose no feedback edited their own essays.

After answering Questionnaire C, students turned to the next page of the packet, which was Prompt C (Appendix U). Prompt C was: "Field trips are a good way to learn new things. Describe a field trip that you went on and what you learned from the trip. Include details so your reader will understand your choice." I read the prompt and directions aloud. Students used the rest of the class period to write the essay. Most of the students did not finish writing the whole essay and were told that they would complete the essay while they were in the computer lab the next day.

Day 18. I returned Questionnaire C to the students and asked them to explain next to each of their choices what made them decide to choose each kind of feedback to give and receive. I decided to do this because I was surprised at the results of the questionnaire, which revealed that three students chose self-feedback and the other five chose to give and receive direct feedback. I expected more students to want to give

indirect feedback because it was less work than direct feedback. I was curious about why they had made the choices they had. After they had written down their explanations and returned the questionnaires to me, they finished typing and revising their C2 essays. Students printed one copy of what they completed in class and gave all documents to me.

Day 19. Students continued typing and revising the C2 essays and each printed one copy for me.

Day 20. Before class, I arbitrarily matched the five students who chose to give and receive direct feedback. The other three students chose to self-edit. I labeled all C2 essays with the kind of feedback the writer wished to receive (direct feedback or self-edit). I told the students to refer to their instructional packets from Cycle B for directions if they were unsure how to give feedback, but gave them brief reminders of what to do. I also reminded them when they were finished giving feedback or self-editing, they needed to start at the beginning of the paper and circle all errors with corrections and number them accordingly. Then I distributed the C2 essays and the students gave feedback. Students who had chosen self-feedback were given back their own essays.

When the students finished giving feedback, I collected the C2 essays and redistributed them to the writers and handed out the Direct Feedback Log C2 packet (Appendix V). This log was the same format as the log used for Cycle B. I had also originally created an Indirect Feedback Log C2 in case students chose that option, but no students did, so it was not used in Cycle C. The writers filled in the logs for their essays. The students who chose to self-edit also filled in logs for their essays.

Day 21. Students went to the computer lab to revise the C2 essays with their feedback logs. When they were finished typing revisions, they changed the heading in the upper-right hand corner to ESSAY C3, added the editor's code (which I had written on the C2 essays for them), and changed the word count if needed before printing three copies of the C3 essay to give to me. All essays and feedback logs were turned in at the end of the class period. Table 3.8 summarizes the procedures for Cycle C.

Table 3.8: Cycle C: Choice of Feedback Cycle Procedures

Day	**Date**	**Place**	**Students' Procedures**	**Teacher's Procedures**
17	May 8	classroom	Students answered Questionnaire C. Students used Prompt C packets to write C1 essays	Teacher collected Questionnaire C and C1 essays and held until next class.
18	May 10	lab	Students wrote why they made their choices for Questionnaire C. Students typed C1 essays. Students saved as ESSAY C2 on computer and printed one copy.	Teacher distributed again and collected Questionnaire C and C1 and C2 essays (in progress) and held until next class.
19	May 11	lab	Students continued typing and revising C2 essays. Students printed one copy to give to teacher.	Teacher collected C1 and C2 essays. Teacher randomly assigned peer editors for those who chose peer feedback.
20	May 14	classroom	Students gave requested feedback to a peer or self-edited C2 essays. Writers recorded feedback for C2 essays on C2 logs.	Teacher collected C2 essays with logs.
21	May 16	lab	Students revised C2 essays on computer. Students saved changes as ESSAY C3 on computer and printed three copies to give to teacher.	Teacher collected C2 essays, C2 logs, and three copies of C3 essays.

Cycle F: Final (Post-test) Cycle

Cycle F was a cycle designed to collect data after the implementation of peer feedback in the classroom. This cycle took only one day to complete.

Day 22. Questionnaire F (Appendix W) was given to the students to measure students' final preferences, perceptions, and attitudes about writing feedback to see if these had changed since the beginning of the study. This questionnaire was almost exactly like Questionnaire P given at the beginning of the study, so comparisons on specific questions would be easy to make. I offered to read the questionnaire aloud as I had done in Cycle B, but students preferred to read and answer the questions on their own. After they answered the pre-printed questions on Questionnaire F, I had them answer some open-ended questions on the back of the packet. I asked these questions aloud. They were:

1. What do you think you learned from giving peer feedback?
2. What do you think you learned from receiving peer feedback?
3. Are there any specific grammar, mechanical, or other mistakes you used to make, but now do not, because of feedback that you received from your peers or gave to your peers?

Unfortunately, a lot of the students did not write anything because they said they did not know what to write, so I could not use this data as part of my research. I believe they were tired of answering questions at this point as well, as I noted in my journal. When students finished answering the questionnaires, they handed them in. Next, I handed out the Prompt F (Appendix X) packets, which would be their final (post-test)

essay for the study. The prompt was: "In Essay P you told about one challenging experience you had in your past. Tell about another (different) challenging experience you had in your past. (Do not write about the same experience you wrote about in Essay P!) Explain why it was challenging for you and what you learned from the experience. Include details so your reader will understand your experience." Students were given the rest of the class period to write the essay, but many students finished quickly. When they felt they were finished, they turned in the essays. These essays did not receive feedback by peers, but were intended to be used as a post-test measure of students' accuracy of selected grammatical structures to compare with errors made in Essay P, but this went beyond the scope of the study and therefore was not used. This completed the participation of the students in the study.

Table 3.9: Cycle F: Final (Post-test) Cycle Procedures

Day	**Date**	**Place**	**Students' Procedures**	**Teacher's Procedures**
22	May 17	classroom	Students answered Questionnaire F. Students used Prompt F packets to write F essays.	Teacher collected Questionnaire F and F essays.

Journal: Observational and Personal Notes

Throughout the study, I collected qualitative data in my journal in the form of observational and personal notes. This qualitative data allowed me to see the quantitative data I had collected from another perspective and to make connections and observations that would allow me to understand why or how certain results may have surfaced in the quantitative data.

I wrote anecdotal notes about what the students did and said and wrote my thoughts about how everything was proceeding in class while the students were answering the questionnaires, learning the peer feedback methods, writing, typing, and correcting their essays, and giving and receiving peer feedback. These notes provided insight on the process of peer feedback and the preferences, perceptions, and attitudes of the students about the different types of peer feedback. My own personal feelings I recorded about the process also provided valuable information from a teacher's perspective about using peer feedback in the ELL classroom.

Conclusion

This chapter explained the methods I used to explore the role of grammatical feedback by peers on essay writing in the high school advanced ELL classroom. The next chapter presents, analyzes, and discusses the results of my study.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of my study was to explore the role of grammatical feedback by peers on essay writing in the advanced English language learners' classroom. The five research questions were:

1. What are the students' preferences, perceptions, and attitudes about writing feedback before, during, and after the implementation of peer feedback in the classroom?
2. Given the choice, do students choose to give or receive indirect or direct grammatical feedback from peers, or do they choose to self-edit their essays?
3. To what extent do students *intend to use* peer feedback in the next revision of their essays, and what reasons do they give?
4. Is *indirect* or *direct* feedback given by peers used *more* by students in preparing to revise their essays?
5. How accurate is peer feedback?

This chapter presents, analyzes, and discusses the results of my study. There were three sources of data for the study: 1) the questionnaires administered before, during, and after the study, 2) the feedback logs and essays, and 3) my observations recorded in a journal during the study. The results pertaining to the research questions are divided into

four separate sections. In the first section, I present and discuss the results of Questionnaires P, A, B, and F (QP, QA, QB, QF) in order to answer Research Question #1. In the second section, I present and discuss the data from Questionnaire C (QC) in order to answer Research Question #2. The third section presents and discusses the results of the feedback logs and essays in order to answer Research Questions #3 and #4 about feedback intended to be used. The fourth section explores Research Question #5 about the accuracy of feedback. Observations recorded in my journal are presented and discussed throughout the four sections where appropriate. Student names are used when unique data are presented.

Research Question #1

Four questionnaires (QP, QA, QB, QF) were administered in order to explore student preferences, perceptions, and attitudes about writing feedback before, during, and after the implementation of peer feedback in the classroom. Questionnaire P (QP) was administered before implementation of peer feedback in the classroom began. Questionnaire A (QA) was administered after indirect feedback was given and received in the classroom. Questionnaire B (QB) was administered after direct feedback was given and received in the classroom. Questionnaire F (QF) was administered at the very end of the study. The research question I attempted to answer by examining these questionnaires was:

1. What are the students' preferences, perceptions, and attitudes about writing feedback before, during, and after the implementation of peer feedback in the classroom?

First, I describe the process of data analysis for this research question. Then I present and discuss the results of the data analysis.

Data Analysis: Questionnaires P, A, B, and F (QP, QA, QB, QF)

I designed Questionnaires P, A, B, and F to be similar in order to be able to compare and contrast answers given by the students before, during, and after the implementation of peer feedback in the study. All questionnaires were collected and responses tabulated and recorded. In presenting the results of the questionnaires, I grouped exact or similar questions together whenever possible for easier analysis. I have not included every question from every questionnaire in the results because I realized that some questions were not particularly relevant to the scope of this capstone. Also, after examining the responses to some of the questions, I realized that some questions were poorly worded and could have been misinterpreted. Therefore, I have only included questions from the questionnaires which are relevant to Research Question #1. I have organized this section of the chapter into five subsections based on the topics of the questions asked on the questionnaires. The subsections are:

1. Student Perceptions and Attitudes about Teacher Feedback
2. Student Perceptions and Preferences of Teacher versus Peer Feedback
3. Student Preferences, Perceptions, and Attitudes about *Receiving* Peer Feedback
4. Student Preferences, Perceptions, and Attitudes about *Giving* Peer Feedback
5. Student Opinions about Using Feedback Logs

Student Perceptions and Attitudes about Teacher Feedback

Although my study focused on peer feedback, not teacher feedback, two questions on Questionnaire P (QP) and Questionnaire F (QF) asked about teacher feedback in order to see if attitudes toward teacher feedback would change positively or negatively over the course of the study, perhaps as a result of students' feelings about peer feedback. This subsection presents and discusses the data on student perceptions and attitudes about teacher feedback.

QP/QF #1 asked, "In your opinion, how helpful is teacher feedback in improving your writing?" Students were asked to circle only one of four choices: "very helpful", "somewhat helpful", "only a little helpful", or "not at all helpful". This question was modeled after Weaver's (1995) study. Before the implementation of peer feedback in the classroom, all eight students found teacher feedback either "very helpful" (5) or "somewhat helpful" (3). However, after the implementation of peer feedback in the classroom, only two students found teacher feedback to be "very helpful", while five students found teacher feedback to be "somewhat helpful". In addition, after the implementation of peer feedback, one student found teacher feedback "only a little helpful", whereas no students had given that response before the implementation of peer feedback. No students answered that teacher feedback was "not at all helpful" on either questionnaire. Table 4.1 shows the frequencies of student responses to the question.

Table 4.1: Student Responses to QP/QF #1
In your opinion, how helpful is teacher feedback in improving your writing?

	QP	QF
Very helpful	5	2
Somewhat helpful	3	5
Only a little helpful	0	1
Not at all helpful	0	0

The second question about teacher feedback (QP/QF #5) asked, “Do you like receiving writing feedback from your teacher?” Students were asked to circle either “yes” or “no”. Tallying the responses for this question became problematic because two students did not answer the questions properly. Therefore, I had to make a decision whether to count a response based on the second part of the question (the follow-up asking why or why not). Xou did not answer the question on QP, but follow-up responses were positive, so “yes” was counted as a response. Antonio circled both “yes” and “no” for responses on QF. In his case, however, follow-up responses were split equally between positive and negative comments. Therefore, I counted his response as both “yes” and “no” in the tabulation. Before and after using peer feedback in my study, all eight students liked receiving writing feedback from their teacher. Only Antonio responded with both possible answers at the end of the study. Table 4.2 shows the frequencies of student responses to this question.

Table 4.2: Student Responses to QP/QF #5
Do you like receiving writing feedback from your teacher?

	QP	QF
Yes	8	8
No	0	1

The second part of this question was a follow-up which asked why students liked or did not like receiving writing feedback from their teacher. Students were given five positive and five negative statements about teacher feedback and asked to circle all statements that were true. The two most frequently chosen positive responses on both QP and QF (when combining totals) reveal students thought the teacher knows more than

they do, so they trusted the teacher's comments (15 responses total), and students felt good about their writing after receiving feedback from their teacher (13 responses total). Students were also given the option to add additional comments about receiving teacher feedback. These additional responses were counted as positive, negative, or not relevant when I tallied the responses to this question. Only Chia added a comment on QP, but it was not relevant to the question and was therefore disregarded. Kao was the only student who added a comment on QF, and it was counted as a positive comment. Before using peer feedback in my study (QP), students had 31 positive responses and only 1 negative response. However, at the end of my study (QF), students gave 27 positive responses and 5 negative responses to teacher feedback. Positive responses decreased and negative responses increased from the beginning to the end of the study. This suggests that implementation of peer feedback in the classroom may have influenced the attitude toward teacher feedback in a negative way. Table 4.3 is split into positive and negative statements and shows frequencies of student responses to the given statements, as well as total positive and negative responses on QP and QF.

Table 4.3: Student Responses to QP/QF #5 Follow-up Question
Why or why not?

Positive Responses	QP	QF	Negative Responses	QP	QF
I think the teacher knows more than I do, so I trust the teacher's comments.	7	8	I do *not* think the teacher knows more than I do, so I do *not* trust the teacher's comments.	0	0
I feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my teacher.	8	5	I do *not* feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my teacher.	0	1
I can figure out what to do next with my writing when I receive writing feedback from my teacher.	7	5	I can *not* figure out what to do next with my writing when I receive writing feedback from my teacher.	0	1
I understand my teacher's feedback because I can read my teacher's handwriting.	5	4	I can *not* understand my teacher's feedback because I can *not* read my teacher's handwriting.	0	2
I understand my teacher's feedback because I understand the marks or symbols that my teacher uses on my paper.	4	4	I can *not* understand my teacher's feedback because I do *not* understand the marks or symbols that my teacher uses on my paper.	1	1
Additional positive comments	0	1	Additional negative comments	0	0
Total positive responses	**31**	**27**	**Total negative responses**	**1**	**5**

In summary, students had very positive responses to teacher feedback at the beginning of the study. At the end of the study, responses were still more positive than negative, although negative responses toward teacher feedback did increase. This suggests that even though teacher feedback was not given throughout this study, the implementation of peer feedback may have influenced the attitude toward teacher feedback negatively.

Student Perceptions and Preferences of Teacher versus Peer Feedback

This subsection examines two questions about teacher versus peer feedback in order to see if the perceptions and preferences about *who* gives feedback changed from

the beginning to the end of the study. QP/QF #3 asked, "Which kind of feedback is more helpful in improving your writing?" Students were asked to circle either "teacher" or "peer" as a response. This same question was used in a study by Zhang (1995). In my study, before peer feedback was implemented, seven students chose teacher feedback, and only one student (Chia) chose peer feedback as being more helpful in improving writing. However, in the final questionnaire, all eight students chose teacher feedback. Table 4.4 shows the frequencies of student responses to this question.

Table 4.4: Student Responses to QP/QF #3
Which kind of feedback is more helpful in improving your writing?

	QP	QF
Teacher	7	8
Peer	1	0

QP/QF #4 asked, "If you had a choice between *teacher* feedback or *peer* feedback, which would you choose?" This question was also modeled after a question in a study by Zhang (1995). Students were asked to circle either "teacher" or "peer". The responses to this question show that there was a shift of one "peer" response from QP (from 2 to 1) to "teacher" (from 6 to 7) on QF. Chia changed her answer from "peer" to "teacher," which was consistent with her change in the previous question. Only Meng chose "peer" over "teacher" feedback at the beginning of the study and at the end of the study. The results of this question are interesting since the results of the previous question show all eight students at the end of the study found teacher feedback to be more helpful than peer feedback in improving their writing. One would think that if a student found teacher feedback to be more helpful, that he or she would also choose teacher feedback over peer feedback when given a choice between the two. However, *improvement in*

writing may not have been the reason the students decided to choose peer feedback on either questionnaire. Perhaps students who chose peer feedback were thinking about enjoying the process of using peer feedback instead of improvement in writing. Table 4.5 shows the frequencies of student responses to this question.

Table 4.5: Student Responses to QP/QF #4
If you had a choice between *teacher* feedback or *peer* feedback, which would you choose?

	QP	QF
Teacher	6	7
Peer	2	1

In summary, the majority of students perceived teacher feedback to be more helpful in improving writing than peer feedback both before and after the study. Most students would choose teacher feedback over peer feedback if given a choice between the two. Overall, teacher feedback became more favorable over peer feedback at the end of the study. This is interesting since in the previous subsection on *only* teacher feedback, responses toward teacher feedback became slightly more negative at the end of the study.

Student Preferences, Perceptions, and Attitudes about *Receiving* Peer Feedback

The majority of the questions on the questionnaires focused on student preferences, perceptions, and attitudes about receiving *peer* feedback. This subsection presents the data from the questions regarding *receiving* peer feedback.

QP/QF #2 asked, “In your opinion, how helpful is peer feedback in improving your writing?” This question was modeled after QP/QF #1 about teacher feedback and improvement in writing in order to compare the responses. Students were asked to circle one of four choices, which were the same as in QP/QF #1: “very helpful”, “somewhat

helpful", "only a little helpful", and "not at all helpful". Before the implementation of peer feedback in the classroom, all eight students found peer feedback "somewhat helpful" (7) or "only a little helpful" (1). After the implementation of peer feedback, "somewhat helpful" (5) remained the majority answer. One student found peer feedback "very helpful", while an additional student found peer feedback to be "only a little helpful" (2). Table 4.6 shows the frequencies of student responses to this question.

Table 4.6: Student Responses to QP/QF #2
In your opinion, how helpful is peer feedback in improving your writing?

	QP	QF
Very helpful	0	1
Somewhat helpful	7	5
Only a little helpful	1	2
Not at all helpful	0	0

When comparing QP/QF #2 to the same question about teacher feedback (QP/QF #1), it appears that before peer feedback was implemented, teacher feedback was considered more helpful in improving writing. However, after peer feedback was implemented in the classroom, five students found both teacher and peer feedback to be "somewhat helpful", although there were still more positive responses for teacher feedback being more helpful overall (8).

The first questions on both Questionnaire A (QA) and Questionnaire B (QB) (QA/QB #1) were modeled after the same questions on QP and QF and gave the same four choices. QA asked, "In your opinion, how helpful was receiving *indirect* feedback in improving your writing?" QB asked the same question except about *direct* feedback: "In your opinion, how helpful was receiving *direct* feedback in improving your writing?" Students were asked to circle one of four choices on both questionnaires: "very helpful",

"somewhat helpful", "only a little helpful", and "not at all helpful". On both questionnaires, Chia did not answer the question, but most of her responses to the next questions were negative, so I counted "not at all helpful" in both cases. Overall, the students believed direct feedback was more helpful than indirect feedback in improving their writing since direct feedback was found to be "very helpful" by half of the students (4), while no students found indirect feedback "very helpful", but half the students (4) found it "somewhat helpful." Table 4.7 shows the frequencies of student responses to these questions.

Table 4.7: Student Responses to QA/QB #1
QA: In your opinion, how helpful was receiving *indirect* feedback in improving your writing?
QB: In your opinion, how helpful was receiving *direct* feedback in improving your writing?

	QA	QB
Very helpful	0	4
Somewhat helpful	4	1
Only a little helpful	3	2
Not at all helpful	1	1

QP/QF #6 asked, "Do you like receiving writing feedback from your peers?" This question was modeled after the question about teacher feedback (QP/QF #5). Students were asked to circle either "yes" or "no". Will did not answer the question, but responses to the follow-up question of why or why not were positive, so "yes" was counted as a response. Before the implementation of peer feedback, seven students responded "yes", but this decreased to six "yes" responses after implementation. One student answered "no" before peer feedback was used in the classroom, whereas two students answered "no" after peer feedback was implemented. When comparing this question to the same one about teacher feedback (QP/QF #5), teacher feedback appears better received than

peer feedback, since all eight students liked receiving teacher feedback both before and after the study, and only six liked receiving peer feedback after the study.

QA and QB asked similar questions, but specifically about the *indirect* or *direct* writing feedback students received from peers in Cycle A and Cycle B. QA #2 asked, "Did you like receiving *indirect* writing feedback from your peer?" QB #2 asked, "Did you like receiving *direct* writing feedback from your peer?" Students were asked to circle either "yes" or "no". Again, one student on each questionnaire did not answer the question. Meng did not answer the question on QA but had positive responses to the follow-up question, so "yes" was counted as a response. Antonio did not answer the question on QB but had negative responses to the follow-up question, so "no" was counted as a response. On both QA and QB, six students responded that they liked receiving feedback from their peers, while two students responded that they did *not* like receiving feedback. There was no difference in preferences for receiving indirect or direct feedback from a peer. These results were exactly the same for QF. Table 4.8 shows the frequencies of student responses for all four questionnaires.

Table 4.8: Student Responses for QP/QF #6 and QA/QB #2
QP/QF: Do you like receiving writing feedback from your peers?
QA: Did you like receiving *indirect* writing feedback from your peer?
QB: Did you like receiving *direct* writing feedback from your peer?

	QP	QA	QB	QF
Yes	7	6	6	6
No	1	2	2	2

A follow-up question to QP/QF #6 and QA/QB #2 asked students to circle all reasons why they liked or did not like receiving peer feedback. Five positive and five negative statements were provided for students to circle on QP, QA, and QF. Only four positive and

four negative statements were provided on QB because the last two statements about “marks or symbols” on QA did not apply to Cycle B in which students gave direct feedback. (See Table 4.9 for statements.) A blank line for students to add other comments was also provided. Before receiving peer feedback (QP), 100% (24/24) of the responses were positive. After receiving indirect feedback (QA), 74% (17/23) of the responses were positive, while 26% (6/23) were negative. After receiving direct feedback (QB), 68% (13/19) of the responses were positive, and 32% (6/19) were negative. On the final questionnaire (QF), 70% (14/20) of the responses were positive, and 30% (6/20) were negative. Table 4.9 shows the frequencies of student responses for the follow-up questions on all four questionnaires. Note that on QP the questions were written in the present tense and on QA and QB the questions were written in the past tense. The present tense only is used in Table 4.9 for the sake of readability.

Table 4.9: Student Responses to QP/QF #6 Follow-up and QA/QB #2 Follow-up
Why or why not?

