# Personal and procedural factors in peer feedback: A survey study

## David ALLEN

## Introduction

### Peer feedback in the writing classroom

Peer feedback is a well-regarded method used in language classrooms and has received considerable interest in the applied linguistics literature (see for example, Liu & Hansen, 2002 and Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Peer feedback has been shown to lead to improved writing quality (Berg, 1999; Suzuki, 2008), the development of social, cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies (De Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Min, 2005; Suzuki, 2008; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996), and improved writing ability (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009).

Peer feedback involves reading a peer's text and commenting upon various levels of the text including content, organization, language and formatting. When language learners pay attention to such features of written language and discuss issues with their peer, they are afforded the opportunity to notice aspects of language, which is a critical stage in language development (Schmidt, 1990). The negotiation of meaning through interaction in giving and receiving peer feedback also provides the basis for language learning as learners try to make their language more target-like, as suggested by the interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996). Moreover, peer feedback involves giving and receiving through written and oral comments, making a multimodal activity that has the potential to lead to development of both receptive and productive skills.

It is well known, however, that not all pairs work as well as one another (Wigglesworth & Storch, 2012). Simply putting learners into pairs will not always allow equal opportunities for

learning for each member due to the various interactive patterns that emerge (e.g., expert-novice, dominant-passive; see Storch, 2002 for more detail regarding these patterns emerging in collaborative writing activities). A variety of interpersonal and experiential factors may mediate the types of interaction and thereby the quantity and type of feedback provided.

One important factor leading to different interactive patterns may be the second (L2) language proficiency of the peers. A number of researchers have proposed that proficiency is likely to influence the process of giving and receiving feedback (Berg, 1999; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Liu & Hansen, 2002). Leki (2001) noted that peers may be concerned with their ability to contribute to the activity, particularly when working with a more advanced peer. Amores (1997) found that the perceived proficiency of the peer was influential in whether peers accepted feedback from one another. Moreover, she found that the quantity of feedback given led students to perceive a sense of authority allocated to the peer giving the most feedback. These findings point towards the importance of language proficiency in peer feedback interactions.

Other interpersonal factors that may influence the interactions may include the age, gender and topic knowledge of the peers. Task factors such as the stage of writing that peers are at (e.g., reviewing an outline, a partial draft, or a completed draft) may also play a role. In addition, procedural factors such as the training provided (e.g., Min, 2005) or the use of technology may also influence the experience of giving and receiving feedback. The present study looks at student perceptions of a range of these factors and provides practical suggestions for managing peer feedback activities.

## Method

### Materials

A survey was created and distributed using online software (surveymonkey.com). The English questions are presented in Appendix 1. A Japanese native speaker, who was proficient in English, translated the questions into Japanese and these were checked by another research assistant for translation accuracy.

**Participants**

Forty-seven participants (31 male, 16 female) completed the questionnaire. Participants were between the ages of 18 and 20, except for one who was a mature student. Of all participants, 90% had spent their lives (home and education) in a Japanese language environment. The remaining 10% had spent time abroad but rated their Japanese language ability as native-speaker level across all four skills (mean=10 on a scale of 1–10 with 10 being native speaker level). English language writing proficiency was estimated to range from low to high intermediate.

**Context**

The present study was conducted with students in a first-year academic writing course entitled Active Learning of English for Students of the Arts (ALESA), which is a compulsory first-year undergraduate course within the university of Tokyo's liberal arts program. In this course, students are required to research and write an academic essay about film or literature. Two types of essay question were allowed which required students to either compare two versions of the same story (often an original work and an adaptation) or to investigate a particular aspect or theme of any work of film or literature. In the initial stages of the course, content focused on developing students' knowledge of academic writing, including essay structure, argumentation, citations and references, academic register and formatting an English essay. Following this, students were required to conceive a topic and through discussion and pair activities developed their ideas and the evidence that they had found to support their argument. Around the ninth week of the thirteen-week course, students began planning (outlining) and writing their essay. Three subsequent classes were solely dedicated to peer feedback activities, in which students read, commented and discussed one another's' writing, and revised their work for the following class. All essays were submitted electronically and the feedback sessions were conducted in class time and with the use of iPads and annotation software (Pockeysoft, 2013). The present study assesses the students' perceptions about the process of peer feedback within this context by using a questionnaire that was completed during the final class.

