Feature Article

Creating an Effective Peer Response Sheet: An Empirical Study

Reina Wakabayashi
Kyoto University

ピアフィードバックは推敲の補助のみならず，自律した書き手を育成するための方法として有効とされる。本論は，ピアフィードバックのタスク中に用いられるピアリスポンスシートに着目し，その作成という観点から協働学習における教師の役割を考察した。調査では，従来のピアリスポンスシートと，ピアフィードバックにおける問題点に焦点を当てて新たに作成したピアリスポンスシートを学習者が用い，それらの評価を行った。その結果，学習者はそれぞれのピアリスポンスシートの有用性と困難を報告し，協働学習における教師の役割および効果的な教材作成を行うための示唆を得た。

Introduction

In the process-oriented writing classroom, *peer feedback* is seen as an important element for both student revision and student motivation. The utility of peer feedback is not limited to revision support but it is also an effective teaching methodology which aims to empower students as writers through reflecting on each other's writing. The pedagogical benefits of peer feedback on student revision and cognition have been reported from both L1 (English as a first language) (Nystrand & Brandt, 1989) and L2 (English as a second/foreign language) (Chaudron, 1984; Mittan, 1989) classrooms. In Japan, however, process-oriented writing instruction is not yet established, and despite its appeal, peer feedback is under-practiced. The reason for the unpopularity of peer feedback in the Japanese context can be found in the Japanese classroom culture, where learner-centeredness is a relatively new concept.

Although peer feedback is a learner-centered learning task, teacher

support is crucial in providing a task environment that promotes and facilitates learners' engagement. Teacher support is even more important when the learners' level of achievement is at the beginning stage. Moreover, in the Japanese context, teachers have even more responsibility for careful oversight, because the technique is introduced on their initiative.

The purpose of this study is to examine the teacher's role in introducing and supporting the peer feedback process, focusing on task material preparation. The Peer Response Sheet guides the peer feedback process. Despite the significant role it plays for effective peer feedback conduct, it is often regarded as an optional supplement and it has not received sufficient research attention. As an attempt to examine the teacher's participation in a learner-centered learning task, this study investigates the utility of two different formats of Peer Response Sheet from the student's perspective, especially as it affects student performance on the task.

Why Use Peer Feedback?

Process-oriented writing instruction highlights the importance of providing feedback to revise texts through multiple drafting. It is desirable that writers can self-diagnose the problems in their own texts. However, providing objective and critical self-feedback may be possible for expert writers, yet difficult if not impossible for learners with insufficient writing experience.

For novice writers, feedback from others should support the drafting process. Among the variety of feedback, teacher feedback might be the first option for learners in a teacher-learner classroom. The advantage of teacher feedback is that learners receive authoritative comments, including correction and evaluation. Because of its instructional function, learners tend to consider teacher feedback to be more helpful than peer feedback (Nelson & Carson, 1998; Saito, 1994; Zhang,

1995). However, research indicates that peer feedback is not inferior to teacher feedback (Chaudron, 1984; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992; Paulus, 1999), and that peer feedback provides some pedagogical benefits that teacher feedback alone cannot.

Liu and Hansen (2002) summarize the benefits of peer feedback in four categories: cognitive, social, linguistic, and practical. In the *cognitive* domain, peer feedback promotes the students' active participation in learning, thereby honing students' critical and analytical skills which are necessary for effectively revising their own writing. Moreover, during peer feedback negotiation, learners talk about what they have learned so that they can reflect on their knowledge or skills to realize what they need to improve. Collaborating with other learners as reviewers and writers also encourages reader awareness, that is, the awareness to revise for the readers' understanding. *Social* benefits refer to the learners' motivation enhancement and apprehension decrease. Peer feedback generates "group dynamics" (Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003; Guerrero & Villamil, 2000) in the classroom and allows collegial ties with other students that results in a comfortable learning environment. *Linguistically*, peer feedback enables learners to practice reading and writing. The *practical* benefits include the flexibility of peer feedback to be utilized in any stage of the writing process (e.g., prewriting, drafting, editing). These pedagogical benefits appeal to the English writing teacher in Japan, especially in the university setting where the students need the explicit teaching of how to write while becoming autonomous learners.