Positive Responses	**QP**	**QA**	**QB**	**QF**	**Total**
I think my peers know more than I do, so I trust my peer's comments.	2	1	2	1	6
I feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my peers.	6	3	2	3	14
I can figure out what to do next with my writing when I receive writing feedback from my peers.	7	4	5	3	19
I understand my peers' feedback because I can read my peers' handwriting.	4	4	4	3	15
I understand my peers' feedback because I understand the marks or symbols that my peers use on my paper.	4	5	n/a	2	11
Additional positive comments	1	0	0	2	3
Total positive responses	**24**	**17**	**13**	**14**	**109**

Negative Responses	**QP**	**QA**	**QB**	**QF**	**Total**
I think my peers do *not* know more than I do, so I do *not* trust my peer's comments.	0	1	2	2	5
I do *not* feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my peers.	0	1	1	1	3
I can *not* figure out what to do next with my writing when I receive writing feedback from my peers.	0	1	0	0	1
I can *not* understand my peers' feedback because I can *not* read my peers' handwriting.	0	1	2	1	4
I can *not* understand my peers' feedback because I do *not* understand the marks or symbols that my peers use on my paper.	0	1	n/a	2	3
Additional negative comments	0	1	1	0	2
Total negative responses	**0**	**6**	**6**	**6**	**18**

According to the responses to these questions, the students were very positive about peer feedback before implementing it in the classroom, but became successively more negative with each implementation until the end of the study. Before implementation, 100% of the responses were positive, and this decreased to 74% after indirect feedback was implemented. No students had negative responses about peer feedback before

implementation in the classroom, but the number of negative responses increased to 26% after peer feedback was implemented in Cycle A. Total positive responses decreased by another 6% to 68% after direct feedback was used. However, by the end of the study, positive responses to peer feedback increased slightly again and were still higher (70%) than negative responses (30%). When examining specific responses, the most frequently selected positive response overall was that students could figure out what to do next with feedback they received from their peers (19). However, from QP to QA, the frequency of responses for that statement decreased more than half, from seven to three. The second and third highest frequencies of responses overall were that students could understand their peers' feedback because they could read the handwriting (15) and students felt good about their writing after receiving feedback from their peers (14). The most frequently selected negative responses included not trusting peers' comments (5) and not understanding the feedback because the student could not read their peers' handwriting (4).

One particularly interesting observation for this question is that Chia *added* a *positive* comment on QP: "My peers helps me think about things that I don't normally think about when writing, eassy, etc…", but on both QA and QB, she added *negative* comments about peer feedback: QA: "I don't think my peers don't know what's in my mind." and QB: "They don't know what I have in mind." It appears she thought her editors did not understand what she was trying to convey in her writing. These comments suggest Chia was more positive about receiving peer feedback before actually experiencing it in the classroom. After receiving both indirect and direct peer feedback, Chia's attitude became more negative. This example illustrates the slight negative shift in attitude change toward peer feedback after actual implementation. The students' perceptions of peer feedback before the study were

very positive, but after actually receiving peer feedback the responses became slightly negative.

QP/QF #7 asked students to choose only one of two statements about receiving peer feedback. The choices were: "1. I prefer to have feedback from other students as one type of feedback on my writing. 2. I prefer *not* to have feedback from other students on my writing." This same question was used in a study by Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, and Huang (1998). In my study, the frequencies of responses were the same in QP and QF. In both cases, every student except Antonio preferred to have feedback from other students as one type of feedback on their writing.

Table 4.10: Student Responses to QP/QF #7
Choose one of these statements:

	QP	QF
1. I prefer to have feedback from other students as one type of feedback on my writing.	7	7
2. I prefer *not* to have feedback from other students on my writing.	1	1

A follow-up open-ended question asked students to explain their choice of the first or second statement. Seven students wrote comments on both questionnaires that indicated feedback from peers helps them figure out what they did wrong, helps them find more mistakes, and helps them to improve their writing. On QP, Antonio, the one student who preferred not to have feedback from other students, wrote: "Because I might know more then them and they just might mess up my papper". On QF, he wrote: "Because I know more then my peer". From these responses, it appears that Antonio feels he is better able to edit his writing than a peer. Antonio's attitude about being better than his peers may have occurred because shortly before the study, he learned that he had

won the ESL class award in the “Laws of Life” writing contest (as mentioned in Chapter 1) that he and his classmates entered. Perhaps this raised his confidence level, as noted in my observational journal, and he believed it made him more knowledgeable about writing than his peers.

Questionnaires P, A, B, and F asked students to circle statements that reflected how they felt about receiving writing feedback from their peers. QP/QF #9 asked, “How do you feel about receiving writing feedback from your peers?” QA #3 asked, “How did you feel about receiving *indirect* writing feedback from your peer?” QB #3 asked, “How did you feel about receiving *direct* writing feedback from your peer?” Students were asked to circle all statements that applied for each question. The statements to choose from consisted of 8 positive and 12 negative comments that I had brainstormed in regards to comments I had heard in the past from students about peer feedback and feelings I personally have felt about receiving feedback. QP and QF also gave students the opportunity to add comments they would use to describe how they felt about receiving writing feedback from their peers. However, no additional comments were added. Table 4.11 is split into positive and negative statements and shows the total number of responses for each statement along with the total number of positive and negative responses for each questionnaire. The percentages of total positive and negative responses on each questionnaire are also displayed.

Table 4.11: Student Responses to QP/QF #9 and QA/QB #3
QP/QF: How do you feel about receiving writing feedback from your peers?
QA: How did you feel about receiving *indirect* writing feedback from your peer?
QB: How did you feel about receiving *direct* writing feedback from your peer?

Positive Statements	**QP**	**QA**	**QB**	**QF**	**Total**
It is/was fun.	3	4	3	2	**12**
I feel/felt confident.	4	2	2	2	**10**
I feel/felt responsible.	0	0	0	1	**1**
I feel/felt independent.	1	1	0	0	**2**
I am/was interested.	1	0	0	0	**1**
I feel/felt successful.	3	3	4	4	**14**
I feel/felt helpful.	6	4	5	5	**20**
I feel/felt like "I'm the best!"	0	0	0	1	**1**
Additional positive comments	0	n/a	n/a	0	**0**
Total positive statements	**18**	**14**	**14**	**15**	**61**
% of positive statements	**64%**	**67%**	**56%**	**60%**	**62%**

Negative Statements	**QP**	**QA**	**QB**	**QF**	**Total**
I feel/felt embarrassed.	2	0	2	1	**5**
I feel/felt scared.	1	0	1	1	**3**
It is/was boring	1	0	1	1	**3**
I feel/felt unsure.	3	3	2	1	**9**
It is/was overwhelming.	0	1	2	1	**4**
I feel/felt alone.	0	0	0	1	**1**
It is/was frustrating.	0	2	1	3	**6**
I feel/felt nervous.	2	0	1	0	**3**
I feel/felt pressured.	0	0	0	0	**0**
It is/was intimidating.	0	0	0	0	**0**
I feel/felt lazy.	1	1	1	1	**4**
I feel/felt anxious.	0	0	0	0	**0**
Additional negative comments	0	n/a	n/a	0	**0**
Total negative statements	**10**	**7**	**11**	**10**	**38**
% of negative statements	**36%**	**33%**	**44%**	**40%**	**38%**

At the beginning of the study (QP), 64% (18/28) of the total statements circled were positive. Students most frequently circled they felt helpful (6), confident (4), and successful (3), and receiving feedback was fun (3). On QP, 36 % (10/28) of the total

statements circled were negative. Students most frequently circled they felt unsure (3), embarrassed (2), and nervous (2).

After receiving indirect feedback (QA), 67% (14/21) of the total statements circled were positive. Four fewer positive statements total were circled from QP, but a slight increase in percentage of positive statements (3%) occurred overall. One more response was circled for fun (4). However responses for confident (2) and helpful (4) both decreased by two. On QA, 33% (7/21) of the total statements circled were negative, which was a slight decrease in percentage (3%) and number (3) from QP. Students remained unsure (3). However, students no longer felt embarrassed (0) or nervous (0), but instead felt the experience of receiving indirect feedback was frustrating (2) and overwhelming (1).

After receiving direct feedback (QB), 56% (14/25) of the statements were positive, which is an 11% decrease from QA, although the number of positive responses remained the same (14). The responses for feeling helpful and successful increased by one from QA, but fun decreased by one. After direct feedback was received, the highest number (11) and highest percentage (44%) of negative statements occurred for all four questionnaires.

On the final questionnaire (QF), 60% (15/25) of the total circled statements were positive, and 40% (10/25) were negative. From the beginning of the study to the end, students seemed to have felt less confident (a decrease from four to two responses.) However, the responses indicate they became less unsure and nervous (a decrease of two for both). Students found receiving peer feedback more frustrating (an increase of three)

by the end of the study. The responses to this question suggest that students had a change of attitude after actually receiving peer feedback. Overall, responses became slightly less positive. However, throughout the study, the students felt more positive than negative about receiving peer feedback.

QA asked students two additional open-ended questions about receiving indirect feedback. QA #4 asked, "What did you *like* about receiving indirect feedback?" QA #5 asked, "What did you *not like* about receiving indirect feedback?" Students wrote they liked receiving indirect feedback because it helped them find mistakes and made their writing better, and Sheng said it was fun. However, they did not like receiving indirect feedback because sometimes the markings were sloppy or confusing, or they believed that their peers were marking things wrong. Chia felt she was being made fun of. (See Appendix Y for all individual responses.)

QB asked the same two additional open-ended questions except about direct feedback. QB #4 asked, "What did you *like* about receiving direct feedback?" QB #5 asked, "What did you *not like* about receiving direct feedback?" Students wrote they liked being able to see how to write things correctly. Three students could not find anything they did not like about receiving direct feedback, while other students thought their peers misunderstood what they were trying to say or marked things "wrong" when the writer thought they were correct. (See Appendix Z for all individual responses.)

QP/QF #10 asked, "How do you feel about using feedback from your peers in revising your writing?" Students were asked to circle one of two choices: "I feel they give helpful feedback, and I *use* it." or "I feel they do *not* give helpful feedback, and I do

not use it." Before the implementation of peer feedback, all eight students thought that peers gave helpful feedback and they used it. However, after actually receiving peer feedback in the study, Antonio changed his response and decided that peers do not give helpful feedback.

Table 4.12: Student Responses to QP/QF #10
How do you feel about using feedback from your peers in revising your writing?

	QP	QF
I feel they give helpful feedback, and I *use* it.	8	7
I feel they do *not* give helpful feedback, and I do *not* use it.	0	1

QP and QF asked who students would want to give feedback on their writing. Six choices were given plus a blank line for other responses, and students were asked to circle all that were true. (See Table 4.13 for choices.) QP #13 asked, "Who do you want to give feedback on your writing?" Because Xou had written in "a Teacher" on QP on the blank line, and the intent of my question was to see which type of *peer* would be desired, I changed the question on QF to ask: "*Which peer would* you want to give feedback on your writing?" However, even after changing the question to read *peer* specifically, Xou still wrote in "Teachers". He possibly read the question incorrectly, was not clear that a teacher was not considered his peer, or maybe he just really preferred teacher feedback. Chia was the only other student who wrote in a response on QF. She wrote: "When I really need help. I'll ask who ever." At the beginning of the study, all eight students wanted a better writer than they were to give them feedback. However, by the end of the study, only half of the students (4) felt that way. Instead, at the end of the study, seven of the students wanted a writer who wrote at their same level to give them feedback. Interestingly, two students at the end of the study chose they would also want

a *poorer* writer to give them feedback. The responses to this question suggest that the students became more aware or accepting of who gave them feedback. Maybe the students began to realize that their peers wrote at basically the same level and getting feedback from them was just as good as getting feedback from a better writer. Maybe students felt like Chia and felt anyone giving feedback was better than nobody. Table 4.13 shows the frequencies of student responses to the question.

Table 4.13: Student Responses to QP/QF #13
QP: Who do you want to give feedback on your writing?
QF: *Which peer would* you want to give feedback on your writing?

	QP	QF
A better writer than I am.	8	4
A writer who writes at my same level.	4	7
A poorer writer than I am.	0	2
A person of the same gender (boy/girl).	2	1
A person of the other gender (boy/girl).	2	1
A person who speaks the same first language as I do.	1	1

QP/QF #14 asked, "Would you rather receive *direct* or *indirect* feedback on your writing?" It was followed by explanations of direct and indirect feedback. Students were asked to circle either "direct" or "indirect". On both questionnaires, more students circled they would rather receive direct feedback. Only one student on both QP and QF circled indirect feedback. This suggests that most students prefer to have the errors they made corrected for them rather than trying to figure out what correction needs to be made. Table 4.14 shows the frequencies of student responses to the questions.

Table 4.14: Student Responses to QP/QF #14
Would you rather receive *direct* or *indirect* feedback on your writing?

	QP*	QF
Indirect	1	1
Direct	6	7

*Note: Xou did not answer the question on QP.

In summary, the majority of the students responded receiving peer feedback was somewhat helpful, with direct feedback being more helpful than indirect feedback in improving their writing. The majority liked receiving peer feedback because they could figure out what to do next with the feedback, and they felt good about their writing after receiving peer feedback. They preferred to receive peer feedback as one type of feedback on their writing. Students felt receiving peer feedback was helpful, made them feel successful, and was fun. Some negative responses toward receiving peer feedback included feeling unsure, frustrated, and embarrassed. Attitudes toward peer feedback became slightly less positive from the beginning of the study to the end. At the beginning of the study, most students wanted a better writer than they were to give them feedback, but by the end of the study, most students wanted a writer who writes at their same level to give them feedback. The next subsection presents and discusses the results of the questions about *giving* peer feedback.

Student Preferences, Perceptions, and Attitudes about *Giving* Peer Feedback

In addition to questions focused on *receiving* peer feedback, some questions focused on *giving* peer feedback. Many of the questions presented in this subsection were modeled after the questions in the previous subsection about receiving peer feedback.

QA #14 asked, "In your opinion, how helpful was giving *indirect* feedback in improving your writing?" QB #14 asked the same question except about direct feedback: "In your opinion, how helpful was giving *direct* feedback in improving your own writing?" Students were asked to circle one of four choices on both questionnaires: "very helpful", "somewhat helpful", "only a little helpful", and "not at all helpful". On both questionnaires, the majority of the responses were the middle two responses: "somewhat helpful" (4) or "only a little helpful" (2). More positive responses for direct feedback were given overall, since one response for indirect feedback was "not at all helpful". Table 4.15 shows the frequencies of student responses to these questions.

Table 4.15: Student Responses to QA/QB #14
QA: In your opinion, how helpful was giving *indirect* feedback in improving your writing?
QB: In your opinion, how helpful was giving *direct* feedback in improving your own writing?

	QA	QB
Very helpful	1	2
Somewhat helpful	4	4
Only a little helpful	2	2
Not at all helpful	1	0

QA and QB asked about the *indirect* or *direct* writing feedback students gave to peers in Cycle A and Cycle B. QA #15 asked, "Did you like giving *indirect* writing feedback to your peer?" QB#15 asked, "Did you like giving *direct* writing feedback to your peer?" Students were asked to circle either "yes" or "no". Both questionnaires had five responses for "yes" and three responses for "no". There was no difference in opinion for giving either indirect or direct feedback. More students liked giving feedback in both cycles than not. Table 4.16 shows the frequencies of student responses to these questions.

Table 4.16: Student Responses to QA/QB #15
QA: Did you like giving *indirect* writing feedback to your peer?
QB: Did you like giving *direct* writing feedback to your peer?

	QA	QB
Yes	5	5
No	3	3

A follow-up question to QA/QB #15 asked students to circle all reasons why they liked or did not like giving feedback. Two positive and four negative statements were provided for students to circle. (See Table 4.17 for statements.) A blank line for students to add other comments about giving feedback was also provided. No additional positive responses were added by the students on either questionnaire. Three negative statements were added on QA. Both Antonio and Cheng added comments to QA which said giving indirect feedback was boring, and Chia added, "I don't really know what was in it's mind." Chia added an additional negative comment on QB: "My peer kept telling me how stupid I was that I kept marking things that didn't need too. (Which it wasn't right.)". Kao added an interesting response on QB: "I don't know it depend if the writer like my corrections." This was not counted as a positive or negative response.

Indirect feedback (8) had more positive responses than direct feedback (7) by one response. In both cycles, the most positive response was that students felt good about their writing skills after giving feedback to their peers (5 responses in each cycle.). Direct feedback (9) had more negative responses than indirect feedback (8). The most frequently chosen negative response was that it was difficult to give feedback on a peer's essay (5 total responses throughout the study.) From these results, it appears that perhaps by the time the students were finished giving direct feedback in Cycle B, they

were starting to feel more negative than positive about giving peer feedback. The negative change in attitude could also be due to the fact that giving direct feedback takes more effort than giving indirect feedback.

Table 4.17: Student Responses to QA/QB #15 Follow-up Question
Why or why not?

Positive Responses	**QA**	**QB**	**Total**
I feel good about my writing skills after giving indirect/direct feedback to my peer.	5	5	10
It was easy to give indirect/direct feedback on my peer's essay.	3	2	5
Additional positive responses	0	0	0
Total positive responses	**8**	**7**	**15**
Negative Responses	**QA**	**QB**	
I think my peer knows more than I do, so I do *not* trust my own writing skills.	2	1	3
I do *not* feel good about my writing skills after giving indirect/direct feedback to my peer.	0	2	2
It was difficult to give indirect/direct feedback on my peer's essay.	2	3	5
I could *not* understand my peer's writing, so I did *not* know what to mark/correct on the paper.	1	1	2
Additional negative responses	3	1	4
Total negative responses	**8**	**9**	**17**

Questionnaires P, A, B, and F asked students to circle statements that reflected how they felt about *giving* writing feedback to their peers. QP/QF #8 asked, "How do you feel about *giving* writing feedback to your peers?" QA #16 asked, "How did you feel about giving *indirect* writing feedback to your peer?" QB #16 asked, "How did you feel about giving *direct* writing feedback to your peer?" Students were asked to circle all statements that applied for each question. The statements to choose from consisted of 8 positive and 12 negative comments that I had brainstormed in regards to comments I had heard in the past from students about peer feedback and feelings I personally have felt about receiving feedback. QP and QF also gave students the opportunity to add

comments they would use to describe how they felt about giving writing feedback from their peers. One additional positive comment and two additional negative comments were added to QA. No additional comments were added on QF. Table 4.18 is split into positive and negative statements and shows the total number of responses for each statement along with the total number of positive and negative responses for each questionnaire. The percentages of total positive and negative responses on each questionnaire are also displayed.

Table 4.18: Student Responses to QP/QF #8 and QA/QB #16
QP/QF: How do you feel about giving writing feedback to your peers?
QA: How did you feel about giving indirect writing feedback to your peer?
QB: How did you feel about giving direct writing feedback to your peer?

Positive Statements	**QP**	**QA**	**QB**	**QF**	**Total**
It is/was fun.	4	5	5	4	**14**
I feel/felt confident.	2	2	2	2	**8**
I feel/felt responsible.	1	3	3	1	**8**
I feel/felt independent.	1	1	1	1	**4**
I am/was interested.	3	1	1	1	**6**
I feel/felt successful.	0	2	5	5	**12**
I feel/felt helpful.	7	7	6	7	**27**
I feel/felt like "I'm the best!"	0	1	1	1	**3**
Additional positive statements	1	n/a	n/a	0	**1**
Total positive statements	**19**	**23**	**24**	**23**	**89**
% of positive statements	**53%**	**62%**	**62%**	**61%**	**59%**

Negative Statements	**QP**	**QA**	**QB**	**QF**	**Total**
I feel/felt embarrassed.	1	1	1	2	**5**
I feel/felt scared.	2	1	1	2	**6**
It is/was boring	3	2	3	2	**10**
I feel/felt unsure.	4	3	4	2	**13**
It is/was overwhelming.	0	2	1	1	**4**
I feel/felt alone.	0	0	0	0	**0**
It is/was frustrating.	0	1	2	2	**5**
I feel/felt nervous.	2	3	2	2	**9**
I feel/felt pressured.	1	0	0	1	**2**
It is/was intimidating.	0	0	1	0	**1**
I feel/felt lazy.	2	1	0	1	**4**
I feel/felt anxious.	0	0	0	0	**0**
Additional negative statements	2	n/a	n/a	0	**2**
Total negative statements	**17**	**14**	**15**	**15**	**61**
% of negative statements	**47%**	**38%**	**38%**	**39%**	**41%**

At the beginning of the study (QP), 53% (19/36) of the total statements circled were positive. Students most frequently circled they felt helpful (7), it was fun to give feedback (4), they were interested (3), and they felt confident (2). One positive comment was added by Meng: "I feel good about myself." On QP, 47% (17/36) of the total

responses were negative. Students most frequently circled they felt unsure (4), they felt giving feedback was boring (3), and they felt scared (2), nervous (2), and lazy (2). Two negative comments were added. Chia wrote: "I really don't care if. it's right or wrong." Sheng wrote, "too much to do…"

After giving indirect feedback (QA), 62% (23/37) of the total statements circled were positive. Four more positive statements were circled from QP (19) to QA (23), which was a 9% increase in positive statements. Students still felt helpful (7), and they felt giving feedback was fun (5, an increase of one response), and they still felt confident (2). They felt more responsible (3) and successful (2) than on QA (increases of 2 for each). However, they felt less interested (1, a decrease of 2 responses.) On QA, 38% (14/37) of the total statements circled were negative. Students still felt unsure (3), nervous (3), and giving feedback was boring (2). However, responses were circled for overwhelming (2) and frustrating (1) when they had not been circled for QA.

After giving direct feedback (QB), 62% (24/39) of the statements circled were positive, which is the same percentage as for indirect feedback (QA), although one more positive statement was circled. The responses for helpful decreased by one (6), and feeling giving feedback was fun stayed the same (5). However, feeling successful increased by three from QA to 5 responses. The percentage of negative statements circled remained the same in QB (38%), although one more negative response was circled. Responses to circled negative statements changed only slightly from QA. Responses to boring (3), unsure (4), and frustrating (2) increased by one response. One response was circled for intimidating, when it had not been circled previously.

Responses for overwhelming (1), nervous (2), and lazy (0) each decreased by one response.

On the final questionnaire (QF), 61% (23/38) of the total circled statements were positive, which was an 8% increase from QP, but only a 1% increase from both QA and QB. Positive responses to individual choices did not change drastically from beginning to end. Being interested decreased by two to only one response by the end of the study. The percentage of negative responses at the end of the study was 39%, which was 8% lower than at the beginning of the study. Negative responses to individual choices did not change drastically from the beginning to the end of the study. The biggest difference was that students felt less unsure by the end of the study (two responses compared to four at the beginning.) Overall, in the study responses were more positive (59%) than negative (41%) about giving peer feedback.

QA asked two additional open-ended questions about giving indirect feedback. QA #17 asked, "What did you *like* about giving indirect feedback?" QA #18 asked: "What did you *not like* about giving indirect feedback?" Three students wrote they liked being able to help their peers, and two students mentioned having fewer errors the next time they wrote. Two students wrote they liked reading their peers' stories. Two students did not like giving indirect feedback because it was boring (Antonio, Cheng). Other students were concerned their feedback may not be correct. Xou did not like giving feedback because he did not want to hurt his peer's feelings. (See Appendix AA for all individual responses.)

QB asked the same two additional open-ended questions as QA except about direct feedback. QB #17 asked, "What did you *like* about giving direct feedback?" QB #18 asked, "What did you *not like* about giving direct feedback?" Students liked helping their peers and reading their stories. However, for QB #17, two students wrote they did not like giving direct feedback (Antonio, Will), while Cheng wrote it was boring. Students did not like giving direct feedback because they wrote it was boring, they were getting tired of giving feedback, and they were insecure about their accuracy of feedback. (See Appendix BB for all individual responses.)