**Peer feedback sessions**

Three peer feedback sessions were conducted in consecutive classes. The first session focused on the outline of the essay and the introduction paragraph(s). Participants revised their work for homework and added as much of the body as possible before the following class. In the second session, peers focused on the revised introduction and additional main body paragraphs. Following this, participants were asked to revise their work and add any remaining paragraphs, including the conclusion, and to add a title and references to their paper. In the third session, peers reviewed one another's' complete essay drafts. Following the final peer feedback session, participants revised their work and submitted as a final paper for assessment. All participants completed the first session, while two were absent for the second session and seven were absent from the third session.

## Results & Discussion

The results and discussion is divided into four parts: Feedback sessions, types of feedback, factors influencing giving and receiving of feedback, and procedural factors.

### I  Feedback sessions

**Most useful session**

Participants were asked which of the three sessions they found *most* useful and why. Responses indicated that the most beneficial session was the final session (45%), followed by the first (34%) and second sessions (21%).

Reasons given for the final session being most useful were as follows: Looking at the whole essay allowed peers to comment on the overall structure of the argument and logical flow of the essay (11 comments), proofreading of the full essay was possible (2), connections between paragraphs could be discussed in detail (1), and citations and punctuation could be commented upon (1). A number of respondents noted that because the amount of writing was the greatest of all sessions, it allowed more comments to be made (4).

Those who thought the outline/introduction session was most useful tended to comment on the benefit of receiving advice about the structure and argument of the essay prior to

writing the essay (10). Many participants pointed also to the importance of the planning stage. In the following student response, the writer points to the initial planning stage being the most difficult but nevertheless the peer feedback received at this stage was especially useful: "The hardest thing for me was thinking of the organization, but Peer Review (of the outline) allowed me to some extent to decide on the direction, and after that, it became significantly easier to write."

The second session, looking at the main body, was stated to be most useful because writers could receive feedback about where they were losing focus in their arguments and thus feedback helped to correct issues in this respect (4). A number also commented on the length being most appropriate particularly in comparison to the full essay, which was stated to be too long, thus limiting time for discussion/commenting (3).

**Least useful session**

The reverse question was also asked to participants (i.e., *which of the three sessions was least useful?*) and the responses provide a somewhat different impression. 52% of respondents said that the initial session was least useful, followed by 36% for the second session, and 12% for the final session. The results of the two questions show that while the final session was certainly found to be most useful, the session focusing on the outline/introduction had both positive and negative aspects (as it was both the *least* useful and the second *most* useful).

Those who thought the first session was the least useful commented that the introduction/text was too short for adequate feedback to be made (6); the writer did not really know what they were going to write at this stage and thus feedback was not possible or inappropriate (5); the feedback was not useful because the writer changed the outline after the session or did not follow their outline anyway (2); and, it was difficult to comment on the outline because it is difficult to know from reading it what the writer really wanted to argue (3).

Those who thought the second session was the least useful commented that this session was perhaps unnecessary as the argument was incomplete (2); similarly, it was difficult to comment on the text as the argument/essay was not complete (6) and this lead to more comments on grammar and vocabulary (2);

51

finally, one respondent noted that his peer 'wasn't very diligent' in the session and thus the feedback was not useful.

Reasons given for the final session being least useful were as follows: Fewer suggestions were made by peers (1); there was little time to revise following the last session (1); the text was too long (2); and because the whole paper had been written, it was more difficult to revise (1).

**Willingness to rewrite following peer feedback**

Following a study by Strijbos, Pat-El and Narciss (2010) who developed a questionnaire to assess Dutch secondary school students' perceptions of peer feedback, a question was included to ascertain participants' willingness to revise their work following peer feedback. Overall, for all three sessions, 90% of participants were willing to spend time revising their papers based on their peers' comments, which suggests a general level of satisfaction with the adequacy of the comments received. Thirteen participants were somewhat unwilling to make revisions following the peer feedback sessions with one being very unwilling. Looking in detail at these individuals' responses to other questions (particularly, *which was the most/least useful session*?) sheds light on possible reasons why such unwillingness occurred.