The difficulties of using peer feedback are also reported. "Rubber-stamp" peer comments such as "good" or "bad" (Sommers, 1980; Zamel, 1985) and lack of learner investment (Carson, 1992; Carson & Nelson, 1994, 1996; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Zhang, 1995) are both claimed to hinder successful peer feedback. The imbalance of learners' writing skills and distrust of peer comments also require consideration. However, these limitations of peer feedback can be overcome to some

extent by teacher support such as training (Berg, 1999; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992; Min, 2005, 2006; Stanley, 1992; Zhu, 1995, 2001) and proper guidance in the use of proper task materials.

Why Use a Peer Response Sheet?

The Peer Response Sheet (PRS) is a set of questions about the given texts for the reviewers to follow and write in their comments during the peer feedback session. Although peer feedback can be attempted simply by exchanging texts among writers, PRS is a powerful aid for effective peer feedback. The three major functions of the PRS are as: 1) a peer feedback process guide, 2) a peer negotiation facilitator, and 3) commentary notes for the subsequent revision. Through planning question items in the PRS, teachers can present the focus points for revision, or the important factors of writing. Teachers can even guide learners' peer negotiation process by structuring the question items. With the PRS, learners would engage in challenging reviews that they usually would not attempt to do. After the task, the PRS with written comments functions as commentary notes for writers to refer to in revising.

The PRS needs to be task-based and learner-based. Therefore, it is important on the teacher's part to prepare an appropriate sheet for the writing task at hand. At the same time, it is also important to take into account the learners' cognitive level in designing cognitive strategies. There are three types of questions used in PRSs: structured questions (e.g., *Does the draft begin with the thesis statement?*), semi-structured questions (e.g., *What is the thesis statement?*), and open-ended questions (e.g., *What would you suggest that the author do to revise this draft?*) (Liu & Hansen, 2002). The level of structuredness predicts the difficulty of the question items as the more structured the question items are, the easier it is for learners to manage the task. The three types of questions can be combined in a PRS, yet it is observed

that structured or semi-structured questions are more commonly used than open-ended questions.

Empirical Study

Two surveys were conducted to investigate learners' perceptions of the usefulness of two different formats of PRS. For this study, the researcher prepared two different formats of PRS – a "traditional" format and an "alternative" format - for learners to use and examine their comparative utility in the process of writing comments and oral negotiation. The purpose of investigating the learners' perception of two different formats of PRS was to develop alternatives that could fill the gap between the help needed in peer feedback and the existing PRSs.

Survey 1

Participants

There were 25 participants, all Japanese university students enrolled in a five-day intensive English course at a university in the Kansai area. The students were all female with varying majors and grades. They were selected for the course based on the following two criteria: 1) an essay about their motivation to learn English, 2) TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) score of under 600. None of them had taken TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) or experienced peer feedback before.

Materials

Three kinds of materials were used: a TOEFL writing test for the participants to compose the first drafts, two formats of PRSs, and a post-task questionnaire.

TOEFL Writing Test

For the participants to compose their first drafts, essay topics from *CBT* (Computer Based Test) TOEFL writing test were used. The TOEFL writing test was a good option because it was developed to assess the test taker's basic academic writing skills required at universities using English as the medium of instruction. From the sample TOEFL essay topics provided in the back of the TOEFL bulletin, the topics chosen for survey 1 were the following:

Topic 1: Some people prefer to live in a small town. Others prefer to live in a big city. Which place would you prefer to live in? Use specific reasons and examples to support you choice.