QP/QF #11 and QA/QB #21 asked students how well they thought they gave writing feedback to their peers. QP/QF #11 asked: "In your opinion, how well do you give writing feedback to your peers?" QA #21 asked, "In your opinion, how well did you give *indirect* writing feedback to your peer?" QB #21 asked, "In your opinion, how well did you give *direct* writing feedback to your peer?" Students were asked to circle only one of five choices listed for them. (See Table 4.19 for exact choices.) A follow-up open-ended question asked why chose that response. (See Appendix CC for all individual responses to the follow-up questions for QP/QF #11 and QA/QB #21.)

Table 4.19: Student Responses to QP/QF #11 and QA/QB #21
QP/QF: In your opinion, how well do you give writing feedback to your peers?
QA: In your opinion, how well did you give *indirect* writing feedback to your peer?
QB: In your opinion, how well did you give *direct* writing feedback to your peer?

	QP	QA	QB	QF	**Total**
I give/gave very good feedback.	0	0	2	0	**2**
I give/gave good feedback.	3	3	2	3	**11**
I give/gave okay feedback.	4	4	4	3	**15**
I do/did *not* give good feedback.	1	1	0	1	**3**
I am/was inconsistent. (It depends on the situation.)	0	n/a	n/a	1	**1**

The majority of responses in the study (47% = 15/32) indicated students felt they gave “okay” feedback. When students circled they gave okay feedback, they wrote that sometimes they knew they were right, but sometimes knew they were wrong. Others felt insecure about whether their feedback was right or wrong. Cheng wrote he was “lazy” (QP) and giving direct feedback (QB) was boring, so he did not really try.

Overall, 34% (11/32) of the responses in the study indicated students felt they gave “good” feedback. When students circled they gave good feedback, some wrote they took their time, tried their best, and felt they accomplished something. Cheng wrote on QA that he was “100% sure” he was giving the right indirect feedback. Others wrote that they did *not* try their best.

Only three responses in the entire study (9% = 3/32) indicated students felt they did not give good feedback and all were given by Will. He wrote he was not good at giving feedback and did not know if he was right or wrong.

In the entire study, only two responses (6% = 2/32) indicated students felt they gave “very good” feedback, and these were given after giving direct feedback (QB). Sheng responded that she gave very good feedback because she tried her best and did what she knew, while Antonio wrote he gave very good feedback “Because Im smart like that.”

“Inconsistent” only received one response (3%) in the entire study in QF. Sheng gave the reason that she sometimes felt “confident and good” about giving feedback, but sometimes she did not.

QP/QF #12 was an open-ended question and asked, “When you are giving feedback on writing, how do you decide what to do? (Explain how you give feedback on your peer’s essay.)” Students’ written-in responses included looking for grammar mistakes such as spelling, run-on sentences, fragments, and verb tenses, as well as looking for content and organizational issues. A few students mentioned they read the essay more than once while giving feedback. Meng wrote he listens to the writer first in order to give the feedback he or she wants. Will wrote he asks the teacher for help. (See Appendix DD for individual responses to this question.)

In summary, students gave more positive responses than negative responses about giving feedback to peers. The majority of positive responses indicated students felt helpful and successful when giving feedback and felt it was fun. Negative statements reflected students felt unsure, bored, nervous, scared, overwhelmed, frustrated, embarrassed, and lazy when giving feedback. The majority of students felt they gave either “okay” or “good” feedback to their peers. Students found giving direct feedback to be more helpful than giving indirect feedback in improving their own writing.

Students’ Opinions about Using Feedback Logs

A few questions asked about the feedback logs to determine if students believed they were helpful and to what extent and to determine if they liked using feedback logs and why or why not. Since my study incorporated the use of feedback logs as a means of recording writing feedback and determining intended usage, I wanted to see students’ perceptions and attitudes about using feedback logs.

QP/QF #16 asked, "Do you think a *Feedback Log* or *Error Chart* is helpful in improving your writing?" QA #24 asked, "Do you think the *Indirect Feedback Log* was helpful in improving your writing?" QB #24 asked, "Do you think the *Direct Feedback Log* was helpful in improving your writing?" A definition of the feedback log or error chart was provided for students after each question. On QP, students were asked to circle either "yes", "no", or "I am not sure because I do not remember using a Feedback Log or Error Chart before." The other three questionnaires only had "yes' or "no" as options because the option of "not sure" was not logical as it was assumed that since students had been using the feedback logs in the study, they would remember and be familiar with using them.

Before using the feedback logs in the study, three students circled "not sure" because they did not remember using a feedback log before. Three students circled "yes", and one circled "no". Antonio did not answer the question on QP. QA and QB had the same frequencies of responses: five students circled "yes" and three circled "no". At the end of the study, six students responded "yes" to a feedback log being helpful, and two students responded "no". The majority of students thought a feedback log helped them improve their writing after using it in class.

Table 4.20: Student Responses to QP/QF #16 and QA/QB #24
QP/QF: Do you think a *Feedback Log* or *Error Chart* is helpful in improving your writing?
QA: Do you think the *Indirect Feedback Log* was helpful in improving your writing?
QB: Do you think the *Direct Feedback Log* was helpful in improving your writing?

	QP*	QA	QB	QF
Yes	3	5	5	6
No	1	3	3	2
Not sure*	3	n/a	n/a	n/a

QP/QF #17 was a follow-up question that asked, “If “yes” or “no” was your answer to number 16, answer this question: In your opinion, how useful is a feedback log in improving your writing?” QA #25 asked, “In your opinion, how useful was the *Indirect Feedback Log* in improving your writing?” QB #25 asked, “In your opinion, how useful was the *Direct Feedback Log* in improving your writing?” Students were asked to circle only one of four choices: “very helpful”, “somewhat helpful”, “only a little helpful”, or “not at all helpful”. When looking at the totals for all four questionnaires, the majority (16/28 = 57%) of the responses were “somewhat helpful”. There was an increase of three responses (50%) for “somewhat helpful” from QP to QF, and this response was the most frequent on QF (6/8 = 75%). The second most frequent response was “only a little helpful” with 29% (8/28). Three responses in the study (11%) indicated the logs were “not at all helpful”. Only one response in the entire study (4%) found the logs “very helpful”. Table 4.21 shows the frequencies of student responses to the questions.

Table 4.21: Student Responses to QP/QF #17 and QA/QB #25
QP/QF #17: If “yes” or “no” was your answer to number 16, answer this question: In your opinion, how useful is a feedback log in improving your writing?
QA #25: In your opinion, how useful was the *Indirect Feedback Log* in improving your writing?
QB #25: In your opinion, how useful was the *Direct Feedback Log* in improving your writing?

	QP	QA	QB	QF	**Total**
very helpful	0	1	0	0	**1**
somewhat helpful	3	3	4	6	**16**
only a little helpful	1	2	4	1	**8**
not at all helpful	0	2	0	1	**3**

QP/QF #18 asked, “If ‘yes’ or ‘no’ was your answer to number 16, answer this question: Do you like using a feedback log?” QA#26 asked, “Did you like using the *Indirect Feedback Log*?” QB #26 asked, “Did you like using the *Direct Feedback Log*?” Students were asked to circle either “yes” or “no”. At the beginning of the study, all four students who had remembered using a feedback log previously answered that they liked using a feedback log. After indirect feedback, responses were split evenly between liking and not liking using a feedback log (four responses for both “yes” and “no”). After using direct feedback and at the end of the study, responses became slightly more negative toward using a feedback log. Only three students in each case responded that they liked using a feedback log, while five students did not like using a feedback log. The change in attitude over the duration of the study suggests that the students became tired of the extra work involved in using a feedback log. This was also indicated in my journal notes as I recorded that students were complaining about filling in the logs. My observations of the logs themselves also indicated that the level of effort (neatness and accuracy) in using the logs seemed to diminish as the study progressed. The final responses in QF are interesting because six students responded that they thought a feedback log was useful (see QF #16), but only three students said they liked using a log. This suggests students believed in the feedback logs’ usefulness by the end of the study, but they did not actually like using the logs.

Table 4.22: Student Responses to QP/QF #18 and QA/QB #26
QP/QF: If "yes" or "no" was your answer to number 16, answer this question: Do you like using a feedback log?
QA: Did you like using the *Indirect Feedback Log*?
QB: Did you like using the *Direct Feedback Log*?

	QP	QA	QB	QF
Yes	4	4	3	3
No	0	4	5	5

In summary, the majority of students thought using a feedback log was somewhat helpful in improving their writing. As the study progressed, students' opinions about liking to use a feedback log became more negative than at the start of the study.

Discussion of Results: Research Question #1

Since the results from Questionnaires P, A, B, and F have been presented and analyzed, the research question for this section can be revisited.

Research Question #1 asked: "What are the students' preferences, perceptions, and attitudes about writing feedback before, during, and after the implementation of peer feedback in the classroom?" Since this question covers many individual questions from the four questionnaires, I summarize what has already been presented from the individual subsections in this section. In response to teacher feedback only, students were very positive at the beginning of the study; at the end of the study, responses were still largely positive, although negative responses toward teacher feedback did increase. In response to teacher feedback versus peer feedback, students perceived teacher feedback to be more helpful than peer feedback both before and after the study. Most students would choose teacher feedback over peer feedback if given a choice between the two.

In response to receiving peer feedback, the majority of the students responded that receiving peer feedback was somewhat helpful, with direct feedback being more helpful

than indirect feedback in improving their writing. The majority liked receiving peer feedback and preferred to receive peer feedback as one type of feedback on their writing. At the beginning of the study, most students wanted a better writer than they were to give them feedback, but by the end of the study, most students wanted a writer who writes at their same level to give them feedback.

Students gave more positive responses than negative responses about giving feedback to peers. Students found giving direct feedback to be more helpful than giving indirect feedback in improving their own writing. Most students felt they gave “okay” or “good” feedback to their peers.

In response to using a feedback log, the majority of students thought using a feedback log was somewhat helpful in improving their writing both before and after the study. As the study progressed, students’ opinions about liking to use a feedback log became more negative than at the start of the study.

This section of the chapter presented and discussed the results of QP, QA, QB, and QF. The next section of the chapter examines the results of Questionnaire C in order to answer Research Question #2.

Research Question #2

Questionnaire C (Appendix T) was administered at the beginning of Cycle C to determine what kind of feedback each student wanted to receive and give on the following essay (C2). This questionnaire was distinct from questions concerning the preferences, perceptions, and attitudes toward indirect and direct feedback discussed previously for Research Question #1.

First, the questionnaire offered the choice of *receiving* indirect feedback from a peer, direct feedback from a peer, or no feedback from a peer (self-edit). Then the questionnaire offered the choice of *giving* indirect feedback to a peer, direct feedback to a peer, or no feedback to a peer (self-edit). If a student chose to self-edit, he or she needed to choose that option for both because of time spent giving feedback in class. By examining the answers to this questionnaire, I attempted to answer the following question:

2. Given the choice, do students choose to give or receive indirect or direct grammatical feedback from peers, or do they choose to self-edit their essays?

Data Analysis: Questionnaire C

Questionnaire C was distributed to students and answered by all students. All questionnaires were collected and responses tabulated and recorded. The results of this questionnaire were then used to assign peer editors for the C2 essays, in addition to answering Research Question #2. Those who chose to receive and give no feedback to peers edited their own essays.

Five students chose to receive direct feedback by peers and give direct feedback to peers. Three students (Antonio, Cheng, Meng) chose to self-edit their essays. No students chose to receive or give indirect feedback to peers.

I was surprised at the results of the choices selected because I thought more students would have decided to give indirect feedback, and I was curious about why the students made the choices they had, so on a following day, I handed back the

Questionnaire C sheets and asked students to write an explanation of their choice next to each option they chose. (See Appendix EE for exact individual responses.)

The students who chose to receive direct feedback by peers gave reasons which indicated direct feedback was easier to use to correct their mistakes, and they thought it was helpful. Likewise, they thought that giving direct feedback to their peers was easier to do and more helpful to their peers than indirect feedback because their peers would not have to try and figure out their errors as with indirect feedback.

The three students who chose to self edit gave interesting reasons. Antonio thought that he did not make a lot of corrections on Essay A3 and Essay B3 due to peer feedback, so he thought it would be better to correct his own essay for Cycle C. Cheng wrote he thought he should be correcting his own mistakes instead of having a peer do it for him. However, he wrote he would have *given* a peer whatever kind of feedback that peer wanted if he was not giving himself feedback. Cheng did get the opportunity in Cycle C to give feedback to a peer in addition to self-editing his own writing. Meng said he preferred to self-edit in order to learn from his own mistakes.

Discussion of Results: Research Question #2

Research Question #2 asked: "Given the choice, do students choose to give or receive indirect or direct grammatical feedback from peers, or do they choose to self-edit their essays?" Five of the eight students (62.5%) chose to receive direct grammatical feedback from peers as well as give direct grammatical feedback to peers because they said both were easier to use and correct mistakes, and direct feedback was more helpful. This represents the majority of students in the study. Three students (37.5%) chose to

receive no peer feedback and preferred to self-edit their essays for reasons which included believing the peer feedback given in the previous cycles was not useful, believing that one should correct his or her own mistakes instead of having someone else do it, and believing that he would learn more from correcting his own mistakes.

This section of the chapter presented and discussed the results of Questionnaire C. The next section examines the results of the feedback logs and accompanying essays to answer Research Questions #3 and #4 about the intended usage of feedback given by peers.

Research Questions #3 and #4

This section of the chapter will present and discuss the data collected from the feedback logs (A2, B2, C2) and essays (A2, B2, C2) in order to answer Research Questions #3 and #4 about the intended use of peer feedback. These two questions use overlapping data and therefore are included together in one section. The two research questions to be answered in this section are:

3. To what extent do students *intend to use* peer feedback in the next revision of their essays, and what reasons do they give?

4. Is *indirect* or *direct* feedback given by peers used *more* by students in preparing to revise their essays?

First, I describe the process of analyzing the relevant data from the feedback logs (A2, B2, C2) and accompanying essays (A2, B2, C2) in order to answer these two questions. Next, I present the results of the data analysis and then discuss and interpret the results.

Data Analysis: Feedback Logs (A2, B2, C2) and Essays (A2, B2, C2)

For each student in each feedback cycle (A, B, C), I grouped together the essay on which feedback was given and the feedback log that was used with that essay. In order to analyze the data gathered from those documents, I created a data analysis table for each feedback cycle. Each table included columns for:

- student matches of writer and editor
- number of feedback units given by the peer editor (counted by me)
- number of feedback units used by the writer (reported by student writers in column four of the logs)
- reasons for intending to use or not use the feedback given (pre-identified reasons in column five of the logs)
- number of "correct" and "wrong" feedback units (determined by me)

To find the number of feedback units given by the peer editor and intended to be used and not used by the writer, I had planned on just using the numbers recorded by the writers on the feedback logs they filled out. However, based on my experience as a teacher and knowing that students make mistakes, I knew it was necessary to check the actual essays that contained feedback to make sure that the editors numbered all feedback units they had given and the writers recorded all feedback units given on the feedback logs. I compared the essays containing feedback to the feedback logs to make sure that the number of feedback units on the essay matched the number of feedback units on the log. The actual numbers of feedback units given by the editors were important because I

would need those numbers to determine the percentages of feedback intended to be used or not used as well as to determine the accuracy of *all* feedback given.

As I began the process of comparing the number of feedback units given on the essays with the number of feedback units recorded on the logs for Cycle A, I discovered three main problems which needed further thought as I was recording my data: 1) some editors did not number some feedback units on essays, 2) some writers did not record some feedback units on logs, and 3) some writers renumbered feedback units.

The first problem I encountered was some editors did not number some feedback units they had given on the A2 essays (the first typed drafts of the essays). In response to an unnumbered feedback unit, a writer either did not record that feedback unit on the log or realized the mistake and numbered it at the end of the feedback log. If the writer did not record the feedback, I made a note on the log to count the unrecorded feedback unit(s) on that log.

The second problem was some writers did not record some feedback units that were circled and numbered on the A2 essays by the editors, so there was no record on the log if the writer intended to use or not use those feedback units. Therefore, the numbers of feedback units intended to be used or not used on the logs (as recorded by the writers) did not always equal the actual number of feedback units given on an essay. I did not count an unrecorded feedback unit as intended to be used or not used if the writer did not record this information on the log, as I could not assume a response for the writer.

Renumbering of feedback units by writers was the third problem I encountered. Some writers changed the editors' numbering to a numbering system that must have

made more sense to them (although it was not always clear to me.) The writer only changed the numbering on the A2 essay, but not on the log, or vice versa. This was extremely frustrating for me as I looked for and counted feedback units because the numbers on the logs and essays simply did not match. Therefore, as I analyzed the data, I found it necessary to renumber (or correctly number) the feedback units on the essays to match the logs in order to have consistent information.

When I had finished recording the numbers of feedback units given by the peer editors and the numbers of feedback units intended to be used or not used by the writers for Cycle A, I continued with Cycle B and Cycle C in the same manner and noticed the same problems occurring in all cycles. I can only speculate why these problems occurred.

One possibility might have been carelessness (rushing) of both editors and writers. Perhaps editors rushed through numbering the feedback units on the essays and therefore missed some. Maybe writers rushed through recording feedback units on the logs and missed feedback units that *were* numbered on their essays. A second possibility might simply be human error. Even without rushing, not numbering or recording a feedback unit might have been an easy mistake to make if the feedback was not written dark enough on the essay or a feedback unit was close to or overlapping with another feedback unit on the essay. Another reason a writer might not have recorded information for a feedback unit might have been that he or she intended to come back to a feedback unit but then did not, and therefore did not record all information. I told the students to write all feedback units on the logs first and then correct the feedback units they knew

how to correct before going back to the others they were unsure about, so perhaps the writers just forgot to go back to some feedback units. However, the absence of a feedback unit on a log could have been intentional by the writer because he or she did not know how or want to correct the error, or maybe the writer was lazy and hoped that nobody would ever notice that the feedback unit was not recorded. In any case, the problems and measures I took to accommodate the discrepancies in error counts from essays to logs should be noted as the data are presented, especially when it *seems* the numbers do not "add up" correctly.

After making accommodations for the problems I encountered, I tallied and recorded the totals for the reasons for intending to use or not use the feedback given to the writers as recorded in the fourth column of the feedback logs by the writers.

I analyzed data from the three data analysis tables for Cycles A, B, and C that were necessary to answer Research Questions #3 and #4. First, I present the relevant data from Cycle A and discuss the results. Then, I present the data for Cycle B and compare and contrast it with Cycle A. Finally, the relevant data from Cycle C is presented and discussed and then compared and contrasted with the previous two cycles.

In each cycle, I present the average number of feedback units *given* by the editors, including the lowest and highest numbers of feedback units given and the range. The average number of feedback units was rounded to the nearest whole number since a feedback unit cannot occur as a part or fraction. I also present the average number of feedback units *intended to be used* by the writers, including the lowest and highest numbers of feedback units intended to be used and the range. The average percentage of

feedback units *intended to be used* was also calculated since I wanted to be able to compare usage from one cycle to the next. The lowest and highest percentages of feedback intended to be used by a writer in each cycle is presented, as well as the range of percentages. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number, unless the calculated percentage was *exactly* half a percent, in which case it was rounded *up* to the next whole number. (Note: When presenting data about the number of students as a percentage, if half a percent occurred, it was not rounded up or down.) Also presented are numbers and percentages for the reasons writers intended to use or not use the feedback given to them. After the data is presented in each cycle, I summarize and speculate about the results of the data.

Cycle A: Indirect Feedback

The average number of indirect feedback units *given* on Essay A2 was 36, with 20 the lowest and 65 the highest, for a range of 46. The average number of feedback units *intended to be used* by the writers was 19, with 8 the lowest and 26 the highest, for a range of 19. The average percentage of feedback *intended to be used* was 54%, with 28% the lowest and 65% the highest, for a range of 38. Table 4.23 displays group data for feedback units (FBU) given and intended to be used in Cycles A, B, and C.

Table 4.23: Group Data for Feedback Units Given (FBU) and Intended to be Used

	A2 (Indirect)	**B2 (Direct)**	**C2 (Peer)**	**C2 (Self)**
Avg. # of FBU given	36	36	32	20
Lowest # of FBU given	20	23	14	16
Highest # of FBU given	65	50	49	27
Range of FBU given	46	28	36	12
Av. # of FBU intended to be used	19	24	26	20
Lowest # of FBU intended to be used	8	13	12	16
Highest # of FBU intended to be used	26	45	48	27
Range of FBU intended to be used	19	33	37	12
Avg. % of FBU intended to be used	54	68	78	100
Lowest % of FBU intended to be used	28	29	58	100
Highest % of FBU intended to be used	65	94	98	100
Range of % of FBU intended to be used	38	66	41	1

Six of the eight students (75%) intended to use over 50% of the feedback given to them. Five of the eight students (62.5%) intended to use over 60% of the feedback given to them. (See Appendix FF, which displays individual data and group averages.)

Writers circled their reasons for intending to use or not use each feedback unit on the Indirect Feedback Log A2 in the fourth column. Only one choice for intending to use the feedback existed on the log, which declared the student *believed there was an error* (choice 1). Therefore, when students reported intending to use the feedback, 100% (170/170) of the responses declared the student believed there was an error.

Two choices for intending *not* to use the feedback existed on the log: one which declared the student *did not believe* there was an error (choice 2), and the other which declared the student *did not know how to correct* the error although he or she believed there was an error (choice 3). When students reported *not* intending to use the feedback, 95.5% (129/135) of the responses declared the student *did not believe* there was an error

(choice 2). The remaining 4.5% (6/135) of the responses declared the student *did not know how* to correct the error although he or she believed there was an error (choice 3).

To summarize, in Cycle A the majority of the students (75% = 6/8) intended to use more than half of the indirect feedback they were given. Two students (25%) did not intend to use most of the feedback given to them; Meng intended to use only 28%, and Kao intended to use 40%. From this data alone, it is not possible to speculate why these two students did not intend to use the majority of the indirect feedback given to them, but in the section on accuracy of feedback, I address whether the feedback given was accurate or not. When students reported they did *not* intend to use the feedback, most (95.5%) disagreed with the feedback and believed their writing was correct in the first place. Only a small amount of the feedback (4.5%) was not intended to be used because the students did not know how to correct the errors.

Cycle B: Direct Feedback

The average number of direct feedback units *given* on Essay B2 was 36, with 23 the lowest and 50 the highest, for a range of 28. The average number of feedback units *intended to be used* was 24, with 13 the lowest and 45 the highest, for a range of 33. The average percentage of feedback intended to be used was 68%, with 29% the lowest and 94% the highest, for a range of 66. (Table 4.23 displays group data.) Six of the eight students (75%) intended to use over 50% of the feedback given to them. Three of the eight students (37.5%) intended to use over 90% of the feedback given to them. (See Appendix FF, which displays individual data and group averages.)

Writers circled their reasons for intending to use or not use the feedback given on the Direct Feedback Log B2 in the fourth column. Two choices for intending to use the feedback existed on the log: one which declared the student *believed there was an error* and planned to use the *exact* feedback given (choice 1), and the other which declared the *exact* feedback would not be used, but the feedback was helpful and the writer planned on correcting it another way (choice 2). When students reported intending to use the feedback, 99.5% (192/193) of the responses declared the student believed there was an error and planned to use the *exact* feedback given (choice 1). Only half a percent (1/193) declared the *exact* feedback would not be used, but the feedback was helpful and the writer planned on correcting it another way (choice 2).