One respondent was apparently unwilling to revise because his peer only focused on language issues, which suggested the writer was unhappy with the type of feedback given. One respondent was unwilling to revise based on the quality of his peer's feedback, which was perceived to be unhelpful. Two participants were unwilling to revise after the first session; in one case this was because the amount of text was too small for him to gain sufficient feedback on, and in another it was because the writer felt that she could not revise her work based on feedback because her peer could not grasp the logic and framework of the essay from only reading her outline.

**Summary observations**

From the initial questions regarding the utility of the three separate feedback sessions a number of important observations can be made.

1. Text length can impact peers' ability to make comments: If the text is too short (i.e., the introductory paragraph)

fewer comments can be made, while if it is too long (and time is limited, as in the final session) then there may be too much text to read and comment upon in the session.

2.  'Completeness' appeared to be an important concept as this could lead a reviewer to have difficulty in commenting on their peer's paper if the argument was not sufficiently complete (as in the main body session).

3.  On at least one occasion, the quality of a peer's feedback was thought to be unsatisfactory and this lead to dissatisfaction with the session and an unwillingness to revise. Also, one participant was dissatisfied with the type of feedback provided.

4.  Peer feedback on the outline of an essay has both positive and negative aspects: Although some thought that this was a very helpful session as feedback could lead the writer to a better conceptualization of his/her essay structure, others thought that it was difficult to comment on their peer's outline either because it was incomplete or not fully developed (i.e., the writer had not a clear idea of what they intended to write about at this stage).

5.  The final session apparently had a number of additional benefits as it allowed readers to focus on references and citations (references were added prior to this session), proofreading, connections across multiple paragraphs, and it allowed the reviewer to fully understand the writer's purpose and argument.

**Suggestions for conducting peer feedback sessions at different stages of writing**

Based on these observations a number of suggestions can be made for effective implementation of peer feedback at different stages of the essay writing process:

1.  As text length can impact the reviewer's ability to provide feedback it may be prudent to diversify the peer feedback methodologies depending on this factor: For longer texts, such as the full/final essay, more time is required and therefore setting the actual reading and reviewing as a homework task with the discussion phase to be conducted in class may lead to a greater quantity (and quality) of feedback as well as allowing for discussion in class.

Having more time for the final review would also allow reviewers to focus on multiple levels of text, such as argument structure, references and citations as well as proofreading.

2.  Outlines need to be carefully thought out and also fleshed out in order for reviewers to understand the logical structure of the proposed essay. A useful pedagogical strategy may thus be to spend additional time planning and considering example outlines prior to students preparing their own. Students may also need more time and additional in-class discussion between the research phase and outline writing stage in order to better understand their own writing objectives.

3.  Peers have a responsibility to provide useful feedback, in terms of both quality and quantity. This is requires a sense of responsibility towards the task which may be fostered through training and emphasis about the collaborative nature of feedback activities. Regarding types of feedback, some participants may end up providing 'too much of one and too little of another', which may stem from factors such as the reviewer's confidence, language proficiency or topic knowledge (discussed later). One solution regarding the distinction between content/meaning-related issues and language/format issues is to conduct separate sessions that initially focus on content and organization, followed by a second session that deals more with formal issues. Another possibility is to have peers discuss which areas they would particularly like to the reviewer to focus on before the reviewing takes place.

4.  To deal with issues stemming from '(in)completeness' (as reviewing of the unfinished draft), teachers may wish to stress that students can question 'what is still to come' as opposed to simply 'what is there'. The peer feedback sessions can be used to discuss what the writer is going to say and through the process of explaining their ideas, they may come to realize potential issues in structuring their argument, logical connections with what is already written or issues pertaining to the validity of their ideas based on their present evidence/writing. They can also direct students to different levels of peer feedback (not only content

and argument) but also language and formatting.

## II  Types of feedback given, received and incorporated

### Areas focused on when giving/receiving feedback

In the following sections, the same questions were asked regarding both the giving and receiving of feedback. However, as the responses for the counterpart questions were highly correlated, only the results of the former are presented and should be considered similar for both giving and receiving of feedback.

In a forced ranking question, respondents ranked the four aspects of writing in terms of the feedback they gave and received the most. For giving feedback the mean rankings were as follows: Language=3.02, content=2.96, organization=2.26, and format=1.77. Overall, participants felt that language issues were the primary focus for comments during the sessions, though this was not greatly different in quantity when compared to feedback on content issues.