Topic 2: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Children should begin learning a foreign language as soon as they start school. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

Peer Response Sheet A

PRS-A was developed in reference to the existing PRSs provided in the previous studies that the researcher obtained (Berg, 1999; Connor & Asenavege, 1994; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992; Hosack, 2003; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Min, 2005; Ng, 1994; Paulus, 1999; Sengupta, 1998; Zhu, 2001). The PRSs had a semi-structured or structured format, and the typical question items they shared were included in PRS-A. The question items were also selected based on the basic components of the TOEFL writing test (topic statement, supporting evidence of the topic statement, and the concluding remark). As in other existing PRSs, the focus was placed more on the content level matters (e.g., organization) than surface level matters (e.g., grammatical errors.) The emphasis on content level problems was based on revision research (Faigley & Witte, 1981; Sommers, 1980; Zamel, 1985) that found skilled writers apply revision more at the content level while unskilled writers focus too heavily on surface level problems. All the question items were written in Japanese

for their use giving peer feedback in Japanese. Although linguistic development in the target language could be expected through its use in peer feedback, Japanese was chosen in this study to put more emphasis on the peer feedback task itself rather than on the challenge of using English.

Peer Response Sheet B

PRS-B was developed as an alternative format with more open-ended questions. The question items were constructed and arranged based on three ideas of alternative format: 1) more writer participation, 2) more oral negotiation, and 3) use of a scale for rating. These three ideas were included as a reflection of the aforementioned constraints of peer feedback: rubber-stamp peer comments and lack of learner investment. Scale rating was included because it was the type of question not included in the existing PRSs but which could promote learner engagement. As in PRS-A, all the question items were written in Japanese.

Post-task Questionnaire

The participants responded to a post-task questionnaire that asked about the two formats of PRS they used in the peer feedback task. The questions asked were:

(1) Which Peer Response Sheet (A or B) did you find useful as reviewer? Why?

(2) Which Peer Response Sheet (A or B) did you find useful as writer? Why?

(3) Which question items did you find effective for peer feedback (for both A and B)? Why?

(4) Which question items did you find difficult to engage in peer feedback (for both A and B)? Why?

(5) Which question items did you find unnecessary for peer feedback (for both A and B)? Why?

Procedure

The data collection took place in the last two days of an English intensive course offered in September 2006. After a mini-lecture on TOEFL writing, the participants engaged in 30 minutes of TOEFL writing on a paper using the essay topic 1. They were allowed to use dictionaries and the TOEFL sample writing during the test. After the test session, the participants formed 11 pairs and one group of three to engage in 30 minutes peer feedback (10 minutes written comment session and 10 minutes oral feedback session for each partner) in Japanese using PRS-A. The revising of the first drafts was done as homework for the next day. They were allowed to refer to any source besides the received peer comments.

On the next day, the learners composed another essay for TOEFL essay topic 2. After the writing session, the learners engaged in peer feedback using PRS-B. At the end of the second class, the participants responded to the questionnaire concerning their opinions about the two formats of PRS they used and the peer feedback task.

Results

The responses of the post-task questionnaire revealed that as reviewers, 7 participants (28%) preferred PRS-A and 18 participants (72%) PRS-B. As writers, 2 students (8%) preferred PRS-A while the vast majority, 23 (92%), preferred PRS-B. Table 1 summarizes the participants' preferences between the two formats of PRS.

Table 1
Summary of students' preferences for Peer Response Sheet type (survey 1)

	Preference	Number of Responses*	Reasons (number of responses)**
As reviewer	Peer Response Sheet A	7	• Revision points were clearly presented (3) • Easier to write comments directly on the drafts (4)
	Peer Response Sheet B	18	• Questions/responses from writers were helpful (6) • Open-ended questions were helpful (9) • Scale-assessment was useful (1)
As writer	Peer Response Sheet A	2	• Q8 was helpful (1) • Structured questions are better than open-ended questions (1)
	Peer Response Sheet B	23	• Questions/responses from writers were helpful (9) • Open-ended questions were helpful (6) • Helpful to have my points and supports restated by the reviewer (6)

* The individual preferences for PRS types could vary either as reviewer or as writer.
** Not all the learners provided the reasons for their preferences.