Two choices for intending *not* to use the direct feedback existed on the log: one which declared the student *did not believe* there was an error (choice 3), and the other which declared the student *did not know how to correct* the error although he or she believed there was an error (choice 4). When students reported *not* intending to use the feedback, 92.5% (87/94) of the responses declared the student *did not believe* there was an error (choice 3). The remaining 7.5% (7/94) of the responses declared the student *did not know how to correct* the error, although he or she believed there was an error (choice 4).

It is interesting that 7.5% of the responses for *not* intending to use the direct feedback stated that the student believed there was an error, but he or she did not know how to correct it (choice 4). One would think if a student was given a correction, he or she would either use the feedback in some way (choices 1 and 2) or believe there was no

error and not use it (choice 3). It is interesting that when given direct feedback, the students would believe there was an error, not agree with the feedback, and *still* not know how to correct the error (choice 4). This may suggest that writers sometimes recognize with the help of peer feedback that they have made an error, but unless they are very sure of how to correct the error, they will leave the writing the same and not correct anything.

Comparison of Cycle A and Cycle B. A comparison of Cycle A (indirect) and Cycle B (direct) indicates the average number of feedback units given in both cycles was the same (n=36). However, the highest number of feedback units decreased 15 feedback units from 65 in A to 50 in B. The lowest number of feedback units given increased 3 feedback units from 20 in A to 23 in B. Therefore, the range of feedback units given decreased 18 feedback units from 46 in A to 28 in B. This means the gap between the highest and lowest amounts of feedback units given in Cycle B decreased. This suggests that those students who gave large amounts of indirect feedback in Cycle A may have given less direct feedback in Cycle B because they needed to know the exact correction to give, whereas that information was not necessary when giving indirect feedback.

The average number of feedback units intended to be used increased by 5 feedback units from 19 in A to 24 in B. The highest number of feedback units intended to be used increased by 19 feedback units from 26 in A to 45 in B. The lowest number of feedback units intended to be used increased by 5 from 8 in A to 13 in B. Therefore, the range of feedback units intended to be used increased by 14 units from 19 in A to 33 in B.

The average percentage of feedback intended to be used in Cycle B (68%) was 14% higher than in Cycle A (54%). The highest percentage of feedback intended to be

used was 94% in B, an increase of 29% from the highest percentage of feedback intended to be used in A (65%). The lowest percentage of feedback intended to be used only increased by 1%, from 28% in A to 29% in B. The range of percentage of feedback intended to be used increased by 28%, from 38% in A to 66% in B. As in Cycle A, six of the eight students (75%) in Cycle B intended to use over 50% of the feedback they were given. In Cycle B, three students (37.5%) intended to use over 90% of the feedback, whereas in Cycle A, the highest percentage of intending to use feedback was 65% (by only one student). Although the students in both cycles gave the same average number of feedback units (36), in Cycle B, the students intended to use more feedback.

All of this information suggests that students felt more confident about intending to use direct feedback because an actual correction was provided, unlike for indirect feedback. However, perhaps students felt more confident in the overall process of giving and receiving peer feedback by this point and this may have contributed to the increase in feedback units intended to be used in Cycle B.

In both Cycles A and B, when students intended to use the feedback, they believed there was an error almost 100% of the time. Only one response on the Direct Feedback Log B2 indicated that the *exact* direct feedback was not used, but it was helpful and the student intended to correct the error in another way.

Cycle C: Choice of Feedback

The data for Cycle C was calculated in two subsets because students were able to choose the kind of feedback they wished to give and receive in this cycle. The choices were indirect peer feedback, direct peer feedback, or no feedback from a peer/self-edit.

Five students (62.5%) chose to give direct feedback to their peers and receive direct feedback from their peers. Three students (37.5%) chose to receive no peer feedback and self-edited. No students chose to give or receive indirect feedback. First, the data for the peer feedback group of five is presented, and then the data for the self-editing group of three is presented. The data for Cycle C is not presented for the entire group of eight because the numbers and percentages were largely affected by the three self-editing students who reported intending to use all of their own feedback. It was more important for my study to compare the two smaller subsets of data (peer and self) against each other in Cycle C. The subset of data for the five students who chose to give and receive peer feedback was used to answer Research Questions #3 and #4 since the questions concern peer feedback, not self-editing or a combination of self-editing and peer feedback.

Peer feedback: Group of five. The average number of direct feedback units *given* on Essay C2 was 32, with 14 the lowest and 49 the highest, for a range of 36. The average number of feedback units *intended to be used* was 26, with 12 the lowest and 48 the highest, for a range of 37. The average percentage of feedback *intended to be used* was 78%, with 58% the lowest and 98% the highest, for a range of 41. Table 4.23 displays the data. All five students giving peer feedback (100%) intended to use over 50% of the feedback given to them. (See Appendix FF for individual data.)

Writers circled their reasons for intending to use or not use the feedback given on the Direct Feedback Log C2 in the fourth column. Two choices for intending to use the feedback existed on the log: one which declared the student *believed there was an error* and planned to use the *exact* feedback given (choice 1), and the other which declared the

exact feedback would not be used, but the feedback was helpful and the writer planned on correcting it another way (choice 2). When students reported intending to use the feedback, 100% (129/129) of the responses declared the student believed there was an error and planned to use the *exact* feedback given (choice 1). No students declared the *exact* feedback would not be used, but the feedback was helpful and the writer planned on correcting it another way (choice 2).

Two choices for intending not to use the feedback existed on the log: one which declared the student *did not believe* there was an error (choice 3), and the other which declared the student *did not know how* to correct the error although he or she believed there was an error (choice 4). When students reported *not* intending to use the feedback, 86% (24/28) of the responses declared the student *did not believe* there was an error (choice 3). The remaining 14% (4/28) of the responses declared the student *did not know how* to correct the error, although he or she believed there was an error (choice 4).

Self-editing: Group of three. The three students who chose to self-edit were Antonio, Cheng, and Meng. The average number of direct feedback units these students gave themselves on Essay C2 was 20, with 16 the lowest and 27 the highest, for a range of 12. The average number of feedback units intended to be used was 20, with 16 the lowest and 27 the highest, for a range of 12. The numbers of feedback units intended to be used were exactly the same as the numbers of feedback units given. The average percentage of feedback intended to be used was 100%, with 100% the lowest and 100% the highest, for a range of 1. This means all three of the students (100%) giving themselves feedback intended to use 100% of their own feedback. (Table 4.23 displays

the data.) This finding suggests that the students who self-edited believed they were giving themselves correct feedback and only wrote in corrections they intended to use.

Writers circled their reasons for intending to use or not use the feedback given on the Direct Feedback Log C2 in the fourth column. Two choices for intending to use the feedback existed on the log: one which declared the student *believed there was an error* and planned to use the *exact* feedback given (choice 1), and the other which declared the *exact* feedback would not be used, but the feedback was helpful and the writer planned on correcting it another way (choice 2). When students reported intending to use the feedback, 100% (53/53) of the responses declared the student believed there was an error and planned to use the *exact* feedback given (choice 1). This would be the expected and logical response for self-editing. No students declared the *exact* feedback would not be used, but the feedback was helpful and the writer planned on correcting it another way (choice 2).

Two choices for intending not to use the feedback existed on the log: one which declared the student *did not believe* there was an error (choice 3), and the other which declared the student *did not know how to correct* the error even though he or she believed there was an error (choice 4). None of the responses declared the student *did not believe* there was an error (choice 3). This again is logical because the students are giving themselves feedback. One would expect choice 4 to also have no responses since the students gave themselves their own feedback, and therefore would be providing direct feedback. However, Meng reported seven feedback units he did *not* intend to use because he *did not know how to correct the error* even though he believed there was an

error (choice 4). This is a contradiction to what he circled in column four. (He circled "yes" for these seven feedback units instead of "no".) The explanation for this discrepancy is that for some of those feedback units, he gave himself indirect feedback rather than direct feedback. I can only speculate that in those instances, he recognized there was an error and did not know how to correct it himself in the classroom, but perhaps thought he could figure out the correction when he revised the essay in the computer lab by using the spell-check or grammar-check tools or the Internet. Therefore, 100% of the feedback is reported intended to be used by him, even though choice 4 claimed he did not intend to use the feedback because he did not know how to correct the errors.

It makes sense that 100% of the feedback was intended to be used (column 4) by the self-editing group because the students would probably not have recorded the feedback on the log if they were not intending to use it. Instead, they most likely would have erased their corrections or crossed them out before making the decision to enter them on the log, so they would not have had to create extra work for themselves.

Comparison of Cycle C to Cycle A and Cycle B. The self-editing group in Cycle C gave 12 feedback units fewer on average (20) than the peer feedback group in Cycle C (32). This finding suggests that students find more errors in their peers' writing than in their own. The average numbers of feedback units given by peer (32) and self (20) in Cycle C were lower than both Cycle A (36) and Cycle B (36). This finding indicates less feedback units on average were given in Cycle C than in Cycles A and B, regardless of peer feedback or self editing. One reason for this might be students were tired of giving

feedback at the end of the study, and therefore did not try as hard to find errors as in the previous cycles. It is also possible that there were fewer errors made in Cycle C. The students in the peer feedback group intended to use 78% of the feedback they received, compared to the self-editing group, which intended to use 100% of the feedback they gave themselves. However, the average number of feedback units intended to be used was greater in the peer feedback group (26) than the self-editing group (20).

All five students (100%) who chose to receive peer feedback in Cycle C intended to use 58% or more of the feedback given to them. Three of the five students (60%) who chose to receive peer feedback intended to use over 80% of the feedback given to them. Xou even intended to use 98% of the feedback given to him, which was the highest percentage for intending to use peer feedback in any of the three cycles. It is not certain why the percentage was so high for Xou, but one possibility is his best friend Sheng gave him feedback in Cycle C and he was aware of this, so maybe he automatically trusted the feedback and intended to use it because he trusted and respected her as his friend. Sheng was also aware that she had Xou's paper. He always commented in class how much smarter Sheng is than himself, so he may not have even tried to determine if the feedback was accurate or not and just accepted that since Sheng was giving him feedback, it was probably correct.

In the group of five who used peer feedback in Cycle C, 78% of the feedback was intended to be used by the students, which is 10% higher than in Cycle B (68%) and 24% higher than in Cycle A (54%). Perhaps the increase in average percentage of feedback intended to be used suggests that as students became more familiar with giving and

receiving peer feedback, they also became confident in using the feedback. Maybe the students who chose to participate in peer feedback in Cycle C chose it because they believed in its usefulness and knew they were likely to use the feedback they were given.

Discussion of Results: Research Questions #3 and #4

Since the relevant data necessary to answer Research Questions #3 and #4 have been presented and analyzed, the questions can be revisited.

Research Question #3 asked: "To what extent do students *intend to* use peer feedback in the next revision of their essays, and what reasons do they give?" To answer this question, I took the mean of the average percentages of peer feedback intended to be used in Cycle A (54%), Cycle B (68%), and Cycle C (78%) and found about two-thirds (67%) of the feedback given to students by peers was intended to be used on the next revisions of their essays. This finding suggests students value peer feedback and intend to use the majority of peer feedback given to them.

To find out *why* students intended to use the feedback given to them, I took the mean of the average percentages of choice 1 in Cycle A (100%), Cycle B (99.5%), and Cycle C (100%) and found almost 100% of the feedback was used because the student *agreed there was an error*. To find out why students did *not* intend to use the feedback given to them, I took the mean of the averages percentages of choice 2 in Cycle A (95.5%), choice 3 in Cycle B (92.5%), and choice 3 in Cycle C (86%) and found 91% of the feedback was *not* intended to be used because the writer *did not believe there was an error*. The remaining 9% of the feedback was not intended to be used because the writer *did not know how to correct the errors*.

In summary, students intended to use about two-thirds (67%) of the peer feedback given to them because they agreed there were errors. Feedback was not intended to be used when students believed there were no errors (91%) rather than agreeing there were errors and not correcting them because they simply did not know how (9%).

Research Question #4 asked: "Is *indirect* or *direct* feedback given by peers used *more* by students in preparing to revise their essays?" To answer this question, I compared the average percentage of *indirect* feedback intended to be used in Cycle A (54%) with the average percentage of *direct* feedback intended to be used in Cycle B (68%) and the average percentage of *direct* feedback intended to be used by the peer feedback group of five in Cycle C (78%). First, I averaged 68% (Cycle B) and 78% (Cycle C) and found the average percentage of *direct* feedback intended to be used in the entire study was 73%. The difference between intending to use indirect feedback (54%) and direct feedback (73%) was 19%. Therefore, students intended to use direct feedback 19% more than indirect feedback in the next revisions of their essays. This finding suggests direct feedback is more likely to be used more in revisions because it is easier to understand and incorporate into revisions than indirect feedback. Students may intend to use more direct feedback because the corrections are already given to them on their papers. There is no guesswork involved in trying to correct the errors as there is when given indirect feedback.

The next section of this chapter presents and discusses the data to answer the fifth and final research question about the accuracy of peer feedback. The results of the

following section on accuracy are compared to the results of this section in order to make connections between intended usage of feedback and accuracy of feedback.

Research Question #5

This section of the chapter will present and discuss data to answer Research Question #5 about the accuracy of peer feedback as indicated by the data collected from the feedback logs and essays. Research Question #5 asked: "How accurate is peer feedback?"

First, I describe my process of analyzing the relevant data from the feedback logs and accompanying essays in order to answer the question. Next, I present the data for Cycles A, B, and C and then discuss and interpret the results.

Data Analysis: Feedback Logs (A2, B2, C2) and Essays (A2, B2, C2)

I continued to use the same three data analysis tables I created and described in the previous section to answer Research Questions #3 and #4 on intended usage of feedback. To record the number of "correct" and "wrong" feedback units given by the editors on each essay, I added two columns labeled "correct feedback units" and "wrong feedback units" to each data analysis table. I also made a column in the margin on the right side of each feedback log (after the fifth and final column) to record the accuracy of each feedback unit given. In the right margin, I wrote a "C" for a correct feedback unit and a "W" for a wrong feedback unit.

I began with Cycle A. To determine the accuracy of each feedback unit given in Cycle A, I read the feedback as written on each A2 essay and determined if each feedback unit was correct or wrong in the context of the writing. With regards to Cycle

A, indirect feedback was given, which mainly consisted of the peer editors circling or marking errors, so determining if each feedback unit was correct or wrong for the A2 essays was fairly simple. I did not need to know exactly *how* the editor would correct the error, but I had to agree that an error existed. I had to assume what the editor wanted to change. However, as I tried to determine the accuracy of each feedback unit, I noticed two issues.

The first issue was sometimes an indirect feedback unit was correct but unnecessary. For example, in a sentence ending "…when they are having hard times.", Meng inserted a circle in front of "hard" and circled the word "times" to indicate two errors had been made. He probably thought the phrase should have read "a hard time". These corrections were not really needed as the phrase was correct in the original writing, but his corrections were not necessarily wrong in the context of the sentence either. Therefore, his two circles were not necessary. I put a "C?" in the margin for both feedback units, as I was not sure how to approach these questionable units at that time.

The second issue was sometimes an indirect feedback unit was wrong according to the marking used by the editor, but a correction was needed in that place. In other words, I could tell by the marking the editor used that the feedback was wrong, but a different error did exist within that word or phrase that was marked. For example, in a sentence including "…he can get girls phone numbers", Will marked the word "girls" with a circle between the "l" and "s" to indicate an apostrophe was needed. However, in the context of the sentence, "girls" was plural, and the circle should have been placed after the "s" to indicate plural possession (girls' phone numbers). In this case, I marked

the questionable feedback unit as “W?” until I could determine another way of categorizing it.

I tallied the number of correct and wrong feedback units (including the questionable units) given by each editor for each essay and recorded the numbers on my data analysis table for Cycle A.

I proceeded to the Cycle B feedback logs and essays to determine the accuracy of the direct feedback units given. I discovered the same two issues I had found in Cycle A while determining the accuracy of the feedback in Cycle B. However, since the editors corrected errors on the essays in Cycle B, rather than just circling or marking the errors, as in Cycle A, I did not need to assume what the editor wanted to change.

As in Cycle A, I found the editors in Cycle B gave some direct feedback that was correct but unnecessary. The feedback was not wrong, but what the writer had originally written was correct and did not need to be changed. For example, in part of a sentence reading “…it was the funniest day that I had.”, Kao crossed out “funniest” and wrote the word “best”. His “correction” was not wrong, but it was not needed and even slightly changed the meaning. I saw the issue of correct but unnecessary feedback happening more frequently in Cycle B than in Cycle A, which gave me the idea to divide the “correct” column on the data analysis table for Cycle B into two separate columns: 1) “correct/necessary” (CN) and 2) “correct/unnecessary” (CU).

As in Cycle A, I found the editors in Cycle B gave some direct feedback that was wrong, but a correction was needed in that place. In other words, the editor realized there was an error and attempted to correct it, but the “correction” was not correct. For

example, in a sentence containing "…one of the main reins I like playing in the grass…", Chia crossed out "reins" and wrote "reason" instead of the plural "reasons", which would have been correct. She knew something was wrong with "reins" and attempted to correct the error but still missed the "s" to make the word plural.

In order to accommodate this issue, I divided the "wrong" column on the data analysis table for Cycle B into two separate columns: 1) "wrong/unnecessary" (WU) and 2) "wrong/correction needed" (WN) and tallied and recorded the data.

I determined the accuracy of the feedback units on the B2 essays using four categories: 1) correct/necessary (CN), 2) correct/unnecessary (CU), 3) wrong/unnecessary (WU), and 4) wrong/correction needed (WN).

Before I determined the accuracy of the feedback units in Cycle C, I revised my data analysis table for Cycle C to include the four categories of accuracy and applied these categories to the feedback units on the C2 essays. After tallying and recording the data for Cycle C, I re-examined the questionable feedback units in Cycle A, and categorized all feedback units into the four categories. Then I re-tallied and re-recorded the data for Cycle A.

I analyzed data from the three data analysis tables for Cycles A, B, and C necessary to answer Research Question #5. First, I present the relevant data from Cycle A and discuss the results. Then, I present the data for Cycle B, discuss the results, and compare and contrast the results with Cycle A. Finally, the relevant data from Cycle C is presented and discussed, and then compared and contrasted to the previous two cycles.

In each cycle, I present the average number of feedback units (FBU) given by all the editors combined. This information was also reported in the previous section on intended usage of feedback and is included in Table 4.23. In addition, the average numbers and percentages of correct feedback units are given. Correct feedback units refers to the combined total of correct/necessary (CN) feedback units and correct/unnecessary (CU) feedback units. The average number of correct feedback units was rounded to the nearest whole number since a feedback unit cannot occur as a part or fraction. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number, unless the calculated percentage was *exactly* half a percent, in which case it was rounded up to the next whole number. Also included for each cycle are total numbers (from all students combined) and percentages of correct feedback units, including a breakdown of correct/necessary (CN) and correct/unnecessary (CU). Likewise, the total numbers (from all students combined) and percentages of wrong feedback units are presented, including a breakdown of wrong/unnecessary (WU) and wrong/correction needed (WN). Wrong feedback units refers to the combined total of wrong/unnecessary (WU) feedback units and wrong/correction needed (WN) feedback units. Tabulations for the total numbers and percentages of correct and wrong feedback units as well as for the four categories of correct and wrong feedback units are included because I compare this data from each cycle in order to see what kind of correct and wrong feedback editors gave in each cycle and how the accuracy of feedback may have changed from cycle to cycle.

Cycle A: Indirect Feedback

The average number of indirect feedback units given on Essay A2 was 36. The average number of correct feedback units given by the editors was 20. The average percentage of correct feedback given was 59% (the combined total of CN and CU). Table 4.24 displays this data.

Table 4.24: Group Data for Accuracy of Feedback

	A2 (Indirect)		**B2 (Direct)**		**C2 (Peer)**		**C2 (Self)**	
Avg. # of FBU given	36		36		32		20	
Avg. # (%) correct FBU given	20	(59%)	24	(68%)	22	(70%)	14	(69%)
Total # correct FBU	158		188		110		42	
# (%) correct/necessary (CN)	156	(99%)	148	(79%)	83	(75%)	32	(76%)
# (%) correct/unnecessary (CU)	2	(1%)	40	(21%)	27	(25%)	10	(24%)
Total # wrong FBU	124		104		52		18	
# (%) wrong/unnecessary (WU)	120	(97%)	74	(71%)	28	(54%)	10	(56%)
# (%) wrong/correction needed (WN)	4	(3%)	30	(29%)	24	(46%)	8	(44%)

Seven of the eight students (87.5%) gave feedback which was over 50% correct. Six of the eight students (75%) gave feedback which was over 60% correct. (See Appendix GG, which displays individual data and group averages.)

The total number of correct feedback units given by all students combined was 158. Feedback units categorized as correct/necessary (CN) equaled 99% (156/158) of the total correct feedback units. Feedback units categorized as correct/unnecessary (CU) equaled 1% (2/158) of the total correct feedback units.

The total number of wrong feedback units was 124. Feedback units categorized as wrong/unnecessary (WU) equaled 97% (120/124) of the total wrong feedback units. Feedback units categorized as wrong/correction needed (WN) equaled 3% (4/124) of the total wrong feedback units.

In summary, in Cycle A the majority of the students (87.5%) gave correct indirect feedback over 50% of the time. This means only one student (Xou) gave feedback which

was under 50% correct (34%) to Kao. It is now understandable why Kao intended to use only 40% of the feedback given to him in this cycle because it is possible that he recognized that most of the feedback given to him was wrong. Similarly, Antonio gave the second lowest amount of correct feedback in Cycle A (52%), and Meng intended to use only 28% of that feedback. It is possible that Meng recognized that the feedback he was given was not very accurate and therefore decided not to use it. (See Appendix FF for individual data and group averages.)

When feedback was correct, 99% was necessary (CN). When feedback was wrong, 97% was unnecessary (WU). This means when editors gave correct feedback, it was feedback that was needed, but when they gave wrong feedback, there was usually no correction needed at all.

Cycle B: Direct Feedback

The average number of direct feedback units given on Essay B2 was 36. The average number of correct feedback units given by the editors was 24. The average percentage of correct feedback given was 68%. Table 4.24 displays group data. Seven of the eight students (87.5%) gave feedback which was over 58% correct. Five of the eight students (62.5%) gave feedback which was over 70% correct. (See Appendix FF for individual data and group averages.)

The total number of correct feedback units given by all students combined was 188. Feedback units categorized as correct/necessary (CN) equaled 79% (148/188) of the total correct feedback units. Feedback units categorized as correct/unnecessary (CU) equaled 21% (40/188) of the total correct feedback units.

The total number of wrong feedback units was 104. Feedback units categorized as wrong/unnecessary equaled 71% (74/104) of the total wrong feedback units. Feedback units categorized as wrong/correction needed (WN) equaled 29% (30/104) of the total wrong feedback units.

Comparison of Cycle A and Cycle B. On average, students in Cycle B gave feedback which was 9% more accurate than in Cycle A (59% in A and 68% in B). The highest percentage of accuracy in Cycle B for one editor was 87%, which was 17% higher than the highest percentage of accuracy for one editor in Cycle A (70%). However, the lowest percentage of accuracy was 27% in Cycle B, which was 7% lower than the lowest percentage of accuracy in Cycle A (34%). (See Appendix FF for individual data.) The average number of correct feedback units increased by four from Cycle A (20) to Cycle B (24). This is especially relevant since the average number of feedback units given for both cycles was the same (36).