It is interesting that language-related feedback was perceived to be given and received the most as the instructions for focusing on feedback were to focus primarily on content issues, then organization, language and finally format. In a separate study by the author (in preparation), the actual suggestions that reviewers made were coded using the four categories, and language issues were indeed the most commented on, followed closely by content issues. Previous work in the same context has also shown that regardless of the instructions, students tend to focus on formal and meaning preserving issues overall (Allen & Mills, 2013). The results of the present study indicate that participants' perceptions of their own and others' focus for feedback was accurate in regard to language and content issues. However, we found that very few comments were directed at organizational issues, and format-related suggestions were made in a comparatively greater quantity. One reason why few organizational issues were addressed may be the aforementioned issue of incompleteness of the draft; if the draft is felt to be incomplete peers may feel less inclined to give contents regarding the macro-structure of the text.

### Amount of feedback incorporated in revised draft

In terms of the amount of feedback that participants incorpo-

rated in their revised drafts (i.e., whether or not suggestions were directly addressed by writers when revising), most stated that they incorporated almost all of their peers' suggestions (62%), with others incorporating more than half (32%), less than half (6%) and almost none (0%). In relation a previous studies looking at the proportion of peer feedback incorporated in L2 contexts, this perception appears to be accurate (Allen & Mills, 2013; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994). Occasionally, however, writers incorporated none of the feedback provided by their peer, while in the questionnaire none admitted to doing so.

## III  Factors influencing the giving and receiving of feedback

Four factors were investigated as having potential impact on the peer feedback process: The perceived L2 proficiency, perceived topic knowledge, gender, and age of the peer. In an initial forced ranking question, respondents ranked the four factors from most to least influential in the peer feedback process. For giving feedback the ranked was as follows: Proficiency: 3.38; Topic knowledge: 3.11; Gender: 1.89; Age: 1.62. Both gender and age appeared from this question to be largely non-influential in the process. Additional questions asking whether these two factors were influential supported this observation and as such additional results regarding these two factors are not presented.

**Proficiency**
Considering the perceived L2 proficiency of the peer, over half of respondents agreed that it had strong (11%) or at least some influence on the process (45%), while just under half thought it had almost (22%) or no influence (22%). In an additional question targeting the role of L2 proficiency, 45% agreed that it had no influence on the process, 2% thought they gave more feedback when the peer was higher proficiency, 23% did so when the peer was lower and 30% did so when the peer was the same proficiency. Overall, in terms of giving feedback, participants were divided in seeing proficiency as an influential factor in the process, though those that acknowledged its effect tended to agree that they would give more feedback if the peer was lower or the same proficiency.

**Topic knowledge**

Just under half agreed that their peer's knowledge of the writer's topic influenced the process of giving feedback (strong influence=6%; some influence=38%), while the remainder stated that it had almost or definitely no influence (38%, 17%, respectively). In an additional free response section, one participant responded that it was difficult to comment on their peer's essay when the peer had done more research on the particular topic. Thus, one's knowledge of the specific topic also appears to be an important factor affecting peer's perception of their ability to give feedback, at least regarding content issues. While this may seem to be an obvious conclusion, we should bear in mind that the topics were all related in theme and thus all participants could ask general questions regarding the content of the paper. Content knowledge nevertheless appears to be a salient factor affecting peers' sense of how much they can contribute to one another's work. It may well be that the increased focus on language and formal features of texts could be due to difficulties in contributing content-related feedback.

**Reasons for not incorporating feedback**

A set of agreement questions were aimed at identifying possible reasons why students did not incorporate their peer's suggestions when they revised their writing. Bearing in mind that most students incorporated around 60% or more of their peer's suggestions, the present set of questions aims to investigate why the remaining 40% or so were not incorporated. The results are summarized in Table 1.

In summary, the primary reasons that suggestions were not incorporated were that they were inaccurate or grammatically incorrect. The high proportion of students who thought that grammatical inaccuracies were a reason for not incorporating feedback shows that there is some criticism of the peer's language ability: Writers were aware that their peer made grammatically inaccurate suggestions sometimes and these were thereafter ignored when revising. A reasonably high proportion of respondents also noted that making revisions based on the feedback would not have improved the paper and thus these suggestions were not incorporated.