The question items found to be effective, difficult, and unnecessary are summarized in Table 2. For PRS-A, the question item most reported as effective was Q5 (*check the sufficiency of text development with possible suggestions from the reviewer*). Q6 (*check the logicality of the text and explain the possible problems*) was perceived to be the most difficult and Q3 (*count the number of supporting examples*) as the most unnecessary among the responses. For PRS-B, Q4 (*check the text's persuasiveness using scale-rating*) was reported as both the most effective and the most difficult. Q6 (*state what you liked about the text*) was perceived as the most unnecessary.

Table 2
Summary of the responses about the question items perceived to be effective, difficult, or unnecessary (survey 1)

PTRS-A	Effective	Difficult	Unnecessary	PRS-B	Effective	Difficult	Unnecessary
Q1	2	1	3	Q1	11	2	
Q2	1	3	2	Q2	6	2	1
Q3	1	2	8	Q3	10	2	
Q4	7	4		Q4	19	9	
Q5	13	6		Q5	11	9	1
Q6	4	9		Q6	6	4	2
Q7	10	3					
Q8	10	4	2				
Q9	2						
Q10	7		1				

Survey 2

Participants

74 participants were enrolled in two different TOEFL courses at another university in the Kansai area. They were all sophomore students from varying majors. TOEFL course 1 was comprised of 24 male and 4 female students and TOEFL course 2 included 42 male and 4 female students. The coursework of these two courses were the same and were taught by the same professor. At the time of data collection, one month had passed since the courses started, and therefore the participants already had experience of TOEFL essay writing. However, they had never experienced peer feedback using PRS.

Materials

The same PRS-A, B, and post-task questionnaire used in survey 1 were used. Only the TOEFL writing topics differed from survey 1 because *iBT* (Internet based test) TOEFL was the target of the courses instead of *CBT* TOEFL. Therefore, two types of writing task - independent task and integrated task - were used to compose the first drafts. The independent task offers the same type of question as in the *CBT* test.

In the integrated task, test takers read a passage on a certain topic and listen to a lecture on the same topic before a writing task is given. The following essay topics were used for survey 2:

Topic 1 (independent task): Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Actions speak louder than words. Use reasons and examples to support your response.

Topic 2 (integrated task): How does the information in the listening passage add to the ideas presented in the reading passage?

Procedure

The data were collected in two classes of each course in November 2006. After 30 minutes of essay writing on a paper, 30 minutes of paired peer feedback session was held using PRS. The combination of the types of TOEFL writing task and the variations of PRS were as shown in Table 3. During the composition, the participants were not allowed to use dictionaries or any source of help. After the second class, the participants responded to the questionnaire.

Table 3

The combination of TOEFL writing task type and Peer Response Sheet type (survey 2)

Type of TOEFL writing task	TOEFL course 1	TOEFL course 2
Independent task (writing only)	Peer Response Sheet A	Peer Response Sheet B
Integrated task (reading, listening, and writing)	Peer Response Sheet B	Peer Response Sheet A

Results

Results of the preferences between the two formats of PRS for TOEFL course 1 are summarized in Table 4. Although not all the learners expressed their preferences for PRS types, in the responses given, 20 participants (77%) preferred PRS-A and 5 participants (19%) PRS-B as

reviewers. As writers, 13 students (50 %) preferred PRS-A and 10 (38 %) PRS-B.

Table 4

Summary of students' preferences of Peer Response Sheet type (survey 2: TOEFL course 1)

	Preference	Number of responses*	Reasons (number of responses)**
As reviewer	Peer Response Sheet A	20	• Revision points were clearly presented (8) • The other Peer Response Sheet (B) was not useful (5) • Difficult to evaluate someone's free writing (1) • Both sheets were good actually but there was not enough time to go through everything (1)
	Peer Response Sheet B	5	• The other Peer Response Sheet (A) was not useful (3) • It was more simple and easier (1) • Scale-assessment was helpful (1)
As writer	Peer Response Sheet A	13	• The problems of the drafts were commented precisely (5) • Scale-assessment was helpful (2)
	Peer Response Sheet B	10	• Questions/responses from writers were helpful (2) • Open-ended questions were helpful (3)

* The individual preferences for PRS types could vary either as reviewer or as writer.