In both Cycles A and B, the majority of the students (87.5%) gave correct direct feedback over 50% of the time, but in Cycle B, the feedback was 8% more accurate for the same number of students (58% or higher in B compared to 50% or higher in A.) Only Kao gave less accurate feedback in Cycle B (27%) than he gave in Cycle A (64%), a difference of 37% accuracy. All other students increased in the percentage of accurate feedback from Cycle A to Cycle B. This is interesting as direct feedback is more specific and perhaps more difficult to give than indirect feedback, yet the editors' accuracy of direct feedback was higher than the accuracy of indirect feedback. Only Kao gave feedback which was under 50% correct (27%) in Cycle B. It is understandable why his

peer Meng only intended to use 29% of the feedback given to him in this cycle, as reported in the previous section. As in Cycle A, Meng probably realized that the feedback given to him was mostly wrong.

When feedback was correct in Cycle B, 79% was necessary (CN), which was 20% lower than in Cycle A (99%). This means editors gave more correct unnecessary (CU) direct feedback than indirect feedback. This finding could be due to the nature of direct and indirect feedback since students may not have circled errors they were not sure needed to be corrected in Cycle A, and therefore the percentage of correct necessary (CN) feedback in Cycle A was higher. When feedback was wrong in Cycle B, 71% was unnecessary (WU), which was 26% lower than in Cycle A (97%). This finding suggests that when students gave direct feedback, they did not give as many unnecessary wrong feedback units because they needed to give a correction rather than just circling or marking a perceived error as they did in Cycle A. Perhaps students got a little "circle-crazy" when giving indirect feedback in Cycle A because it did not take as much effort to circle an error as actually correcting an error when they gave direct feedback in Cycle B.

Cycle C: Choice of Feedback

The data for Cycle C was calculated in two subsets because students were able to choose the kind of feedback they wished to give and receive in this cycle. The choices were indirect peer feedback, direct peer feedback, or no feedback from a peer/self-edit. Five students (62.5%) chose to give direct feedback to their peers and receive direct feedback from their peers. Three students (37.5%) chose to receive no peer feedback and

self-edited. No students chose to give or receive indirect feedback. First, I present the data for the peer feedback group of five and then for the self-editing group of three.

Peer feedback: Group of five. The average number of direct feedback units given on Essay C2 was 32. The average number of correct feedback units given by the editors was 22. The average percentage of correct feedback given was 70%. All five students (100%) gave feedback which was over 50% correct. Four of the five students (80%) gave feedback which was over 65% correct.

The total number of correct feedback units given by all students combined in the peer feedback group was 110. Feedback units categorized as correct/necessary (CN) equaled 75% (83/110) of the total correct feedback units. Feedback units categorized as correct/unnecessary (CU) equaled 25% (27/110) of the total correct feedback units.

The total number of wrong feedback units given by all students combined in the peer feedback group was 52. Feedback units categorized as wrong/unnecessary equaled 54% (28/52) of the total wrong feedback units. Feedback units categorized as wrong/correction needed (WN) equaled 46% (24/52) of the total wrong feedback units.

Self-editing: Group of three. The three students who chose to self-edit were Antonio, Cheng, and Meng. The average number of direct feedback units they gave themselves on Essay C2 was 20. The average number of correct feedback units they gave themselves was 14. The average percentage of correct feedback was 69%. All three students (100%) gave feedback which was over 65% correct. (Table 4.24 displays group data. Appendix GG displays individual data and group averages.)

The total number of correct feedback units given by all students combined in the self-editing group was 42. Feedback units categorized as correct/necessary (CN) equaled 76% (32/42) of the total correct feedback units. Feedback units categorized as correct/unnecessary (CU) equaled 24% (10/42) of the total correct feedback units.

The total number of wrong feedback units given by all students combined in the self-editing group was 18. Feedback units categorized as wrong/unnecessary (WU) equaled 56% (10/18) of the total. Feedback units categorized as wrong/correction needed (WN) equaled 44% (8/18) of the total wrong feedback units.

Comparison of Subgroups. In analyzing both subgroups in Cycle C, the average percentages of accuracy were nearly the same for both the peer feedback group (70%) and self-editing group (69%), with the peer feedback group giving only one percent more accurate feedback than the self-editing group. However, on average the peer feedback group gave 22 correct feedback units, which was 8 feedback units more than the self-editing group (14). The percentages for giving correct and necessary (CN) feedback for both groups were similar, with 75% for the peer feedback group, and 76% for the self-editing group, a difference of one percent. Similarly, wrong and unnecessary feedback (WU) only differed by two percent, with 54% for the peer feedback group, and 56% for self-editing group. These findings suggest that peer feedback and self-editing are similar in the percentage of accuracy for correct and wrong feedback given. However, students giving peer feedback gave more feedback units on average than those students giving feedback to themselves. This may be because it is easier to find errors in a peer's writing than one's own writing. Naturally, a writer tries to write correctly the first time.

An interesting finding in Cycle C occurred as a result of chance. Chia, who had chosen to give and receive peer feedback and was paired with Kao before class began, was sick the day the class gave feedback on the C2 essays. Therefore, I asked Cheng, who had chosen to self-edit, if he wanted to give feedback on Kao's essay since Cheng was done giving himself feedback and was "bored". He had also answered on Questionnaire C that if he had not chosen to self-edit, he would give a peer whatever type of feedback that peer wanted. Therefore, in Cycle C, Cheng was included not only in the self-editing group, but also in the peer feedback group. The percentage of accuracy of feedback Cheng gave to himself and to his peer were exactly the same (69%). However, he gave a little over twice the number of feedback units on his peer's essay (35) than on his own (16). He also gave a little over twice the number of total *correct* feedback units on his peer's essay (24) than on his own (11). This finding shows Cheng was consistent in the percentage of correct feedback whether he self-edited or gave peer feedback, but he gave about twice as many feedback units, including correct ones, to his peer.

Comparison of Subgroups in Cycle C with Cycles A and B. The accuracy of feedback for both groups in Cycle C (peer, 70%, and self, 69%) was higher than both Cycle A (59%) and Cycle B (68%). However, the difference between Cycle C and B was slight (2% and 1% respectively for the groups.) The average number of correct feedback units given by the peer feedback group in Cycle C was 22, which was the mean of the average number of correct feedback units given in Cycle A (20) and Cycle B (24). The average number of correct feedback units given by the self-editing group in Cycle C was 14, which was much lower than the average in Cycle A (20) and Cycle B (24). So

although the average percentage of accuracy of feedback was slightly higher in Cycle C, the actual number of correct feedback units was slightly lower. This may suggest that as students become more used to the feedback process, they give more accurate feedback, but less of it. It is also possible that students were tired of giving feedback by Cycle C, and therefore, gave less feedback. Another possibility is that there were fewer errors made in Cycle C.

Discussion of Results: Research Question #5

Since the relevant data have been presented and analyzed for each cycle, I revisit the main research question for this section: "How accurate is peer feedback?" To answer this question, I took the mean of the average percentages of correct feedback by peers in Cycle A (59%), Cycle B (68%), and Cycle C (70%) and found about two-thirds (66%) of the peer feedback given overall was accurate.

When the average percentages of direct feedback given by peers in both Cycle B (68%) and Cycle C (70%) were averaged, 69% accuracy was found. This is the exact same percentage of accuracy for the self-editing group in Cycle C (69%). This suggests that self feedback is as worthwhile as peer feedback since they both produced the same results in accuracy.

Another interesting finding is that the overall average percentage of accurate peer feedback was 66%, and the average percentage of feedback *intended to be used* was 67% (see previous section of chapter), which is only a 1% difference. This finding suggests that in general, students recognize accurate feedback and use it, while they ignore

feedback that is wrong. However, the feedback that was intended to be used might not have been the same two-thirds of the feedback that was found to be accurate.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I presented the results obtained from the three sources of data for the study: 1) the questionnaires administered before, during, and after the study, 2) the feedback logs and essays, and 3) my observations recorded in a journal during the study. I discussed and analyzed the data and answered the five research questions. The results of the questionnaires indicate students were positive about teacher feedback and perceived teacher feedback to be more helpful than peer feedback. Most students would choose teacher feedback over peer feedback if given a choice between the two. The majority of the students liked receiving peer feedback and found it somewhat helpful, with direct feedback being more helpful than indirect feedback in improving their writing. Students gave more positive responses than negative responses about giving feedback to peers. Students found giving direct feedback to be more helpful than giving indirect feedback in improving their own writing. Most students felt they gave “okay” or “good” feedback to their peers. The majority of students thought using a feedback log was somewhat helpful in improving their writing. As the study progressed, students’ opinions about liking to use a feedback log became more negative than at the start of the study. The majority of the students chose to give and receive direct grammatical feedback from peers when given a choice for the final cycle (Cycle C.) The results of the feedback logs and essays indicate that students intended to use about two-thirds (67%) of the peer feedback given to them because they agreed there were errors. Feedback was

not intended to be used when students believed there were no errors (91%) rather than agreeing there were errors and not correcting them because they simply did not know how (9%). The feedback logs and essays also indicate that about two-thirds (66%) of the peer feedback given overall was accurate. The accuracy of direct feedback in the study was 69%.

Chapter Five, the Conclusion, summarizes the findings of the research, discusses the implications of this study, limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Introduction

This capstone investigated the role of grammatical feedback by peers on essay writing in the high school advanced English language learners' classroom. I conducted classroom research over a period of six weeks (22 class periods) in my advanced ELL class of eight students. I collected data from questionnaires, feedback logs and essays, and my own personal journal in order to answer my five research questions. My main goal of this research project was to determine if using peer feedback in my classroom was worthwhile with the students I teach.

In Chapter Four, I presented the results from the sources of data and analyzed and discussed the research questions in sections. In this chapter, I summarize and reflect on the major findings of my study and connect them to the information presented in the literature review. In addition, I discuss the implications of the study for using peer feedback in the ELL classroom. I also consider the limitations of this study and recommend suggestions for further research.

Reflections on Major Findings and Connections to the Literature

My study included five main guiding research questions. In this section, I discuss the major findings of my study and how they relate to previous research.

Research Question #1 asked: "What are the students' preferences, perceptions, and attitudes about writing feedback before, during, and after the implementation of peer feedback in the classroom?" In order to answer this question, I analyzed the data from many individual questions from four questionnaires. My study found students perceived teacher feedback to be more helpful than peer feedback both before and after the study, although negative responses toward teacher feedback increased by the end of the study. Despite the increase in negative responses, most students would choose teacher feedback over peer feedback if given a choice between the two. This finding is similar to other studies in which teacher feedback was preferred over peer feedback (Freedman, 1987, as cited in Weaver, 1995; Linden-Martin 1997; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Sengupta, 1998; Tang & Tithecott, 1999; Zhang, 1995).

In response to *receiving* peer feedback, the majority of the students in my study responded receiving peer feedback was somewhat helpful, with direct feedback being more helpful than indirect feedback in improving their writing. The preference for direct feedback, rather than indirect feedback, differed from most of the research I cited in my literature review. In most of the studies I reviewed, the students preferred to receive some kind of indirect feedback over direct feedback (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Leki, 1986, as cited in Leki, 1990; Semke, 1984). However, in all of those studies, the teacher gave the feedback, rather than the student. Perhaps the students in my study wanted direct feedback from their peers because it would be easier for the writers to decide if the feedback was correct or not. My study corroborates Chandler's (2003) study in which the majority of the students preferred direct feedback. The majority of students in my study

liked receiving peer feedback and preferred to receive peer feedback as one type of feedback on their writing. This result is very much like the result from Jacobs, et al. (1998) study, which found that 93% of the students surveyed wanted peer feedback as one type of feedback on their writing. At the beginning of my study, most students wanted a better writer than they were to give them feedback, but by the end of the study, most students wanted a writer at their same level to give them feedback.

In response to *giving* peer feedback, students gave more positive responses than negative responses. This finding supports research encouraging the use of peer feedback in the classroom (Allaei & Connor, 1990; Braine, 1989; Carson & Nelson, 1994; De Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Freedman, 1992; Keh, 1990; Leki, 1990; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Mittan, 1989; Olson, 1990; Tang & Tithecott, 1999; Vataloro, 1990). Students in my study found giving direct feedback to be more helpful than giving indirect feedback in improving their own writing. Most students in my study felt they gave "okay" or "good" feedback to their peers.

In response to using a feedback log, the majority of students thought using a feedback log was somewhat helpful in improving their writing both before and after the study. I speculate that the students believed this for a few reasons. First of all, I (the teacher) required them to use the log, and they probably believed that the teacher would only require them to use a log if it was beneficial to them. Second of all, they probably did become more aware of errors they were making because the same types of errors appeared on their logs in each cycle. This finding is similar to the finding in Lalande's (1982) study in which 76% of students believed keeping track of their errors helped them

become aware of recurring errors. As my study progressed, however, students' opinions about liking to use a feedback log became more negative than at the start of the study. I can only speculate that the students began to feel more negative because they realized that using a feedback log required them to do more writing, and they were getting tired and bored with the process by the end of the study (and the end of the school year).

My second research question asked: "Given the choice, do students choose to give or receive indirect or direct grammatical feedback from peers, or do they choose to self-edit their essays?" The results for this question were determined from the answers to Questionnaire C. Five of the eight students (62.5%) chose to receive direct grammatical feedback from peers as well as give direct grammatical feedback to peers because they said both were easier to use and correct mistakes, and direct feedback was more helpful. This represents the majority of students in the study. Three students (37.5%) chose to receive no peer feedback and preferred to self-edit their essays for reasons which included believing the peer feedback given in the previous cycles was not useful, believing that one should correct his or her own mistakes instead of having someone else do it, and believing that he would learn more from correcting his own mistakes. If students do not want grammatical feedback from their peers, or had bad experiences with receiving or giving feedback, then it is understandable that students would choose to self-edit. I can understand the students' choices of feedback based on my knowledge of the students' personalities. However, my study did not examine the effects of peer feedback on the finished revised pieces of writing, so ineffectiveness of grammar feedback on quality of writing is impossible to determine from my study.

Research Question #3 asked: "To what extent do students *intend to* use peer feedback in the next revision of their essays, and what reasons do they give?" The data showed about two-thirds (67%) of the feedback given to students by peers was intended to be used on the next revisions of their essays because they agreed there were errors. This finding is similar to the findings in other studies examining the use of writing feedback in which students used the majority of the feedback given to them by their peers (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Rollinson,1998, as cited in Rollinson, 2005; Tang & Tithecott, 1999; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998). In my study, feedback was not intended to be used when students believed there were no errors (91%), rather than agreeing there were errors and not correcting them because they simply did not know how (9%). This finding suggests students value peer feedback and intend to use the majority of peer feedback given to them if they believe that they made errors in their writing.

Research Question #4 asked: "Is *indirect* or *direct* feedback given by peers used *more* by students in preparing to revise their essays?" My study found the students intended to use direct feedback 19% more than indirect feedback in the next revisions of their essays. This finding suggests direct feedback is easier to understand and incorporate into revisions than indirect feedback. Students may intend to use more direct feedback because the corrections are already given to them on their papers. There is no guesswork involved in trying to correct the errors as there is when given indirect feedback. None of the research I reviewed examined this kind of question.

The last research question in my study asked: "How accurate is peer feedback?" I found about two-thirds (66%) of the peer feedback given overall was accurate. When the average percentages of direct feedback given by peers in both Cycle B (68%) and Cycle C (70%) were averaged, 69% accuracy was found. Other research has also found that the majority of the feedback given by peers is accurate (Caulk, 1994; Rollinson, 1998, as cited in Rollinson, 2005). The accuracy of feedback for the self-editing group in Cycle C was 69%. This suggests that self feedback is as worthwhile as peer feedback since they both produced the same results in accuracy in my study.

Another interesting finding in my study is that the overall average percentage of accurate peer feedback was 66%, and the average percentage of feedback *intended to be used* was 67% which is only a 1% difference. This finding suggests that in general, students recognize accurate feedback and use it, while they ignore feedback that is wrong.

Implications

My study has several implications. The main implication of my study is that implementing grammatical feedback by peers on essay writing in the high school ELL classroom is a worthwhile activity; however, students should sometimes be allowed to self-edit their writing instead of participating in peer feedback activities if they so choose. Using peer feedback activities in the ELL classroom should be considered as one part of the revising and editing process in regards to grammar, but teacher feedback on student writing should not be eliminated since students often prefer teacher feedback over peer feedback.

Another implication of my study is it is beneficial to train ELLs at the secondary level how to use editing strategies, both for peer and self-editing tasks. For most of the students in the study, peer-editing using indirect and direct feedback was a new experience. These students had a lack of experience with this kind of problem solving in writing, and therefore, they needed practice. Although I did not measure the development of metacognitive skills as part of my study, I believe that the students' awareness and understanding of themselves as editors and writers developed as a result of the modeling, training, and practice of editing sample writings and their peers' writing. While peer-editing or self-editing, students were forced to stop, analyze, and reflect about how to correct errors. While editing their own writing after receiving feedback, students needed to use the feedback logs, and in doing so, they reflected on their own errors and how to correct them. By drawing attention to the process of editing, it is possible that students made fewer errors in their writing by the end of the study. In my study, it appears as though fewer errors were found in the writing overall as the study progressed; however, it is possible that the writing of the students improved, and therefore fewer errors were made overall, meaning there were fewer errors to be found by students in the first place. Teachers should model editing strategies and give students many opportunities to practice peer-editing techniques.

Limitations of My Study and Suggestions for Further Research

There are several limitations to my study. These limitations include participant size, lack of variety of first languages spoken by students, length and time of the study, and limits on types of feedback given.

The first and most obvious limitation was the small participant size. I used a class of only eight students that I was already teaching. Ideally, this study would include a larger number of participants in more than one classroom, perhaps with several teachers. Further research may include more than one class of students to compare results. Another suggestion is to have students in different classes give and receive different types of peer feedback in order to compare results.

A second limitation with the participants in my study was a lack of variety of first languages and writing abilities. The majority of students spoke Hmong as a first language, and only one student spoke Spanish as a first language. These students had also spent the majority, if not their entire lives, in the United States. Further research might consider looking at a more linguistically-diverse group or groups of students. The levels of English language ability varied only slightly in my study, as all of the students were considered advanced ESL writers at the high school level. Another suggestion for future research would be examining peer feedback with students of many different levels of English language writing abilities in one or more classes.

I also believe the length of the study and the time of year the study was conducted were limitations. My study only took place over a six-week period, consisting of 22 class periods in one term. A study that would examine data over a period of a year or several years would provide more data to be analyzed and compared. More time would have allowed for more cycles of each type of feedback to be compared to one another. In addition to the short length of the study, the time of year I conducted the study may have had an effect on the results. I conducted my research in the last two months of the school

year (April and May). At this point in the year, many students had spring fever and were not concentrating in class or giving their full effort. They were getting tired of being in school and I could tell by the comments they made and by their fidgeting in class that they were beginning to be lazy and distracted. A suggestion for future research would be to limit the number of questionnaires given in a study that is limited to a short period of time, as in my study. Students' comments in class about the questionnaires revealed burn-out. Interviewing individual students about the feedback they received and gave or allowing students to write journals about each of the cycles might have given more insight on the peer feedback process. Maybe different results would have occurred at the beginning of a school year, rather than at the end.

A final suggestion for future research would be to examine the accuracy of student writing after implementing many cycles of peer feedback. This was beyond the scope of my research questions; however, it would have been interesting to see if implementing peer feedback resulted in improved accuracy of student texts.

Conclusion

Through conducting classroom research with my own students, I have answered my burning questions about the role of grammatical feedback by peers on essay writing in the ELL classroom. The most significant discoveries for me included learning that students value both teacher and peer feedback and want both kinds of feedback on their writing. I was also pleased to find that the majority of students plan to use the majority of the feedback they are given. It was also encouraging for me to find out that about two-thirds of the feedback given was accurate. This information strengthened my belief that

using peer feedback for grammatical aspects of writing is worthwhile for my students. I plan on continuing to use peer feedback in my ELL classroom with my students based on the findings of my research. I would like to try new and different techniques in implementing peer feedback on essay writing, perhaps by using oral feedback or having students give feedback on content in addition to grammar.

I plan on sharing the results of my study with the students who were involved with the hope of convincing or reassuring them that their feedback is valuable and the majority of it is accurate and used by the peers to whom they are giving it. In addition, I plan on sharing my findings with the ESL teacher at the middle school in my district, as well as with the other second language teachers in my school in order to encourage them to try using peer feedback in their classrooms. It is my hope that my study has added to the growing research base on ELL writing approaches and feedback.

APPENDIX A

Student Information Questionnaire

Student Information Questionnaire

Please fill out the following information as completely and accurately as possible.

Full Name: _____

Age: _____

Grade in school: _____

Number of years living in the United States: _____

Number of years in English as a Second Language classes: _____

APPENDIX B

Consent Letter

April 2, 2007

Dear Parent or Guardian:

As you already know, I am your child's English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher at Winona Senior High School. I am also completing a master's degree in ESL at Hamline University. An important part of my degree is a research project. I plan to conduct research during the fourth term of the 2006-2007 school year (April-June) in your child's ESL class during the regular school day. The purpose of my letter is to get your permission for your child to take part in my research. The final product will be published and probably accessible on the Hamline website. I may also use my results in an article for publication in a professional journal or in a report at a professional conference in the future.

My research will examine the role of peer feedback in grammar revisions in the high school advanced English Language Learners classroom. More specifically, I will look at the effects, preferences, perceptions, and attitudes regarding the use of direct and indirect grammar feedback on expository essays. My main goal is to find out how different kinds of peer feedback may help ESL students with their writing.

During fourth term, all students in my advanced ESL class will be writing expository essays which are based on actual Minnesota state writing test prompts. They will give each other peer feedback on these essays and record the feedback as they revise their essays. In addition, each student will also answer a series of questionnaires regarding their preferences, perceptions, and attitudes regarding writing and writing feedback. I will also observe the students as they complete the tasks in class. Since research and writing are dynamic processes, I may add other tasks and goals during the research period as well. I will collect the writing tasks and questionnaires in order to do a detailed analysis of the data in order to have a better understanding of peer feedback, which I will eventually share with the students.

If your child participates in my research, his or her identity will be protected. No real names or identifying characteristics will be used. Participants' grades will not be affected by my analysis of their writing, although they will be expected to participate in all activities as they are a part of the class requirements. All results will be confidential and anonymous. Also, you or your child may decide not to participate in this study at any time without negative consequences.

I have received approval for my study from the Graduate School of Education at Hamline University and from my principal, Nancy Wondrasch, at Winona Senior High School.

Please sign and return the attached form to indicate your permission for your child to participate in this study. If you have any questions, please call me at school (507-494-1593) between 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Thank you for your cooperation. A follow-up phone call will also be made by an interpreter at the high school.