According to writer perceptions, their peer's language pro-

| | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The suggestions were not grammatically correct | 13% | **45%** | 23% | 19% |
| Making such revisions would not improve my paper | 2% | 40% | **45%** | 13% |
| My peer's English proficiency wasn't high enough | 0% | 21% | **49%** | 30% |
| My peer didn't know enough about my topic | 4% | **45%** | 40% | 11% |
| The suggestion was inaccurate/incorrect | 6% | **51%** | 30% | 13% |
| It would take too long to revise | 4% | 17% | **55%** | 24% |
| Couldn't read the comments due to poor handwriting | 4% | 17% | **43%** | 36% |
| Couldn't understand peer's comments | 6% | **45%** | 28% | 21% |

Table 1: *Agreement statements for reasons why peers' suggestions were not incorporated*

ficiency was a less common reason than topic knowledge for not incorporating suggestions in the revision process. Rejecting content-related suggestions may certainly depend on their peers' topic knowledge; we may also assume that rejecting language-related suggestions because they are grammatically inaccurate is at least partially determined by language proficiency (i.e., higher proficiency leads to higher overall accuracy). However, respondents did not believe that their peers' language proficiency influenced whether or not they incorporated the feedback but pointed instead to the accuracy of the suggestions themselves.

Participants believed that the amount of time required to address their peers' comments and their peers' handwriting did *not* greatly influence whether or not they incorporated feedback. Half agreed that suggestions were often incomprehensible, which lead to the writers not addressing those comments. Interestingly, when coding the suggestions into categories according to whether they focused on content, organization, language or format, we found that there were many suggestions that were unclassifiable. These tended to be when peer's had simply underlined a word or section of text and added a question mark.

In such cases, we were often unable to determine what the suggestion referred to. From this it appears students' perceptions of this issue correlate with our observations, and when the suggestions are unclear this may lead writers to overlook them when revising. However, we also found that a lot of annotations appeared to be more akin to notes made by readers in the aim of helping them to follow the text; in such cases, when this was not adequately explained by the reader, the writer may have been confused about what the annotations referred to. Instruction on the use of multiple colors in the iPad application may allow for better differentiation of real suggestions and other annotations.

**Summary**
Overall in this section we found that, for most participants, age and gender were unimportant factors influencing the peer feedback process. Language proficiency and topic knowledge were reported to be more influential factors, though neither was seen to be a critical factor. In addition, participants noted that they gave more feedback when their peer was of equal or lower proficiency than themselves. Thus, when a writer is higher proficiency, the reviewer may feel less able to provide feedback. This supports the common sense assumption that when peers' proficiencies differ greatly, the lower proficiency peer is more likely to feel less able to provide adequate feedback in comparison to the higher proficiency peer (also see Leki, 2001). Moreover, if *giving* feedback is important for learning writing skills and for developing writing proficiency (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009), then mixing proficiencies may disadvantage the lower proficiency peer in this regard. When teachers use peer feedback in mixed-proficiency classrooms, it is clear that the role of L2 proficiency should be considered as an important factor mediating the likelihood of 'successful' interactions.

Of the reasons for not incorporating peers' suggestions, the most common factors concerned the legitimacy of those comments in terms of grammatical accuracy (when addressing language issues) or content-related accuracy. Students are clearly critical of their peers' comments and do not simply incorporate all of the suggestions offered to them. Moreover, whether feedback is incorporated or not may be mediated by the topic knowledge and, to a lesser extent according to the survey, the per-

ceived proficiency of the peer. Given that previous research has shown that less proficient reviewers relinquish ownership of their texts (Amores, 1997), and are thus more likely to accept their peer's suggestions, it is surprising not to see a stronger influence of language proficiency. This is perhaps due to the methodology used in this study: To investigate the issue more objectively requires a combination of observation, text-analysis, and text-based interviews to discern the role of relative proficiency on incorporation of peer's suggestions. This is an aim of our subsequent research.

## IV  Procedural factors

In the final section of the paper, respondents were asked about the procedure employed in classes for the peer feedback sessions.