** Not all the learners provided the reasons for their preferences.

The question items found to be effective, difficult, and unnecessary

are summarized in Table 5. For PRS-A, the question item most reported as effective was Q7, whereby the reviewer underlines the confusing parts in the text. Q6 (*check the logicality of the text and explain the possible problems*) was perceived to be the most difficult and Q8, whereby the reviewer has to restate the confusing part, as the most unnecessary among the responses. For PRS-B, the question item most reported as effective was Q4 (*check the text's persuasiveness using scale-rating*). Among the responses, Q3 (*explain the interpreted support of the main idea*) and Q1 (*give comments for the questions asked by the writer*) were most reported as difficult and unnecessary respectively.

Table 5

Summary of the responses about the question items perceived to be effective, difficult, or unnecessary (survey 2: TOEFL course 1)

PRS-A	Effective	Difficult	Unnecessary	PRS-B	Effective	Difficult	Unnecessary
Q1	7	1	1	Q1	3	5	7
Q2	7	6	4	Q2	9	4	4
Q3	4	1	4	Q3	5	13	4
Q4	6	6	1	Q4	11	3	3
Q5	11	5	2	Q5	7	5	1
Q6	5	9		Q6	5	2	3
Q7	13	3	1				
Q8	7	7	7				
Q9	1	2					
Q10	7	3	3				

Results of the preferences between the two formats of PRSs of TOEFL course 2 are summarized in Table 6. As reviewers, 8 participants (17%) preferred PRS-A and 35 participants (76%) PRS-B. As writers, 10 students (22%) preferred PRS-A and 31 (67%) PRS-B. There was one participant who found both A and B helpful as a writer.

Table 6

Summary of students' preferences of Peer Response Sheet type (survey 2: TOEFL course 2)

	Preference	Number of Responses*	Reasons (number of responses)**
As reviewer	Peer Response Sheet A	8	• Easier to write comments directly on the drafts (2) • Revision points were clearly presented (3) • Questions/responses from writers were useful (4)
	Peer Response Sheet B	35	• Open-ended questions were helpful (7) • The other Peer Response Sheet (A) was not useful (15)
As writer	Peer Response Sheet A	10	• Revision points were clearly presented (6) • Questions/responses from writers were helpful (5) • Easier to understand (7)
	Peer Response Sheet B	31	• The other Peer Response Sheet (A) was not useful (7) • Scale-assessment was helpful (2) • Partner's comment was unpredictable and interesting (1)

* The individual preferences for PRS types could vary either as reviewer or as writer.

** Not all the learners provided the reasons for their preferences.

The question items found to be effective, difficult, and unnecessary are summarized in Table 7. For PRS-A, the question items most identified as being effective were Q5 (*check the sufficiency of text development with possible suggestions*) and Q7 (*underline the confusing parts in the text*). Q4 (*check the relevance of the examples to the main idea*) and

Q8 (*restate the confusing part by the reviewer*) were most perceived to be difficult and Q3 (*count the number of supporting examples*) was most considered to be unnecessary. For PRS-B, the most reported as effective were Q4 (*check the text's persuasiveness using scale-rating*) and Q5 (*mark the level of satisfaction with the conclusion using scale-rating*). Q6 (*state what the reviewer liked about text*) was most perceived as both difficult and unnecessary.