Sincerely,

Ms. Angela Birk – ESL Teacher
Winona Senior High School
901 Gilmore Avenue
Winona, MN 55987
Email: Antonioa.birk@winona.k12.mn.us

APPENDIX C

Consent Form

For the parent or guardian:

April 2007

Dear Ms. Birk,

I have received and read your letter about conducting research my child's ESL classroom. I understand that your goal is to better understand the effects, preferences, perceptions, and attitudes regarding the use of direct and indirect grammar feedback by peers on expository essay writing in the high school advanced English Language Learners classroom.

I give permission for my child, _____, to participate in the research project that is part of your graduate degree program. I understand that all results will be confidential and anonymous.

Signed,

_____ _____

(Parent/Guardian) (Date)

For the participating student:

Dear Ms. Birk:

I have read and shown your letter to my parents or guardians about conducting research my ESL classroom. I understand that your goal is to better understand the effects, preferences, perceptions, and attitudes regarding the use of direct and indirect grammar feedback by peers on expository essay writing in the high school advanced English Language Learners classroom.

I agree to participate in the research project that is part of your graduate degree program. I agree to try my best in all activities. I understand that all results will be confidential and anonymous.

Signed,

_____ _____

(Student) (Date)

APPENDIX D

Prompt P

PROMPT P

Directions: You will be writing an essay on the prompt in the box.

- You must write your answer in English.
- You must write on the lines inside the box.
- You have three pre-writing pages for planning and organizing.
- You have three final essay pages.
- You must not write more than three pages.
- You must use a number 2 pencil.

Tell about one challenging experience you had in your past.

Explain why it was challenging for you and what you learned from the experience.

Include details so your reader will understand your experience.

REMINDERS

Write as neatly as possible.

Make sure your composition has the following:

_____ a clear, focused central idea

_____ supporting details (reasons, examples)

_____ a logical organization (beginning, middle, end)

_____ correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation

_____ complete sentences.

APPENDIX E

Prewriting Page

PREWRITING PAGE

THIS PAGE WILL NOT BE SCORED.

USE PENCIL ONLY WRITE INSIDE LINES ONLY

APPENDIX F

Final Writing Page

FINAL

THIS PAGE WILL BE SCORED.

USE PENCIL ONLY WRITE INSIDE LINES ONLY

APPENDIX G

Questionnaire P

Questionnaire P (Before Classroom Research)

Preferences, Perceptions, and Attitudes about Writing Feedback

You are helping Ms. Birk with her classroom research project.
Please answer the following questions as honestly as possible.
Try to think back to when you have given and received writing feedback.
Close your eyes and think about each situation.

Please read these **definitions** to help you understand the following questions:

Teacher feedback is when a teacher gives you help with your writing.
Peer feedback is when an ESL classmate gives you help with your writing.

1. In your opinion, how helpful is <u>teacher feedback</u> in improving your writing?
(Circle only one.)

4 = very helpful
3 = somewhat helpful
2 = only a little helpful
1 = not at all helpful

2. In your opinion, how helpful is <u>peer feedback</u> in improving your writing?
(Circle only one.)

4 = very helpful
3 = somewhat helpful
2 = only a little helpful
1 = not at all helpful

3. Which kind of feedback is more helpful in improving your writing?
(Circle only one.)

Teacher Peer

4. If you had a choice between <u>teacher feedback</u> or <u>peer feedback</u>, which would you choose? (Circle only one.)

Teacher Peer

5. Do you like receiving writing feedback from your teacher? (Circle one.) Yes No

Why or why not? (Circle all statements that are true.)

- I think the teacher knows more than I do, so I trust the teacher's comments.
- I do not think the teacher knows more than I do, so I do not trust the teacher's comments.
- I feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my teacher.
- I do not feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my teacher.
- I can figure out what to do next with my writing when I receive writing feedback from my teacher.
- I can not figure out what to do next with my writing when I receive writing feedback from my teacher.
- I understand my teacher's feedback because I can read my teacher's handwriting.
- I can not understand my teacher's feedback because I can not read my teacher's handwriting.
- I understand my teacher's feedback because I understand the marks or symbols that my teacher uses on my paper.
- I can not understand my teacher's feedback because I do not understand the marks or symbols that my teacher uses on my paper.
- Add any other thoughts:

_____

_____

6. Do you like receiving writing feedback from your peers? (Circle one.) Yes No

Why or why not? (Circle all statements that are true.)

- I think my peers know more than I do, so I trust my peer's comments.
- I think my peers do not know more than I do, so I do not trust my peer's comments.
- I feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my peers.
- I do not feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my peers.
- I can figure out what to do next with my writing when I receive writing feedback from my peers.
- I can not figure out what to do next with my writing when I receive writing feedback from my peers.
- I understand my peers' feedback because I can read my peers' handwriting.
- I can not understand my peers' feedback because I can not read my peers' handwriting.
- I understand my peers' feedback because I understand the marks or symbols that my peers use on my paper.
- I can not understand my peers' feedback because I do not understand the marks or symbols that my peers use on my paper.
- Add any other thoughts:

_____

_____

7. Choose one of these statements: (Circle only one.)

1. I prefer to have feedback from other students as one type of feedback on my writing.

2. I prefer not to have feedback from other students on my writing.

Explain your choice. (Why did you choose either #1 or #2?)

_____

_____

8. How do you feel about giving writing feedback to your peers?
(Circle all that apply.)

It is fun.	I feel embarrassed.	I feel scared.
It is boring	I feel confident.	I feel unsure.
It is overwhelming.	I feel alone.	I feel responsible.
It is frustrating.	I feel nervous.	I feel pressured.
It is intimidating.	I feel independent.	I am interested.
I feel lazy.	I feel anxious.	I feel successful.
	I feel helpful.	I feel like "I'm the best!"

Other words you would use: _____

9. How do you feel about receiving writing feedback from your peers?
(Circle all that apply.)

It is fun.	I feel embarrassed.	I feel scared.
It is boring	I feel confident.	I feel unsure.
It is overwhelming.	I feel alone.	I feel responsible.
It is frustrating.	I feel nervous.	I feel pressured.
It is intimidating.	I feel independent.	I am interested.
I feel lazy.	I feel anxious.	I feel successful.
	I feel helpful.	I feel like "I'm the best!"

Other words you would use: _____

10. How do you feel about using feedback from your peers in revising your writing?
(Circle one.)

- I feel they give helpful feedback, and I use it.
- I feel they do not give helpful feedback, and I do not use it.

11. In your opinion, how well do <u>you give</u> writing feedback to your peers?
(Circle only one.)

- I give very good feedback.
- I give good feedback.
- I give okay feedback.
- I do <u>not</u> give good feedback.
- I am inconsistent. (It depends on the situation.)

Why do you feel this way? Explain.

_____

_____

_____

12. When you are giving feedback on writing, how do you decide what to do?
(Explain how you give feedback on your peer's essay.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Who do you want to give feedback on your writing?
(Circle all that are true.)

- **A better writer than I am.**
- **A writer who writes at my same level.**
- **A poorer writer than I am.**
- **A person of the same gender (boy/girl).**
- **A person of the other gender (boy/girl).**
- **A person who speaks the same first language as I do.**
- **Other: _____**

14. Would you rather receive <u>direct</u> or <u>indirect</u> feedback on your writing?
(Circle one of the following explanations.)

<u>Direct feedback</u> is when the correct form is given to the writer by the person giving feedback.

In other words, the responder corrects the error for you.

Example: You write: I wanted to go shoping.
The responder crosses out "shoping" and writes "shopping" correctly.

<u>Indirect feedback</u> is when an error is marked in some way by the person giving feedback, but the writer is not given the correction.

In other words, the writer is shown there is an error, but the responder does not correct the error. The writer must correct it himself or herself.

Example: You write: I wanted to go shoping.
The responder circles the word "shoping", but you must figure out how to correct it yourself.

15. How do you decide which writing feedback to use and which to ignore? Explain.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. Do you think a "Feedback Log " or "Error Chart" is helpful in improving your writing?

A <u>Feedback Log</u> or <u>Error Chart</u> is a paper on which the writer can record the errors made in his or her writing, and the writer can also record the corrections needed. (Circle only one.)

Yes No

I am not sure because I do not remember using a Feedback Log or Error Chart before.

17. If "yes" or "no" was your answer to number 16, answer this question:

In your opinion, how useful is a <u>feedback log</u> in improving your writing? (Circle only one.)

4 = very helpful
3 = somewhat helpful
2 = only a little helpful
1 = not at all helpful

18. If "yes" or "no" was your answer to number 16, answer this question:

Do you like using a feedback log? (Circle one.) Yes No

Why or why not? (Circle all statements that are true.)

- A feedback log is easy to use.
- A feedback log is complicated to use.
- A feedback log is quick to use.
- A feedback log takes too much time to use.
- A feedback log helps me learn from my errors.
- A feedback log does <u>not</u> help me learn from my errors.
- A feedback log helps me avoid the same errors in future writing.
- A feedback log does <u>not</u> help me avoid the same errors in future writing.
- A feedback log is fun to use.
- A feedback log is <u>not</u> fun to use.
- A feedback log is important to use to learn how to correct errors.
- A feedback log is a waste of time.
- Add any other thoughts:

_____

_____

APPENDIX H

Prompt A

PROMPT A

Directions: You will be writing an essay on the prompt in the box.

- You must write your answer in English.
- You must write on the lines inside the box.
- You have three pre-writing pages for planning and organizing.
- You have three final essay pages.
- You must not write more than three pages.
- You must use a number 2 pencil.

Who did you admire when you were younger?

Tell about that person and explain why he or she was special to you.

Include details so your reader will understand your choice.

REMINDERS

Write as neatly as possible.

Make sure your composition has the following:

_____ a clear, focused central idea

_____ supporting details (reasons, examples)

_____ a logical organization (beginning, middle, end)

_____ correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation

_____ complete sentences.

APPENDIX I

Indirect Feedback Instructions and Exercises Packet

<u>INDIRECT</u> FEEDBACK

INSTRUCTIONS and EXERCISES PACKET

In this packet, you will find directions and examples on how to give **<u>indirect feedback</u>**. You will also find a sample essay that you will use to practice giving indirect feedback.

<u>Indirect feedback</u> is when an error is marked in some way by the person giving feedback, but the writer is not given the correction. In other words, you will show the writer there is an error, but you will not correct it or explain how to correct it.

You are only correcting grammatical, mechanical, and spelling errors. You are not correcting content errors (organization, ideas, meaning, style) for this exercise.

First, Ms. Birk will guide you through the directions and examples for giving indirect feedback. Follow along by looking at the overhead and marking the examples on your sheets.

Next, Ms. Birk will begin to guide you through the sample essay by modeling on the overhead. Then, she will give you time to work through the sample essay on your own before the class corrects it together.

The sample essay in this packet is a response to **<u>PROMPT A</u>**:
(You answered this same prompt for Essay A.)

> Who did you admire when you were younger?
> Tell about that person and explain why he or she was special to you.
> Include details so your reader will understand your choice.

INDIRECT FEEDBACK
DIRECTIONS AND EXAMPLES

To give indirect feedback, follow these directions and examples. Mark the examples as we go through this in class.

GRAMMAR ERRORS

If the <u>subject and verb do not agree</u>, circle both the subject and verb. This means that the subject and verb <u>do not fit together</u>. This should be counted as one error.

Example: They wants to go home.

Example: He want to see a movie.

If the <u>tense or form of the verb is wrong</u> in the sentence, circle the parts of the verb that are wrong.

Example: He want to go home yesterday.

Example: She will go home yesterday.

Example: We would always had fun.

If the <u>wrong word is used</u> in the context of the sentence, circle it.

Example: I went house after school.

Example: He played good during the game.

If a <u>word is missing</u>, use an arrow and draw a circle where the word should be.

Example: She wanted go to the store.

Example: He bought CD.

If an <u>extra word</u> is in the text where it should <u>not</u> be, circle the word or words that create the problem.

Example: She went to a the store.

Example: My friends they go to the store.

If <u>words are in the wrong order</u>, circle the part of the sentence where the words are mixed up.

Example: Why he did do that to you?

Example: He wanted the car to buy.

COMMA ERRORS

If a <u>comma is missing</u>, circle the space where the comma should be.

Example: If she really wanted to go she would have called him.

Example: I live in Winona Minnesota.

If an <u>unnecessary comma</u> is placed where it should <u>not</u> be, circle it.

Example: If, she really wanted to go, she would have called him.

Example: He brought home pizza, and pop.

If a <u>comma is added between two sentences without a conjunction</u> (comma splice), circle the comma.

Example: I went to the store, I bought a pizza.

Example: I went shopping, I bought a shirt.

RUN-ON SENTENCES (RUN-ONS)

A <u>run-on</u> is two or more sentences combined with no end punctuation or no internal punctuation (semi-colon or comma with a conjunction).

If you find a run-on sentence, draw an arrow and circle the space where you think the sentences should be separated in some way (a correction is needed).

Example: I went to the store I bought a pizza.

Example: I went shopping I bought a shirt.

END PUNCTUATION ERRORS

If <u>end punctuation is forgotten</u> (period, question mark, exclamation point), circle where the punctuation should be.

Example: I wanted to go to the store

Example: Are we going to the store

Example: Let's go to the store

If the <u>wrong</u> end punctuation is used, circle the punctuation that is misused.

Example: I wanted to go to the store?

Example: Are we going to the store.

Example: Let's go to the store?

INCOMPLETE SENTENCES (FRAGMENTS)

An incomplete sentence (fragment) is a phrase that is punctuated like a sentence, but it is missing a subject, verb, or complete idea.

If you find an incomplete sentence (fragment), highlight the fragment in yellow, circle the fragment (what is in yellow), and count it as one error.

Example: If I had to go to the store. My mom would take me.

Example: Because he wanted to buy a game. He went to the store.

SPELLING ERRORS

If a word is <u>spelled wrong</u>, circle the entire word.

Example: I wanted to go shoping.

Example: He had a qustion.

If a <u>word is separated when it should not be</u>, circle both words together and count it as one error.

Example: I needed help on my home work.

Example: He wanted to talk to some one.

If <u>two words are put together as one word when they should not be</u>, circle the entire word.

Example: I ate alot of candy.

CAPITALIZATION ERRORS

If a <u>word is capitalized when it should not be</u>, circle the letter.

Example: I could not wait to go to High School.

Example: He was a Doctor.

If a <u>word should be capitalized when it is not</u>, circle the letter.

Example: I go to winona senior high school.

Example: I went to see dr. smith.

OTHER ERRORS

Circle any <u>typing errors (typos)</u>. In other words, circle any <u>careless mistakes</u> you find that do not fit into any other category listed here.

Example: He waanted to go to the store.

Example: He bough.t a pizza.

**** If you find any other grammatical or mechanical errors not listed here, circle them.**

<u>Remember:</u>

**** You are only correcting grammatical, mechanical, and spelling errors.**
**** You are not correcting content errors (organization, ideas, meaning, style).**

SAMPLE ESSAY
PROVIDE INDIRECT FEEDBACK ON THIS ESSAY

Who you did admire when you were younger. When I was a young kid I always admire my dad, I admire him so much because, he always help me, he done any thing for me, and we would always had fun together.

The first reason I admire him so much is because he always help me, no madder what it was that I need. If I need help on my home work he help me withit. For example I didn't understood math, it was so hard. If I ever had any Problems with my Life. I could Just talk to him he would helped me out by telling me wat to do.

Another reason I admire him so much is, because he would done any thing for me if I really need it. When I

needed my bicycle fix would he always fixed it as soon as he have time. If I ever need a ride to my friends howe would he do that for me.

The third reason why I admire my dad so much is, because we would alway s had fun together. We used to go to the twins games was alot of Fun to do. The twins they always plays real good.

He use to take me Bowling. Which was alot of fun because he would always teached me how to get better

As a kid I admire my dad more then any one because, he always help me, he done anything me, and we always have a fun together. These are the reasons I admire my dad so much.

APPENDIX J

Direct Feedback Instructions and Exercises Packet

<u>DIRECT</u> FEEDBACK

INSTRUCTIONS and EXERCISES PACKET

In this packet, you will find directions and examples on how to give **<u>direct feedback</u>**. You will also find a sample essay that you will use to practice giving direct feedback.

<u>Direct feedback</u> is when the writer is given the correction by the person giving feedback (the editor). In other words, you will correct the error for the writer.

You are only correcting grammatical, mechanical, and spelling errors. You are not correcting content errors (organization, ideas, meaning, style) for this exercise.

First, Ms. Birk will guide you through the directions and examples for giving direct feedback. Follow along by looking at the overhead and marking the examples on your sheets.

Next, Ms. Birk will begin to guide you through the sample essay by modeling on the overhead. Then, she will give you time to work through the sample essay on your own before the class corrects it together.

The sample essay in this packet is a response to **<u>PROMPT A</u>**:
(You answered this same prompt for Essay A. You also used this sample essay to practice giving indirect feedback.)

> Who did you admire when you were younger?
> Tell about that person and explain why he or she was special to you.
> Include details so your reader will understand your choice.

DIRECT FEEDBACK
DIRECTIONS AND EXAMPLES

To give direct feedback, follow these directions and examples. Mark the examples as we go through this in class.

GRAMMAR ERRORS

If the <u>subject and verb do not agree</u>, cross out either the subject or verb and write the correct form above it. Then circle the original error and the correction you made. This should be counted as one error.

Example: They wants to go home.

Example: He want to see a movie.

If the <u>tense or form of the verb is wrong</u> in the sentence, cross out the parts of the verb that are wrong and write the correct verb above it. Then circle the original error and the correction you made. This should be counted as one error.

Example: He want to go home yesterday.

Example: She will go home yesterday.

Example: We would always had fun.

If the <u>wrong word is used</u> in the context of the sentence, cross out it and write the correct word above it. Then circle the original error and the correction you made. This should be counted as one error.

Example: I went house after school.

Example: He played good during the game.

If a <u>word is missing</u>, use an arrow and write the word where the word should be. Circle the inserted word. This should be counted as one error.

Example: She wanted go to the store.

Example: He bought CD.

If an <u>extra word</u> is in the text where it should <u>not</u> be, cross out the word or words that create the problem. Then circle the original error and the correction you made. This should be counted as one error.

Example: She went to a the store.

Example: My friends they go to the store.

If words are in the wrong order, cross out the part of the sentence where the words are mixed up and write the correction above them. Then circle the original error and the correction you made. This should be counted as one error.

Example: Why he did do that to you?

Example: He wanted the car to buy.

COMMA ERRORS

If a comma is missing, write in the comma where it should be. Circle the comma. This should be counted as one error.

Example: If she really wanted to go she would have called him.

Example: I live in Winona Minnesota.

If an unnecessary comma is placed where it should not be, cross out it. Circle the correction. This should be counted as one error.

Example: If, she really wanted to go, she would have called him.

Example: He brought home pizza, and pop.

If a <u>comma is added between two sentences without a conjunction</u> (comma splice), make a correction to fix the error. Circle your correction. This should be counted as one error.

Example: I went to the store, I bought a pizza.

Example: I went shopping, I bought a shirt.

RUN-ON SENTENCES (RUN-ONS)

A <u>run-on</u> is two or more sentences combined with no end punctuation or no internal punctuation (semi-colon or comma with a conjunction).

If you find a run-on sentence, make a correction to fix the error. Circle the correction. This should be counted as one error.

Example: I went to the store I bought a pizza.

Example: I went shopping I bought a shirt.

END PUNCTUATION ERRORS

If <u>end punctuation is forgotten</u> (period, question mark, exclamation point), write in the punctuation where it should be. Then circle the correction you made. This should be counted as one error.

Example: I wanted to go to the store

Example: Are we going to the store

Example: Let's go to the store

If the <u>wrong</u> end punctuation is used, cross out the punctuation that is misused and write in the correct punctuation. Then circle the original error and the correction you made. This should be counted as one error.

Example: I wanted to go to the store?

Example: Are we going to the store.

Example: Let's go to the store?

INCOMPLETE SENTENCES (FRAGMENTS)

An incomplete sentence (fragment) is a phrase that is punctuated like a sentence, but it is missing a subject, verb, or complete idea.

If you find an incomplete sentence (fragment), highlight the fragment in yellow and make a correction to fix the error. Then circle the original error (the highlighted fragment) and the correction you made. This should be counted as one error.

Example: If I had to go to the store. My mom would take me.

Example: Because he wanted to buy a game. He went to the store.

SPELLING ERRORS

If a word is <u>spelled wrong</u>, cross out the entire word and write the correct spelling above it. Then circle the original error and the correction you made. This should be counted as one error.

Example: I wanted to go shoping.

Example: He had a qustion.

If a <u>word is separated when it should not be</u>, cross out both words together and rewrite the word correctly above them. Then circle the original error and the correction you made. This should be counted as one error.

Example: I needed help on my home work.

Example: He wanted to talk to some one.

If <u>two words are put together as one word when they should not be</u>, cross out the entire word and rewrite the words correctly above them. Then circle the original error and the correction you made. This should be counted as one error.

Example: I ate alot of candy.

CAPITALIZATION ERRORS

If a <u>word is capitalized when it should not be</u>, cross out the capital letter and rewrite the small letter above it. Then circle the original error and the correction you made. Each circle should count as one error.

Example: I could not wait to go to High School.

Example: He was a Doctor.

If a <u>word should be capitalized when it is not</u>, cross out the small letter and write a capital letter above it. Then circle the original error and the correction you made. Each circle should count as one error.

Example: I go to winona senior high school.

Example: I went to see dr. smith.

OTHER ERRORS

Cross out any <u>typing errors (typos)</u> and write the word correctly above the error or make another necessary correction. In other words, cross out any <u>careless mistakes</u> you find that do not fit into any other category listed here and make the necessary corrections. Then circle the original errors and the corrections you made.

Example: He waanted to go to the store.

Example: He bough.t a pizza.

**** If you find any other grammatical or mechanical errors not listed here, cross out them and write in the corrections. Then circle the original errors and the corrections you made.**

<u>Remember:</u>

**** You are only correcting grammatical, mechanical, and spelling errors.**
**** You are not correcting content errors (organization, ideas, meaning, style).**

SAMPLE ESSAY
PROVIDE DIRECT FEEDBACK ON THIS ESSAY

Who you did admire when you were younger. When I was a young kid I always admire my dad, I admire him so much because, he always help me, he done any thing for me, and we would always had fun together.

The first reason I admire him so much is because he always help me, no madder what it was that I need. If I need help on my home work he help me withit. For example I didn't understood math, it was so hard. If I ever had any Problems with my Life. I could Just talk to him he would helped me out by telling me wat to do.

Another reason I admire him so much is, because he would done any thing for me if I really need it. When I

needed my bicycle fix would he always fixed it as soon as he have time. If I ever need a ride to my friends howe would he do that for me.

The third reason why I admire my dad so much is, because we would alway s had fun together. We used to go to the twins games was alot of Fun to do. The twins they always plays real good.

He use to take me Bowling. Which was alot of fun because he would always teached me how to get better

As a kid I admire my dad more then any one because, he always help me, he done anything me, and we always have a fun together. These are the reasons I admire my dad so much.

APPENDIX K

Indirect Feedback Log Directions

INDIRECT FEEDBACK LOG DIRECTIONS

Column 1: Feedback Unit Number

Your peer editor circled each error he/she believes you made in your essay and numbered each feedback unit for you.
Write the number your editor wrote above the circled feedback unit in your essay in the column labeled "**Feedback Unit Number**."

Column 2: Write the correction you will make.