### Same or different peer

In the present classes, students chose their own peers though it was suggested from the second session onwards that they find a different peer from the previous session.

When asked whether they would prefer the same or different partner each time 75% thought a different partner is best, while 25% thought that the same partner would be better. Reasons for working different partners included: The writer could gain a variety of perspectives on her work; some people are not so good at peer feedback and so having the same partner would disadvantage writers paired with such reviewers; reviewers tend to focus on different things and thus feedback would similarly be varied, which would be helpful for the writer. Reasons suggested for the same pairing included: New reviewers could not understand the ideas fully and thus feedback would be less useful; and, the more a reviewer reads the paper the better they understand and thus feedback would gradually improve.

### iPad

In the classes that made up this study, all participants used iPads with the writing/annotation application Upad (PockeySoft, 2012). According to the survey, 94% enjoyed using the iPads, commenting that it was easy to rewrite if one made mistakes when commenting and that for many it was the first time to use an iPad, which itself was an enjoyable experience. 79% thought they

would prefer to use the iPad instead of paper and pencil format. The minority of students who would have preferred the traditional format suggested that their eyes would not tire so quickly (1), it took time to get used to using the iPad (1) and it would be more efficient to use the traditional method (1).

## DVD

A training DVD was used prior to the initial peer feedback session (Middleton, Allen & Shibata, 2009). 85% of respondents agreed that the DVD was useful to understand the process of peer feedback. In addition to this training, two students (4%) suggested that further preparation/training for peer feedback would have been helpful, while 96% thought it sufficient.

## Limitations and Conclusions

The primary limitation of the study is that it is only a single instrument/method approach (i.e., survey), meaning that the data cannot be confirmed directly with other sources of information. It is often the case that self-reported data does not completely match observed behaviour (or reported behaviour elicited through other means such as interviews). This is particularly important for the discussion of the role of proficiency and topic knowledge as influencing factors on the feedback process. In fact, other data (interviews and texts) have been collected and will be presented separately to deal more specifically with the issue of L2 proficiency.

The study has provided student perspectives on the peer feedback process and has highlighted a variety of factors that can influence the process. The type of text being reviewed is an important task factor which influences the quantity and type of suggestions provided. Inter-personal factors such as L2 proficiency and topic knowledge were also suggested to be salient factors, while age and gender appeared to be largely inconsequential according to the responses in this survey. Finally, procedural factors such as pairings (same peer, different peer) highlight a variety of considerations for teachers conducting peer feedback activities. Our training methods and use of technology were shown to be satisfactory according to respondents, which is both reassuring and useful information: Training need not be restricted to direct instruction by the teacher nor does peer feed-

back need to be restricted to the traditional paper-and-pencil format.

Though peer feedback is undoubtedly both a pedagogically and theoretically sound methodology for writing classrooms, it is still necessary to reflect upon the actual implementation and student's perceptions of this. Hopefully this modest study serves as a record of valuable student perceptions and prompts teachers to consider the methods employed and factors that influence peer feedback activities.

## Acknowledgements

## References

Allen, D., & Mills, A. (2013). Peer feedback in the academic English classroom: A pilot study. *Komaba Journal of English Education, 4, 27–52.*

Amores, M. J. (1997). A new perspective on peer editing. *Foreign Language Annals 30 (4),* 513–523.

Berg, C. E. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8,* 215–237.

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.*

De Guerrero, M. C. M., & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual Scaffolding in Peer Revision. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84, 51–68.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.) (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leki, I. (2001). A narrow thinking system: Non-native English speaking students in group projects across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly,* 35, 39–57.

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

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language

acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of research on language acquisition: Vol. 2. Second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 18, 30–43.

Mendonça, C., & Johnson, K. (1994). Peer review negotiations: revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly 28, 745–769.*

Middleton, G., Allen, D., & Shibata, N. (2009). *An Introduction to Peer Review.* (DVD). KOMEX and the Department of English Language, College of Arts & Sciences, University of Tokyo.

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

PockeySoft. (2013). Upad (version 2.11). [Mobile application software]. Retrieved from http://itunes.apple.com/

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 192–196.

Strijbos, J., Pat-El, R. J., & Narciss, S. (2010). Validation of a (peer) feedback perceptions questionnaire. *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Networked Learning 2010*, pp. 378–386.

Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning, 52*, 119–158.

Suzuki, M. (2008). Japanese learners' self revisions and peer revisions of their written compositions in English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 2, 209–233.

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

Wigglesworth, G., & Storch, N. (2012). Feedback and writing development through collaboration: A socio-cultural approach. In R. Manchón (Ed.), L2 writing development: Multiple perspectives (pp. 69–101). New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

# Appendix 1: Survey

**1. Informed consent** (omitted here)

**2. Personal information** (omitted here)

**3. Peer feedback sessions**
  1. Which of the three peer feedback sessions (Outline/Introduction – week 10, Main body – week 11, Full essay – week 12) did you participate in? (Yes/No for each)
  2. Which peer feedback session was most beneficial? Why? (Select one of three options, then comment)

3. Which peer feedback session was least beneficial? Why? (Select one of three options, then comment)
4. How useful was the feedback you received in each session? (Rate on 4-point scale from *very useful* to *not useful* for each session)
5. How did you feel after each session? Select the most appropriate from the following (*satisfied, confident, successful, offended, angry, frustrated*) for each session.
6. How much do you agree with the following statement for each peer feedback session? "After the peer feedback sessions I felt willing to invest a lot of effort in revising my writing" (Rate on 4-point scale from completely agree to completely disagree for each session)

## 4. Giving feedback

1. In general, in which area did you make the most suggestions on your peers' writing? (Content, organization, language, format. Rank in order from 1= the most to 4=the least)
2. How much did the following factors influence the amount of feedback that you gave to your peer? (Peer's gender, age, English language proficiency, knowledge of your topic. Rate on 4-point scale from *very influential* to *not influential at all*)
   a. Did any other factor influence the amount of feedback you gave to your peer?
3. Rank the following factors in terms of how influential they were when you gave feedback to your peer? (Peer's gender, age, English language proficiency, knowledge of your topic. Rate on 4-point scale from *most influential* to *least influential*)
4. Select the most appropriate sentence from the following: (Randomly ordered for each participant)
   • I made more suggestions when my peer was the same English language proficiency as myself
   • My peer's language proficiency did not influence the number of suggestions I made
   • I made more suggestions when my peer was higher in English language proficiency than myself
   • I made more suggestions when my peer was lower in English language proficiency than myself
5. Select the most appropriate sentence from the following: (Randomly ordered for each participant)
   • I made more suggestions when my peer was the same age as myself
   • My peer's age did not influence the number of suggestions I made
   • I made more suggestions when my peer was older than myself
   • I made more suggestions when my peer was younger than myself
6. Select the most appropriate sentence from the following: (Randomly ordered for each participant)

- I made more suggestions when my peer was the same gender as myself
- My peer's gender did not influence the number of suggestions I made
- I made more suggestions when my peer was the same in gender as myself
- I made more suggestions when my peer was different in gender to myself

## 5. Receiving feedback

1. How many of your peer's comments did you incorporate in your revised drafts? (Select a response from the following: *Almost all, more than half, less than half, almost none*)
2. How much do you agree with the following statements? (Select from a 4-point scale from *completely agree* to *completely disagree*). In cases when I did NOT act upon my peer's suggestions, this was because….
   - the suggestions were grammatically inaccurate
   - I felt my peer's understanding of my topic wasn't good enough
   - I could not understand my peer's suggestion
   - the revisions would not have improved my writing
   - I could not read my peer's suggestion because of the handwriting
   - the revisions would have taken too much time
   - the suggestions were mistaken
   - I felt my peer's language proficiency was not high enough

## 6. Procedural and technical factors

1. Would you prefer to have had the same partner for each peer review or to have different partners? Why?
2. Did you enjoy using the iPad for peer review? Yes/No
3. Would you have preferred to have done peer review using paper and pencil instead of using the iPad? Yes/No/Either would be ok
4. How useful was the 'peer review' DVD for understanding the process of peer review before beginning to 'peer review yourself? (Rank on a 3-point scale from *Very useful* to *not useful*)
5. Would you have liked any more information about the process before beginning peer feedback? (Yes/No)
6. If 'yes', what would you have liked to know more about?

## 7. Language experience and learning history (omitted here)