Table 7

Summary of the responses about the question items perceived to be effective, difficult, or unnecessary (survey 2: TOEFL course 2)

PRS-A	Effective	Difficult	Unnecessary	PRS-B	Effective	Difficult	Unnecessary
Q1	10	7	5	Q1	4	6	4
Q2	7	8	4	Q2	15	3	1
Q3	4	8	10	Q3	11	5	2
Q4	5	10	3	Q4	16	7	2
Q5	14	7	2	Q5	16	8	5
Q6	5	8	2	Q6	3	9	11
Q7	14	6	2				
Q8	6	10	3				
Q9	7	7	4				
Q10	3	6	9				

Discussion

In survey 1, PRS-B was overwhelmingly preferred to PRS-A both as reviewers and writers. The difficulty expressed in using PRS-A indicated the participants' lack of confidence as reviewers and hesitation towards judging the others' writings. Q6 (*check the logicality of the text and explain the possible problems*) in the PRS-A was reported to be the most difficult task as reviewers. The reason for the difficulty was that the reviewers themselves were not sure how a logical text reads. Also reported were hesitation towards giving suggestions and fear of deteriorating the partner's text quality. One participant even blamed her low language proficiency in finding the other's texts confusing.

As writers, the participants showed appreciation for receiving

suggestions on their own writing using PRS-A (Q5: *check the sufficiency of text development with possible suggestions from reviewer,* was found to be the most effective), and its positive side - revision points are clearly presented – was recognized. However, PRS-B was a clear preference for the participants. By using this PRS, which aimed at more writer participation and more oral negotiation, the anxiety of commenting on the other's writing was moderated and active participation in peer feedback was promoted. Open-ended questions could provide space for giving positive comments together with rather harsh but necessary suggestions. The same reason could be given as to why Q10 (*state what you liked about the text*) in PRS-A was liked by the participants. There is some question here as to whether structured question items are more helpful than open-ended ones. Open-ended questions could be more of a psychological help to comment on the other's texts.

In survey 2, mixed results were obtained. PRS-A was preferred to PRS-B by the participants in TOEFL course 1. The utility of PRS-A, that the revision points are clearly presented, was appreciated. Q7 (*underline the confusing parts in the text*) and Q5 (*check the sufficiency of text development with possible suggestions from reviewer*) were found to be effective. This suggests that the participants expected practical usefulness of the task material for better revision. However, from the reviewer's point of view, judging the clarity of a text (Q6) was a challenging task as in survey 1. The utility of PRS-B was also recognized especially by Q4, the scale scoring of the persuasiveness of a text. Besides writer participation and oral negotiation, scale scoring was the other idea that the PRS-B was based on, as an alternative format. According to the reasons stated, the scale scoring was helpful for the writers to understand the reviewer's suggestions. It was also observed that almost all the participants as reviewers marked the scale scoring when the open-ended questions were left blank. This indicates that scale scoring is helpful both for reviewers to provide peer feedback and for writers to understand the reviewer's points in an activated peer

negotiation.

The participants in TOEFL course 2 preferred PRS-B to PRS-A for the major reason that the latter did not match the task at hand. The TOEFL integrated task demands the test takers to synthesize the information from reading and listening, but the PRS-A and the other existing PRSs referred to were constructed to review persuasive essays. This mismatch emphasizes the importance of task-based material preparation and the weak versatility of a structured PRS. A mismatched PRS is not only of little use but could actually be counterproductive. Another possibility is that the participants in survey 2 took into consideration the difficulty of the integrated task in not choosing PRS-A. By the same token, in the TOEFL course 1, the preference for PRS-A, used for an independent task, over PRS-B, used for an integrated task, could be a reflection of the relative difficulty of the integrated task. At any rate, the participants in TOEFL course 2 found the scale scoring (Q4 and Q5) effective and expressed the usefulness of the writer's involvement in Q1 (*give comments for the questions asked by the writer*) and the small section prepared for the writer to react to the feedback in Q2 (*explain the interpreted main idea of the text*) and Q3 (*explain the interpreted support of the main idea*).

Pedagogical Implications

In view of the results of the two surveys, two practical implications are suggested for creating an effective PRS. The first implication is that greater focus be placed on the instructional function of PRSs. The function of PRSs should not be limited to the guidance of peer feedback, but should also serve as task material that teaches learners important points of writing. Therefore, question items should incorporate the focal points of the writing in such a way that learners can cope with them. For example, in the two surveys, the question item perceived to be the most difficult asked to judge the logicality of a text. The learners

expressed the difficulty of the question item saying that they did not have the capacity to judge the logicality of the text. This problem could be solved by constructing question items that explains the logicality of a text in a way that the learners could deal with. Teachers are encouraged to construct question items while paying close regard to the levels of the learners so as to better teach the focal points of writing.