Your peer editor gave you indirect feedback on your essay by circling and/or drawing arrows where he/she thinks errors are.
Write the correction you will make for each Feedback Unit Number.
Write "No correction" if you will not correct anything for that Feedback Unit Number.

Column 3: Describe the correction you will make.

If you decide to make a correction based on your peer editor's indirect feedback, describe the correction you will make and describe what is incorrect. (Why are you making the correction?)

Column 4: Did I use the feedback in my revision?

Circle Yes or No.

Yes = I used the feedback.
No = I did not use the feedback.

Column 5: Circle the reason for using or not using the feedback.

1 = I used the feedback because I agree there was an error.
2 = I did not use the feedback because I do not believe there was an error.
3 = I did not use the feedback because I did not know how to correct the error.

APPENDIX L

Indirect Feedback Log (Sample Essay)

Writer's Code: _____
Editor's Code: _____

INDIRECT FEEDBACK LOG (SAMPLE ESSAY)

Feedback Unit Number	Write the correction you will make.	Describe the correction you will make. (Why are you making the correction?)	Did I use the feedback in my revision?	Circle the reason for using or not using the feedback.
1	did you	Wrong word order for a question	Yes No	1 2 3
2	?	Need question mark, not a period	Yes No	1 2 3
3	kid, I	Need a comma after introductory clause	Yes No	1 2 3
4	admired	Added –d to admire for past tense verb	Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3

KEY for LAST COLUMN: 1 = I used the feedback because I agree there was an error.
2 = I did not use the feedback because I do not believe there was an error.
3 = I did not use the feedback because I did not know how to correct the error.

APPENDIX M

Indirect Feedback Log A2

Writer's Code: _____
Editor's Code: _____

INDIRECT FEEDBACK LOG (A2)

Feedback Unit Number	Write the correction you will make.	Describe the correction you will make. (Why are you making the correction?)	Did I use the feedback in my revision?	Circle the reason for using or not using the feedback.
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3
			Yes No	1 2 3

KEY for LAST COLUMN: 1 = I used the feedback because I agree there was an error.
2 = I did not use the feedback because I do not believe there was an error.
3 = I did not use the feedback because I did not know how to correct the error.

APPENDIX N

Questionnaire A

Questionnaire A (After Indirect Feedback on Essay A2)

Preferences, Perceptions, and Attitudes about
Indirect Writing Feedback from a Peer

You are helping Ms. Birk with her classroom research project.
Please answer the following questions as honestly as possible.
Try to think of when you received and gave indirect writing feedback.
Close your eyes and think about each situation.

Indirect feedback is when an error is marked in some way by the person giving feedback, but the writer is not given the correction.

In other words, the writer is shown there is an error, but the responder does not correct the error. The writer must correct it himself or herself.

Questions about receiving indirect feedback from a peer:

1. In your opinion, how helpful was receiving indirect feedback in improving your writing? (Circle one.)

4 = very helpful
3 = somewhat helpful
2 = only a little helpful
1 = not at all helpful

2. Did you like receiving indirect writing feedback from your peer? (Circle one.) Yes No

Why or why not? (Circle all statements that are true.)

- I think my peer knows more than I do, so I trust my peer's comments.
- I think my peer does not know more than I do, so I do not trust my peer's comments.
- I feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my peer.
- I do not feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my peer.
- I could figure out what to do next with my writing when I received writing feedback from my peer.
- I could not figure out what to do next with my writing when I received writing feedback from my peer.
- I understood my peer's feedback because I could read my peer's handwriting.
- I could not understand my peer's feedback because I could not read my peer's handwriting.
- I understood my peer's feedback because I understood the marks or symbols that my peer used on my paper.
- I could not understand my peer's feedback because I did not understand the marks or symbols that my peer used on my paper.
- Add any other thoughts:

  _____

  _____

3. How did you feel about receiving indirect writing feedback from your peer? (Circle all that apply.)

It was fun.	I felt embarrassed.	I felt scared.
It was boring	I felt confident.	I felt unsure.
It was overwhelming.	I felt alone.	I felt responsible.
It was frustrating.	I felt nervous.	I felt pressured.
It was intimidating.	I felt independent.	I felt interested.
I felt lazy.	I felt anxious.	I felt successful.
	I felt helpful.	I felt like "I'm the best!"

Other words you would use: _____

4. What did you like about receiving indirect feedback?

_____

_____

5. What did you not like about receiving indirect feedback?

_____

_____

6. Did you make corrections in your writing (ESSAY A3) that were suggested by a peer?

Yes No

7. How many specific corrections do you think you made with the help of indirect peer feedback? (In other words, how many corrections did you make because of feedback from your peer editor?) (Circle one.)

0 - 10 10 - 20 20 - 30 30 – 40 40 – 50 50 - 60

8. In your opinion, did ESSAY A3 improve as a direct result of receiving indirect peer feedback? (Circle one.)

Yes No

9. In your opinion, will receiving indirect feedback help you make fewer errors in your writing in the future? (Circle one.)

Yes No

10. Did you make corrections in your writing (Essay A3) that were not suggested by a peer?

Yes No

11. Did you make more corrections because of the indirect feedback from your peer or because of your own editing skills (without peer feedback)? (Circle one statement.)

- I made more corrections because of indirect feedback from my peer than by myself.
- I made more corrections because of my own editing skills than from peer feedback.

12. How many specific corrections do you think you made without the help of indirect peer feedback (in ESSAY A3)? (In other words, how many corrections did you make on your own that were not suggested by your peer?) (Circle one.)

0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26 or more

13. How do you feel about the peer who gave you indirect writing feedback? (Circle one.)

- **He/she is a better writer than I am.**
- **He/she is a writer who writes at my same level.**
- **He/she is a poorer writer than I am.**

Questions about giving indirect writing feedback to a peer:

14. In your opinion, how helpful was giving indirect feedback in improving your own writing? (Circle one.)

4 = very helpful
3 = somewhat helpful
2 = only a little helpful
1 = not at all helpful

15. Did you like giving indirect writing feedback to your peer? (Circle one.) Yes No

Why or why not? (Circle all statements that are true.)

- I think my peer knows more than I do, so I do not trust my own writing skills.
- I feel good about my writing skills after giving indirect feedback to my peer.
- I do not feel good about my writing skills after giving indirect feedback to my peer.
- It is easy to give indirect feedback on my peer's essay.
- It is difficult to give indirect feedback on my peer's essay.
- I could not understand my peer's writing, so I did not know what to mark on the paper.
- Add any other thoughts about giving indirect writing feedback to your peer:

_____

_____

_____

16. How did you feel about giving indirect writing feedback to your peer? (Circle all that apply.)

It was fun.	I felt embarrassed.	I felt scared.
It was boring	I felt confident.	I felt unsure.
It was overwhelming.	I felt alone.	I felt responsible.
It was frustrating.	I felt nervous.	I felt pressured.
It was intimidating.	I felt independent.	I felt interested.
I felt lazy.	I felt anxious.	I felt successful.
	I felt helpful.	I felt like "I'm the best!"

17. What did you like about giving indirect feedback?

_____

_____

18. What did you not like about giving indirect feedback?

_____

_____

19. In your opinion, did ESSAY A3 improve as a direct result of giving indirect peer feedback? (Circle one.)

Yes No

20. In your opinion, will giving indirect feedback to a peer help you make fewer errors in your writing in the future? (Circle one.)

Yes No

21. In your opinion, how well did you give indirect writing feedback to your peer? (Circle only one.)

- I gave very good feedback.
- I gave good feedback.
- I gave okay feedback.
- I did not give good feedback.

Why do you feel this way? Explain.

_____

_____

22. How do you feel about the <u>writer to whom you gave</u> indirect writing feedback? (Circle one.)

- **He/she is a better writer than I am.**
- **He/she is a writer who writes at my same level.**
- **He/she is a poorer writer than I am.**

23. In your opinion, did you learn more by <u>receiving</u> indirect feedback from your peer or <u>giving</u> indirect feedback to your peer? (Circle one statement.)

- **I learned more by receiving indirect feedback.**
- **I learned more by giving indirect feedback.**

24. Do you think the <u>Indirect Feedback Log</u> was helpful in improving your writing?

Yes No

25. In your opinion, how useful was the <u>Indirect Feedback Log</u> in improving your writing? (Circle only one.)

4 = very helpful
3 = somewhat helpful
2 = only a little helpful
1 = not at all helpful

26. Did you like using the <u>Indirect Feedback Log</u>? (Circle one.) Yes No

Why or why not? (Circle all statements that are true.)

- A feedback log is easy to use.
- A feedback log is complicated to use.
- A feedback log is quick to use.
- A feedback log takes too much time to use.
- A feedback log helps me learn from my errors.
- A feedback log does <u>not</u> help me learn from my errors.
- A feedback log helps me avoid the same errors in future writing.
- A feedback log does <u>not</u> help me avoid the same errors in future writing.
- A feedback log is fun to use.
- A feedback log is <u>not</u> fun to use.
- A feedback log is important to use to learn how to correct errors.
- A feedback log is a waste of time.

Add any other thoughts:

_____

APPENDIX O

Prompt B

PROMPT B

Directions: You will be writing an essay on the prompt in the box.

- You must write your answer in English.
- You must write on the lines inside the box.
- You have three pre-writing pages for planning and organizing.
- You have three final essay pages.
- You must not write more than three pages.
- You must use a number 2 pencil.

Think of your favorite place to play when you were a child.

Describe this place and explain why it was your favorite.

Include details so your reader will understand your choice.

REMINDERS

Write as neatly as possible.

Make sure your composition has the following:

_____ a clear, focused central idea

_____ supporting details (reasons, examples)

_____ a logical organization (beginning, middle, end)

_____ correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation

_____ complete sentences.

APPENDIX P

Direct Feedback Log Directions

DIRECT FEEDBACK LOG DIRECTIONS

Column 1: Feedback Unit Number

Your peer editor crossed out and corrected each error he/she believes you made and circled and numbered each feedback unit for you.
Write the number your editor wrote above the circled feedback unit in your essay in the column labeled "**Feedback Unit Number**."

Column 2: Write the correction you will make.

Your peer editor gave you direct feedback on your essay by crossing out what he/she thought were errors and re-writing the corrections above. You may agree or disagree with the feedback.
Write the correction you decide to make for each feedback unit.
Write "No correction" if you will not correct anything for that Feedback Unit Number.

Column 3: Describe the correction you will make.

If you decide to make a change based on your peer editor's direct feedback, describe the correction you will make or describe what is incorrect. (Why are you making the correction?)

Column 4: Did I use the feedback in my revision?

Circle Yes or No.

Yes = I used the feedback.
No = I did not use the feedback.

Column 5: Circle the reason for using or not using the feedback.

1 = I used the exact feedback my peer editor wrote because I agree there was an error.
2 = I did not use the exact feedback my peer editor wrote, but the feedback was helpful and I corrected the error in my own way.
3 = I did not use the feedback because I do not believe there was an error. (I believe the feedback was incorrect.)
4 = I did not use the feedback because I did not know how to correct the error. (I believe there is an error, but I just did not know how to use the feedback to correct it.)

APPENDIX Q

Direct Feedback Log (Sample Essay)

Writer's Code: _____
Editor's Code: _____

DIRECT FEEDBACK LOG (SAMPLE ESSAY)

Feedback Unit Number	Write the correction you will make.	Describe the correction you will make. (Why are you making the correction?)	Did I use the feedback in my revision?	Circle the reason for using or not using the feedback.
1	did you	Wrong word order for a question	Yes No	1 2 3 4
2	?	Need a question mark, not a period	Yes No	1 2 3 4
3	kid, I	Need a comma after the clause	Yes No	1 2 3 4
4	admired	Added –d to admire for past tense verb	Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4

KEY: 1 = I used the exact feedback my peer editor wrote because I agree there was an error.
2 = I did not use the exact feedback my peer editor wrote, but the feedback was helpful and I corrected the error in my own way.
3 = I did not use the feedback because I do not believe there was an error. (I believe the feedback was incorrect.)
4 = I did not use the feedback because I did not know how to correct the error. (I believe there is an error, but I just did not know how to use the feedback to correct it.)

APPENDIX R

Direct Feedback Log B2

Writer's Code: _____
Editor's Code: _____

DIRECT FEEDBACK LOG (B2)

Feedback Unit Number	Write the correction you will make.	Describe the correction you will make. (Why are you making the correction?)	Did I use the feedback in my revision?	Circle the reason for using or not using the feedback.
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4

KEY: 1 = I used the exact feedback my peer editor wrote because I agree there was an error.
2 = I did not use the exact feedback my peer editor wrote, but the feedback was helpful and I corrected the error in my own way.
3 = I did not use the feedback because I do not believe there was an error. (I believe the feedback was incorrect.)
4 = I did not use the feedback because I did not know how to correct the error. (I believe there is an error, but I just did not know how to use the feedback to correct it.)

APPENDIX S

Questionnaire B

Questionnaire "B" (After Direct Feedback on Essay B2)

Preferences, Perceptions, and Attitudes about
Direct Writing Feedback from a Peer

You are helping Ms. Birk with her classroom research project.
Please answer the following questions as honestly as possible.
Try to think of when you received and gave direct writing feedback.
Close your eyes and think about each situation.

Direct feedback is when the writer is given the correction by the person giving feedback (the editor). In other words, the editor corrects the errors for the writer.

Questions about receiving direct feedback from a peer:

1. In your opinion, how helpful was receiving direct feedback in improving your writing? (Circle one.)

4 = very helpful
3 = somewhat helpful
2 = only a little helpful
1 = not at all helpful

2. Did you like receiving direct writing feedback from your peer? (Circle one.) Yes No

Why or why not? (Circle all statements that are true.)

- I think my peer knows more than I do, so I trust my peer's comments.
- I think my peer does not know more than I do, so I do not trust my peer's comments.
- I feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my peer.
- I do not feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my peer.
- I could figure out what to do next with my writing when I received direct writing feedback from my peer.
- I could not figure out what to do next with my writing when I received direct writing feedback from my peer.
- I understood my peer's feedback because I could read my peer's handwriting.
- I could not understand my peer's feedback because I could not read my peer's handwriting.
- Add any other thoughts:

_____

_____

3. How did you feel about receiving direct writing feedback from your peer? (Circle all that apply.)

It was fun.	I felt embarrassed.	I felt scared.
It was boring	I felt confident.	I felt unsure.
It was overwhelming.	I felt alone.	I felt responsible.
It was frustrating.	I felt nervous.	I felt pressured.
It was intimidating.	I felt independent.	I felt interested.
I felt lazy.	I felt anxious.	I felt successful.
	I felt helpful.	I felt like "I'm the best!"

Other words you would use: _____

4. What did you like about receiving direct feedback?

_____

_____

5. What did you not like about receiving direct feedback?

_____

_____

6. Did you make corrections in your writing (ESSAY B3) that were suggested by a peer?

Yes No

7. How many specific corrections do you think you made with the help of direct peer feedback? (In other words, how many corrections did you make because of feedback from your peer editor?) (Circle one.)

0 –10 10 – 20 20 –30 30 – 40 40 – 50 50 –60

8. In your opinion, did ESSAY B3 improve as a direct result of receiving direct peer feedback? (Circle one.)

Yes No

9. In your opinion, will receiving direct feedback help you make fewer mistakes in your writing in the future? (Circle one.)

Yes No

10. Did you make changes in your writing (ESSAY B3) that were not suggested by a peer?

Yes No

11. Did you make more changes because of the direct feedback from your peer or because of your own editing skills (without peer feedback)? (Circle one statement.)

- I made more changes because of direct feedback from my peer than by myself.
- I made more changes because of my own editing skills than from peer feedback.

12. How many specific changes do you think you made without the help of direct peer feedback (in ESSAY B3)? (In other words, how many changes did you make on your own that were not suggested by your peer?) (Circle one.)

0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26 or more

13. How do you feel about the peer who gave you direct writing feedback? (Circle one.)

- **He/she is a better writer than I am.**
- **He/she is a writer who writes at my same level.**
- **He/she is a poorer writer than I am.**

Questions about giving direct writing feedback to a peer:

14. In your opinion, how helpful was giving direct feedback in improving your own writing? (Circle one.)

4 = very helpful
3 = somewhat helpful
2 = only a little helpful
1 = not at all helpful

15. Did you like giving direct writing feedback to your peer? (Circle one.) Yes No

Why or why not? (Circle all statements that are true.)

- I think my peer knows more than I do, so I do not trust my own writing skills.
- I feel good about my writing skills after giving direct feedback to my peer.
- I do not feel good about my writing skills after giving direct feedback to my peer.
- It was easy to give direct feedback on my peer's essay.
- It was difficult to give direct feedback on my peer's essay.
- I could not understand my peer's writing, so I did not know what to correct on the paper.
- Add any other thoughts about giving direct writing feedback to your peer:

_____

16. How did you feel about <u>giving</u> direct writing feedback to your peer? (Circle all that apply.)

It was fun.	I felt embarrassed.	I felt scared.
It was boring	I felt confident.	I felt unsure.
It was overwhelming.	I felt alone.	I felt responsible.
It was frustrating.	I felt nervous.	I felt pressured.
It was intimidating.	I felt independent.	I felt interested.
I felt lazy.	I felt anxious.	I felt successful.
	I felt helpful.	I felt like "I'm the best!"

17. What did you like about <u>giving</u> direct feedback?

_____

_____

_____

18. What did you <u>not</u> like about <u>giving</u> direct feedback?

_____

_____

_____

19. In your opinion, did your ESSAY B3 improve as a direct result of <u>giving</u> direct peer feedback? (Circle one.)

Yes No

20. In your opinion, will <u>giving</u> direct feedback to a peer help you make fewer mistakes in your writing in the future? (Circle one.)

Yes No

21. In your opinion, how well did you <u>give</u> direct writing feedback to your peer? (Circle only one.)

- I gave very good feedback.
- I gave good feedback.
- I gave okay feedback.
- I did <u>not</u> give good feedback.

Why do you feel this way? Explain.

_____

_____

_____

22. How do you feel about the <u>writer to whom you gave</u> direct writing feedback? (Circle one.)

- **He/she is a better writer than I am.**
- **He/she is a writer who writes at my same level.**
- **He/she is a poorer writer than I am.**

23. In your opinion, did you learn more by <u>receiving</u> direct feedback from your peer or <u>giving</u> direct feedback to your peer? (Circle one statement.)

- **I learned more by receiving direct feedback.**
- **I learned more by giving direct feedback.**

24. Do you think the <u>Direct Feedback Log</u> was helpful in improving your writing?

Yes No

25. In your opinion, how useful was the <u>Direct Feedback Log</u> in improving your writing? (Circle only one.)

4 = very helpful
3 = somewhat helpful
2 = only a little helpful
1 = not at all helpful

26. Did you like using the <u>Direct Feedback Log</u>? (Circle one.) Yes No

Why or why not? (Circle all statements that are true.)

- A feedback log is easy to use.
- A feedback log is complicated to use.
- A feedback log is quick to use.
- A feedback log takes too much time to use.
- A feedback log helps me learn from my errors.
- A feedback log does <u>not</u> help me learn from my errors.
- A feedback log helps me avoid the same errors in future writing.
- A feedback log does <u>not</u> help me avoid the same errors in future writing.
- A feedback log is fun to use.
- A feedback log is <u>not</u> fun to use.
- A feedback log is important to use to learn how to correct errors.
- A feedback log is a waste of time.

Add any other thoughts:

_____

APPENDIX T

Questionnaire C

Questionnaire "C" (Choice)
(Before giving feedback on Essay C2)

For Essay C2, you will have a choice of what kind of feedback you want to receive and give.

Please check the box of your choice.

I prefer to receive:

- ☐ Indirect feedback from my peer editor.
- ☐ Direct feedback from my peer editor.
- ☐ No feedback from my peer editor. I prefer to self-edit.

I prefer to give:

- ☐ Indirect feedback to a peer.
- ☐ Direct feedback to a peer.
- ☐ No feedback to a peer. I prefer to self-edit.

Please note:
Every attempt will be made to give you both of your choices. However, because it is unpredictable what everyone will choose, this may not happen. Preference will be given to what you want to receive. If you choose the "No Feedback" option, you will still be doing all the assigned work as everyone else. (You will have the same amount of work, not less.) This includes self-editing your own work, filling out a feedback log, and doing the necessary revisions on your own Essay C2.

APPENDIX U

Prompt C

PROMPT C

Directions: You will be writing an essay on the prompt in the box.

- You must write your answer in English.
- You must write on the lines inside the box.
- You have three pre-writing pages for planning and organizing.
- You have three final essay pages.
- You must not write more than three pages.
- You must use a number 2 pencil.

Field trips are a good way to learn new things.

Describe a field trip that you went on and what you learned from the trip.

Include details so your reader will understand your choice.

REMINDERS

Write as neatly as possible.

Make sure your composition has the following:

_____ a clear, focused central idea

_____ supporting details (reasons, examples)

_____ a logical organization (beginning, middle, end)

_____ correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation

_____ complete sentences.

APPENDIX V

Direct Feedback Log C2

Writer's Code: _____
Editor's Code: _____

DIRECT FEEDBACK LOG (C2)

Feedback Unit Number	Write the correction you will make.	Describe the correction you will make. (Why are you making the correction?)	Did I use the feedback in my revision?	Circle the reason for using or not using the feedback.
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4
			Yes No	1 2 3 4

KEY: 1 = I used the exact feedback my peer editor wrote because I agree there was an error.
2 = I did not use the exact feedback my peer editor wrote, but the feedback was helpful and I corrected the error in my own way.
3 = I did not use the feedback because I do not believe there was an error. (I believe the feedback was incorrect.)
4 = I did not use the feedback because I did not know how to correct the error. (I believe there is an error, but I just did not know how to use the feedback to correct it.)

APPENDIX W

Questionnaire F

Questionnaire "F" (Final - After Classroom Research)

Preferences, Perceptions, and Attitudes about Writing Feedback

You are helping Ms. Birk with her classroom research project.
Please answer the following questions as honestly as possible.
Try to think back to when you have given and received writing feedback.
Close your eyes and think about each situation.

Please read these **definitions** to help you understand the following questions:

Teacher feedback is when a teacher gives you help with your writing.
Peer feedback is when an ESL classmate gives you help with your writing.

1. In your opinion, how helpful is <u>teacher feedback</u> in improving your writing?
(Circle only one.)

4 = very helpful
3 = somewhat helpful
2 = only a little helpful
1 = not at all helpful

2. In your opinion, how helpful is <u>peer feedback</u> in improving your writing?
(Circle only one.)

4 = very helpful
3 = somewhat helpful
2 = only a little helpful
1 = not at all helpful

3. Which kind of feedback is more helpful in improving your writing?
(Circle only one.)

Teacher Peer

4. If you had a choice between <u>teacher feedback</u> or <u>peer feedback</u>, which would you choose? (Circle only one.)

Teacher Peer

5. **Do you like receiving writing feedback from your teacher? (Circle one.)** Yes No

Why or why not? (Circle all statements that are true.)

- I think the teacher knows more than I do, so I trust the teacher's comments.
- I do not think the teacher knows more than I do, so I do not trust the teacher's comments.
- I feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my teacher.
- I do not feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my teacher.
- I can figure out what to do next with my writing when I receive writing feedback from my teacher.
- I can not figure out what to do next with my writing when I receive writing feedback from my teacher.
- I understand my teacher's feedback because I can read my teacher's handwriting.
- I can not understand my teacher's feedback because I can not read my teacher's handwriting.
- I understand my teacher's feedback because I understand the marks or symbols that my teacher uses on my paper.
- I can not understand my teacher's feedback because I do not understand the marks or symbols that my teacher uses on my paper.
- Add any other thoughts:

_____

_____

6. **Do you like receiving writing feedback from your peers? (Circle one.)** Yes No

Why or why not? (Circle all statements that are true.)

- I think my peers know more than I do, so I trust my peer's comments.
- I think my peers do not know more than I do, so I do not trust my peer's comments.
- I feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my peers.
- I do not feel good about my writing after receiving feedback from my peers.
- I can figure out what to do next with my writing when I receive writing feedback from my peers.
- I can not figure out what to do next with my writing when I receive writing feedback from my peers.
- I understand my peers' feedback because I can read my peers' handwriting.
- I can not understand my peers' feedback because I can not read my peers' handwriting.
- I understand my peers' feedback because I understand the marks or symbols that my peers use on my paper.
- I can not understand my peers' feedback because I do not understand the marks or symbols that my peers use on my paper.
- Add any other thoughts:

_____

_____

7. Choose one of these statements: (Circle only one.)

1. I prefer to have feedback from other students as one type of feedback on my writing.
2. I prefer not to have feedback from other students on my writing.

Explain your choice. (Why did you choose either #1 or #2?)

_____

_____

8. How do you feel about giving writing feedback to your peers?
(Circle all that apply.)

It is fun.	I feel embarrassed.	I feel scared.
It is boring	I feel confident.	I feel unsure.
It is overwhelming.	I feel alone.	I feel responsible.
It is frustrating.	I feel nervous.	I feel pressured.
It is intimidating.	I feel independent.	I am interested.
I feel lazy.	I feel anxious.	I feel successful.
	I feel helpful.	I feel like "I'm the best!"

Other words you would use: _____

9. How do you feel about receiving writing feedback from your peers?
(Circle all that apply.)

It is fun.	I feel embarrassed.	I feel scared.
It is boring	I feel confident.	I feel unsure.
It is overwhelming.	I feel alone.	I feel responsible.
It is frustrating.	I feel nervous.	I feel pressured.
It is intimidating.	I feel independent.	I am interested.
I feel lazy.	I feel anxious.	I feel successful.
	I feel helpful.	I feel like "I'm the best!"

Other words you would use: _____

10. How do you feel about using feedback from your peers in revising your writing?
(Circle one.)

- I feel they give helpful feedback, and I use it.
- I feel they do not give helpful feedback, and I do not use it.

11. In your opinion, how well do <u>you give</u> writing feedback to your peers?
(Circle only one.)

- I give very good feedback.
- I give good feedback.
- I give okay feedback.
- I do <u>not</u> give good feedback.
- I am inconsistent. (It depends on the situation.)

Why do you feel this way? Explain.

_____

_____

_____

12. When you are giving feedback on writing, how do you decide what to do?
(Explain how you give feedback on your peer's essay.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Which peer would you want to give feedback on your writing?
(Circle all that are true.)

- **A better writer than I am.**
- **A writer who writes at my same level.**
- **A poorer writer than I am.**
- **A person of the same gender (boy/girl).**
- **A person of the other gender (boy/girl).**
- **A person who speaks the same first language as I do.**
- **Other: _____**

14. Would you rather receive <u>direct</u> or <u>indirect</u> feedback on your writing?
(Circle one of the following explanations.)

<u>Direct feedback</u> is when the correct form is given to the writer by the person giving feedback.

In other words, the responder corrects the error for you.

Example: You write: I wanted to go shoping.
The responder crosses out "shoping" and writes "shopping" correctly.

<u>Indirect feedback</u> is when an error is marked in some way by the person giving feedback, but the writer is not given the correction.

In other words, the writer is shown there is an error, but the responder does not correct the error. The writer must correct it himself or herself.

Example: You write: I wanted to go shoping.
The responder circles the word "shoping", but you must figure out how to correct it yourself.

15. How do you decide which writing feedback to use and which to ignore? Explain.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. Do you think a "Feedback Log " or "Error Chart" is helpful in improving your writing?

A <u>Feedback Log</u> or <u>Error Chart</u> is a paper on which the writer can record the errors made in his or her writing, and the writer can also record the corrections needed. (Circle only one.)

Yes No

17. In your opinion, how useful is a <u>feedback log</u> in improving your writing? (Circle only one.)

4 = very helpful
3 = somewhat helpful
2 = only a little helpful
1 = not at all helpful

18. Do you like using a feedback log? (Circle one.) Yes No

Why or why not? (Circle all statements that are true.)

- A feedback log is easy to use.
- A feedback log is complicated to use.
- A feedback log is quick to use.
- A feedback log takes too much time to use.
- A feedback log helps me learn from my errors.
- A feedback log does <u>not</u> help me learn from my errors.
- A feedback log helps me avoid the same errors in future writing.
- A feedback log does <u>not</u> help me avoid the same errors in future writing.
- A feedback log is fun to use.
- A feedback log is <u>not</u> fun to use.
- A feedback log is important to use to learn how to correct errors.
- A feedback log is a waste of time.
- Add any other thoughts:

_____

_____

APPENDIX X

Prompt F

PROMPT F

Directions: You will be writing an essay on the prompt in the box.

- You must write your answer in English.
- You must write on the lines inside the box.
- You have three pre-writing pages for planning and organizing.
- You have three final essay pages.
- You must not write more than three pages.
- You must use a number 2 pencil.

In Essay P you told about one challenging experience you had in your past.

Tell about another (different) challenging experience you had in your past. (Do not write about the same experience your wrote about in Essay P!)

Explain why it was challenging for you and what you learned from the experience.

Include details so your reader will understand your experience.

REMINDERS

Write as neatly as possible.

Make sure your composition has the following:

_____ a clear, focused central idea

_____ supporting details (reasons, examples)

_____ a logical organization (beginning, middle, end)

_____ correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation

_____ complete sentences.

APPENDIX Y

Student Responses to QA #4 and QA #5

Student Responses to QA #4 and QA #5

Note: Responses are written exactly as students wrote them on the questionnaires.

Student	QA #4: What did you like about receiving indirect feedback?	QA #5: What did you not like about receiving indirect feedback?
Antonio	I don't think it was good feedback	Most thing they marked was okay and they marked somthing wrong.
Cheng	He showed me what I needed to put down.	that sometime his words were a little sloppy.
Meng	to know what mistakes you got.	sometimes the marking.
Chia	it helped	The person was making fun of me and made a lot of unneeded change
Sheng	I think that, learning how to make your own corrections is pretty fun, when a peer is giving indirect feedback.	I didn't really had anything to do with "not liking it".
Will	To see if it is better then mine and It can make mine better to	[no response]
Xou	One thing I like about receiving indirect feedback because it could help me figure what I did wrong.	One thing that I don't like about receiving indirect feedback because you have to figure out you own mistake.
Kao	What I liked was that your partner can helped you find any mistakes.	When there wasn't anything wrong and your partner circle it and it makes you confusion.

APPENDIX Z

Student Responses to QB #4 and QB #5

Student Responses to QB #4 and QB #5

Note: Responses are written exactly as students wrote them on the questionnaires.

Student	QB #4: What did you like about receiving direct feedback?	QB #5: What did you not like about receiving direct feedback?
Antonio	NOTHING BECAUSE I GO A LOT OF NO CORRECTIONS	ALL THE ONES SHE SAID THERE WERE WRONG WEARNT
Cheng	It give you direct feedback because it show you the answers.	[no response]
Meng	to know the little mistakes that you made or the big mistakes	Sometime it doesn't go with what you were going with.
Chia	I liked how they made me think more then I did even though what the wrote wasn't what I was looking for.	They keep writing down things that don't need to be in.
Sheng	I could get corrections from my peer.	There could be misunderstand about words or they could of be wrong.
Will	I liked it because I like to see othe people's oppion on my writeing	everything was ok
Xou	I like about receiving direct feedback because it could help me know what I wrote the wrong words	I don't like it when my paper is all messes with all kinds of marks.
Kao	So you can makes your sentence sound better and clerly. Also, It's helpful for me.	everything was okay

APPENDIX AA

Student Responses to QA #17 and QA #18

Student Responses to QA #17 and QA #18

Note: Responses are written exactly as students wrote them on the questionnaires.

Student	QA #17: What did you like about giving indirect feedback?	QA #18: What did you not like about giving indirect feedback?
Antonio	that it helps my peer out.	that it was boring.
Cheng	I liked when I show him what he did wrong, so the next time he won't make the same mistake.	I didn't really like indirect feedback because it was boring."
Meng	Reading their story that they have wrote.	I may not always be right.
Chia	I like to read there story.	There's things that don't make sense to me but do to them.
Sheng	I feel like I could help out and give out some what advice for he/she to use on her essay.	N/A [student wrote N/A]
Will	[no response]	Because I am not a good feedback person
Xou	One thing that I like about giving indirect feedback to others is because in some ways my indirect feedback could help that person figure out his mistake	One thing I don't like about giving indirect feed because I don't want to hurt there feelings by making a lot of changes.
Kao	You can correct your mistakes and have less error in your writing.	Sometimes you don't know what they ment and don't know what was the error.

APPENDIX BB

Student Responses to QB #17 and QB #18

Student Responses to QB #17 and QB #18

Note: Responses are written exactly as students wrote them on the questionnaires.

Student	QB #17: What did you like about giving direct feedback?	QB #18: What did you not like about giving direct feedback?
Antonio	nothing	nothing but it was boring
Cheng	very boring not fun at all.	that I had to correct the pages.
Meng	to learn that how go you have become.	don't sure what to put if it doesn't make sence.
Chia	I get to be the first to read their paper.	The peer I corrected kept yelling me that I just mark down things that didn't need correction, but to me it was mistakes they made.
Sheng	I feel that I could at least made some right changes for my peer and make corrections good.	At times I'm not so sure if my changes are really accurate.
Will	I don't like giving direct feedback	Because I don't know a lot so I make alot of mistake
Xou	I like giving direct feedback to others because I like to help others by correcting there paper.	One thing I don't like it because I'm very tire correcting others.
Kao	It gives you more information.	they might don't like your direct feedback.

APPENDIX CC

Student Responses to QP/QF #1 and

QA/QB #21 Follow- up Question: “Why do you feel this way? Explain.”

Student Responses to QP/QF #1 and

QA/QB #21 Follow- up Question: "Why do you feel this way? Explain."

Note: Responses are written exactly as students wrote them on the questionnaire.

<u>"very good" responses</u>

QB: Sheng: Because I tried my best and I did what or as much as what I know.
Antonio: Because Im smart like that.

<u>"good" responses</u>

QP: Sheng: I think that I give good feedback because I usually take my time and try the best as I could.
Antonio: Because if there stuck on something I can give them a good Idia and they cach on and writ it good.
Xou: I feel that I give them good feedback because with my feedback it could be very helpful for them if they need it.

QA: Xou: I feel like I'm a very helpful person in some ways and I feel like I have acomplished some works.
Antonio: because I do.
Cheng: Because I found some mistake that I was 100% sure I was doing the right indirect feedback.

QB: Xou: I feel like I have accomplish something.

QF: Antonio: Because I'm not the best
Cheng: When I read my peer eassy and don't understand it. I would try to find out what there talking about and fix it.
Xou: Because I think I did give them good feedback but not with all my efforts.

<u>"okay" responses</u>

QP: Chia: Sometimes I'm right or close others I'm wrong or way off.
Meng: I feel this way because I'm not the best at feedback but when I do I usually give okay ones.
Kao: Because I know I'm not a good grammer correction, so I think I give okay feedback to other students.
Cheng: Because sometime I'm lazy or I have too much to do and can't focus on one thing.

QA: Sheng: I feel like I did the best I could and I could often be wrong so that's why I decided like that.
Kao: Because I am not a good grammer correction.
Meng: I know what the story was about but didn't really know what to put.
Chia: He came up to me and told me I made a lot of un needed errs.

QB: Kao: That I have helped them out a little.

Chia: I marked all they mistakes but he still said that I didn't know how to do the feedback.
Cheng: Because it very boring and I guess when things are boring, you don't really try.
Meng: not really sure what to put and sometimes I don't know what the sences.
Will: Because I am not sure if it is right already or wrong

QF: Chia: It's just a feeling
Meng: don't really know many words and really got with the symbols
Kao: Because I'm not the best

"Not good" responses:
QP: Will: Because I am not good at giving feedback.
QA: Will gave no explanation.
QF: Will: I am not good at writeing so I don't know if it is right or wrong

"Inconsistent"response:
QF: Sheng: Because sometimes I could really feel confident and good, but sometimes I don't feel that way and so that's why.

APPENDIX DD

Student Responses to QP/QF #12: When you are giving feedback on writing, how do you decide what to do? (Explain how you give feedback on your peer's essay.)

Student Responses to QP/QF #12: When you are giving feedback on writing, how do you decide what to do? (Explain how you give feedback on your peer's essay.)

Note: Responses are written exactly as students wrote them on the questionnaire.

Student	QP Responses	QF Responses
Antonio	I just see the spelling and see there sentenses and R.O. and tell them it's good but and I tell them whats wrong.	I read the essay and if it don't make sense to me I change it.
Cheng	I will read my peer's essay frist. Then I'll read it again, but this time I will look for mistake while I'm reading.	I would read the sectence again and find past tense or miss spell. Then fix it by adding the right words.
Meng	When I am giving feedback I would listen to them first before giving them the feedback that they want.	I read the hole paragraph and find out what they are trying to say.
Chia	I read and read and if it don't make sense I try to make it sound like it makes sense and then I re-read until I can remember the whole eassy and mark all the mistakes and write what's wrong at the side.	If it don't make sense or if it's a mistake.
Sheng	I look for error and verb tense, try to see if there's fragment or run-off sentences. I make sure that they have their body paragraph, hook, thesis, conclusion and transitions, Especially I check for clearity and puntuation too.	I make sure that I reread the essay more than one time and I make sure it makes sense.
Will	I don't know I just do it	I ask the teacher for help
Xou	[no response]	I read it and if it doesn't make sense I would try to add some of my ideas to it.
Kao	I read their eassy, than find what is not a completely sentences, or what error they have.	I only change the mistakes if I think its wrong.

APPENDIX EE

Student Responses to Questionnaire C Choice of Feedback

Student Responses to Questionnaire C Choices of Feedback

Note: Responses are written exactly as students wrote them on the questionnaire.

Antonio, Cheng, and Meng chose to give and receive no feedback (self-edit).
All other students chose to give and receive direct feedback.

Student	Reason to Receive Feedback	Reason to Give Feedback
Chia	I choose Direct feedback because it's easier and gives me more options to write to write.	I choose to give Direct feedback because that way they'll know what I me by marking it wrong.
Sheng	I choose to to get or recieve direct feedback because I would want direct corrections for my errors that I made. And it would be much easier for me to make corrections. It's easier and it doesn't waste that much time for me.	
Will	I choose this because I want to see why it is wrong and it is helpful.	Because I think it might be helpful the them and me
Xou	I chose to receive Direct feedback because it could be helpful for me to know what I did wrong.	I chose to give direct feedback to a peer so they wouldn't have a hard time figuering their mistakes.
Kao	Direct feedback – helped me more than Indirect feedback."	Direct feedback – because I think It helped them out more.
Antonio	MY FIRST TWO ESSAYS HAD ALOT OF NO CORRECTIONS SO I THOGHT IT WOULD BE BETTER FOR ME TO CORRECT MY OWN	I WOULD LIKE TO CHEK MY OWN INTED OF ANY BODY ELSES.
Cheng	I chose No feedback because I think I need to find my own mistake and don't make other peer editor clean up my mistake.	I chose it because I had no other choice. If I did I would chose whatever my peer prefer what he/she wants me to do."
Meng	I chose to receive no feedback beccus I prefer to self-edit. I want to learn by myself in my own mistake.	I prefer to give no feedback becuuse I prefer to self-edit. I think it takes up my time.

APPENDIX FF

Individual Data and Group Averages for Feedback Units Given and Feedback Units Intended to Be Used

Individual Data and Group Averages for Feedback Units Given and Feedback Units Intended to Be Used

The following table displays the individual students as writers in Cycles A, B, and C. The columns labeled "FB units given" are the numbers of feedback units *given* to the writer by the editor. The columns labeled "FB units intended to be used" are divided into two parts: the numbers of feedback units each writer reported on the log that he or she intended to use in the next revision of the essay (A3, B3, C3) and the percentage of feedback intended to be used. The percentage was calculated by dividing the number of feedback units intended to be used by the number of feedback units given to the writer. For Cycle C, the averages are reported as follows: The first number is for the group of three (self-feedback), and the second number is for the group of five (peer feedback).

Individual Data and Group Averages for Feedback Units Given and Feedback Units Intended to Be Used

	A2 (Indirect)			B2 (Direct)			C2 (Choice = Self or Peer)		
	FB units given	FB units intended to be used		FB units given	FB units intended to be used		FB units given	FB units intended to be used	
Writer	#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
Antonio	29	18	**62**	34	14	**41**	17 (self)	17	**100**
Meng	29	8	**28**	45	13	**29**	27 (self)	27	**100**
Cheng	33	21	**64**	36	34	**94**	16 (self)	16	**100**
Sheng	26	17	**65**	23	17	**74**	31	18	**58**
Xou	43	22	**51**	48	45	**94**	49	48	**98**
Kao	65	26	**40**	50	32	**64**	35	28	**80**
Will	40	24	**60**	23	21	**91**	33	23	**70**
Chia	20	13	**65**	32	17	**53**	14	12	**86**
Average	**36**	**19**	**54**	**36**	**24**	**68**	**20/32**	**20/26**	**100/78**

Note: C2 averages are reported in table as follows: self (3)/peer (5)

APPENDIX GG

Individual Data and Group Averages of Accuracy of Feedback

Individual Data and Group Averages of Accuracy of Feedback

The following table displays the individual students as editors in Cycles A, B, and C. The columns labeled "FB units given" are the numbers of feedback units *given* by the editor. The columns labeled "FB units correct" are divided into two parts: the numbers of correct feedback units each editor gave and the percentage of accuracy of the feedback given. The percentage of accuracy was calculated by dividing the number of correct feedback units by the number of feedback units given by the editor. For Cycle C, the averages are reported as follows: The first number is for the group of three (self feedback), the second number is for the group of five (peer feedback); and the third number is for the entire group of eight.

Individual Data and Group Averages of Accuracy of Feedback Given

	A2 Indirect			**B2 Direct**			**C2 Choice**		
	FB units	FB units correct		FB units	FB units correct		FB units	FB units correct	
Editor	given	#	%	given	#	%	given	#	%
Antonio	29	15	**52**	23	17	**74**	17 (self)	11	**65**
Meng	26	17	**65**	32	22	**69**	27 (self)	20	**74**
Cheng	43	26	**60**	48	34	**71**	16 (self)	11	**69**
*Cheng							35(peer)	24	**69**
Sheng	40	24	**60**	36	26	**72**	49	33	**67**
Xou	65	22	**34**	50	29	**58**	33	25	**76**
Kao	33	21	**64**	45	12	**27**	31	16	**52**
Will	20	14	**70**	23	20	**87**	14	12	**86**
Chia	29	19	**66**	34	28	**82**	n/a	n/a	**n/a**
Average	**36**	**20**	**59**	**36**	**24**	**68**	**20/32**	**14/22**	**69/70**

Note: C2 averages are reported in table as follows: self (3)/peer (5)
*Cheng replaced Chia as an editor for C2 because she was absent.

REFERENCES

Allaei, S. K., & Connor, U. (1990). Using performative assessment instruments with ESL student writers. In L. Hamp-Lyons (Ed.), *Assessing second language writing in academic contexts* (pp. 227-240). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bartels, N. (2005). Researching applied linguistics in language teacher education. In Bartels, N. (Ed.). *Applied linguistics and language teacher education* [Electronic version] (pp. 1-26). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Bitchener, J., Young, S. & Cameron, D. (2005) The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 191-205.

Brown, J. D. & Rodgers, T. (2004). *Doing Second Language Research.* Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

Caulk, N. (1994). Comparing teacher and student responses to written work. *Tesol Quarterly, 28,* 181-8.

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' perception s of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5,* 1-19.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 students writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(3), 267-296.

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.

Cross, K. P. & Steadman, M. H. (1996). *Classroom research: Implementing the scholarship of teaching.* San Francisco: CA. Jossey-Bass Publishers.

De Guerrero, M. & Villamil, O. S. (1994). Social-cognitive dimensions of interaction in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(4), 484-496.

Fathman, A. K. & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 178-190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 1-11.

Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D. (2004). The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime…?). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(1), 49-62.

Ferris, D. & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 161-184.

Ferris, D. & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Hirvela, A. (1999). Collaborative writing instruction and communities of readers and writers. *TESOL Journal, 8*(2), 7-12.

Holt, S. (1997). Responding to grammar errors. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning, 70*, 69-76.

Jacobs, G., Curtis, A., Braine, G. & Huang, S. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(3), 307-317.

Karegianes, M. L., Pascarella, E. T. & Pflaum, S. W. (1980). The effects of peer editing on the writing proficiency of low-achieving tenth grade students. *Journal of Educational Research, 73*(4), 203-207.

Lalande, J.F. II. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal, 66*(2), 140-149.

Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 57-68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers Inc.

Liu, J. & Hansen, J. G. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*,207-227.

Mendonca, C. O. & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(4), 745-769.

Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment Basic Skills Test 2005 Written Composition Handbook from the Minnesota Department of Education website. http://children.state.mn.us/mdeprod/groups/Assessment/documents/Instruction/000378.pdf

Mittan, T. (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.

Muncie, J. (2000). Using written teacher feedback in EFL composition. *ELT Journal, 54*(1), 47-53.

Nelson, G. L. & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(2), 113-131.

Nelson, G. L. & Murphy, J. M. (1993). Peer response groups: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts? *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 135-141.

Olson, V. (1990). The revising processes of sixth-grade writers with and without peer feedback. *Journal of Educational Research, 84*(1), 22-29.

Radecki, P. M. & Swales, J. M. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System, 16*(3), 355-365.

Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. In B. Leeds (Ed.), *Writing in a second language: Insights from first and second language teaching and research* (pp. 9-26). Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Reid, J. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Rollinson, P. (2005) Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal, 59*, 23-30.

Semke, H. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals, 17*, 195-202.

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

Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal, 23*, 103-110.

Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to student writing. In B. Leeds (Ed.), *Writing in a second language: Insights from first and second language teaching and research* (pp. 148-154). Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Tang, G., & Tithecott, J. (1999). Peer response in ESL writing. *TESL Canada Journal, 16*(2), 20-38.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*(2), 327-369.

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "the case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(2), 111-122.

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.

Weaver, M. (1995). Using peer response in the classroom: Students' perspectives. *Research & teaching in developmental education, 12*, 31-37.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. In B. Leeds (Ed.) *Writing in a second language: Insights from first and second language teaching and research (pp. 155-172).* Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

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

Zhang, S. (1999). Thoughts on some recent evidence concerning the affective advantage of peer feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3), 321-326.