The second implication is that affective factors of the learners should be taken into account. Learners in both surveys shared hesitation in giving peer comments to others. Compliments, open-ended question items, and scale scoring all appeared to ease the hesitation, suggesting that complimenting and mechanical feedback could be of psychological help. Moreover, since the learners' hesitation can be interpreted as stemming from their reluctance to be critical towards others' writing, learners need to be reminded that they are not evaluating the others' writing, but are collaborating together on making revisions and improvements.

Conclusion

For writing teachers, peer feedback can be situated in their teaching practice as a scaffolding teaching technique by which to promote learners' reflective and critical learning. Underlying this study is the definition of peer feedback as being, beyond simply a type of feedback, a teaching methodology for learners' cognitive development. Peer feedback is a potent task by which learners can achieve various skills needed both as reviewers and writers, to help them become autonomous writers. Through engaging in the task repeatedly, learners should get used to giving and receiving critical comments and become confident reviewers.

The teacher's role in peer feedback is to support its effective conduct based on the purpose of the writing and the learners' needs, including the provision of appropriate and flexible task material, in this study,

the PRS. Teachers who implement peer feedback must be aware of the importance of this task material and prepare effective formats for their learners. This in turn indicates that teachers who use peer feedback are those who communicate with their learners and place them at the center of learning.

In this study, the utility of the existing format of PRS which focused on helping bring about the subsequent revisions was affirmed, and an alternative PRS, which focused on increased peer negotiation was well-appreciated by the learners. Although this is a small sample study of which the results cannot be over-generalized, the results suggest the importance of learner participation in preparing classroom tasks. This study limited learner participation to using and commenting on the newly developed format, yet it is also hoped that both teachers and learners would be involved in developing a variety of PRS alternatives that support effective peer feedback.

References

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

Carson, J. (1992). Becoming biliterate: First language influences. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*, 37-60.

Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1994). Writing groups: Cross-cultural issues. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*(1), 17-30.

Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5(1),* 1-19.

Chaudron, C. (1984). Evaluating writing: Effects of feedback on revision. *RELC Journal, 15*(2), 1-14.

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

Language Writing, 3(3), 257-276.

Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge Language Teaching Library.

Faigley, L., & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision. *College Composition and Communication, 32*, 400-415.

Guerrero, M. C. M. de, & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal, 84(i)*, 51-68.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 4*, 51-70.

Hosack, I. (2003). The effects of anonymous feedback on Japanese university students' attitudes towards peer review. *Ritsumeikan hougaku bessatsu, 1,* 297-322.

Liu, J., & Hansen, J. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think? *ELT Journal, 45,* 274-284.

Mendonca, C. O., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 28(*4), 745-769.

Min, H. T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System, 33*(2), 293-308.

Min, H. T. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15,* 118-141.

Mittan, R. (1989). The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing*. (pp. 207-219). New York: Longman.

Nelson, G. L., & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7,* 113-132.

Ng, R. (1994). Revision in the ESL class: A comparative study of the effectiveness of peer and self-feedback. *Hong Kong Journals Online, 6,* 61-81.

Nystrand, M., & Brandt, D. (1989). Response to writing as a context for learning to write. In C. M. Anson (Ed.), *Writing and response: Theory, practice, and research*. (pp. 209-230). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Paulus, T. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3), 265-289.

Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: a case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal, 11(2),* 46-70.

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

Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced writers. *College Composition and Communication, 31*(4), 378-87.

Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1,* 217-233.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(1), 79-101.

Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 4*(3), 209-222.

Zhu, W. (1995). Effects of training for peer response on students' comments and interaction. *Written Communication, 1*(4), 492-528.

Zhu, W. (2001). Interaction and feedback in mixed peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(4), 251-276.