

**T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES**



**THE EFFECT OF TEACHER AND PEER FEEDBACK ON STUDENT'S
WRITING**

MASTER'S THESIS

Dilfuza BAKHTIYAROVA

**Department of English Language and Literature
English Language and Literature Program**

September, 2020

T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES



**THE EFFECT OF TEACHER AND PEER FEEDBACK ON STUDENT'S
WRITING**

MASTER'S THESIS

Dilfuza BAKHTIYAROVA
(Y1712.020051)

Department of English Language and Literature
English Language and Literature Program

Thesis Advisor: Prof. Dr. Veysel KILIÇ

September, 2020

ONAY FORMU



DECLARATION

I hereby declare that all information in this thesis document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results, which are not original to this thesis.

Dilfuza BAKHTIYAROVA



FOREWORD

I'd like to extend my acknowledgment to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Veysel KILIC. He is, without a doubt, one of the greatest educators under whose tutelage I had a chance to study and write this thesis. His massive support helped me persevere with this big undertaking. I appreciate all of the consistent support, mentorship and feedback he has given me along the way and would like to thank him for his time and efforts.

I'd also like to express my gratitude to the entire Aydin University's educators and admin staff. I enjoyed every moment of my studies.

September, 2020

Dilfuza BAKHTIYAROVA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Introduction to the Problem	1
1.2 Background of the Problem	1
1.3 Theoretical Framework of the Study.....	2
1.4 Statement of the Problem	3
1.5 Purpose of the Study	4
1.6 Research Questions	4
1.7 Definition of Terms.....	5
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
2.1 Introduction to Chapter 2	6
2.2 The Role of Corrective Teacher Feedback in L2 Writing.....	6
2.2.1 The Influence of Error Feedback on Student Revision.....	8
2.3 The Role of Peer Feedback	10
2.3.1 Theoretical Perspectives on Peer Feedback in L2 Writing Classrooms	10
2.4 The Effects of Training	15
2.5 Computer-Mediated Peer Feedback.....	16
2.5.1 Synchronous and Asynchronous Modes	19
2.6 Summary	20
3. METHODOLOGY.....	21
3.1 Introduction to Chapter 3	21
3.2 Research Questions	21
3.3 Research Methodology and Design	21
3.3.1 Participants and Setting.....	22
3.4 Data Collection Procedures.....	29
3.5 Data Analysis Procedures	29
3.6 Validity.....	30
3.7 Credibility	30
4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	32
4.1 Introduction to Chapter 4	32
4.2 Quantitative Results	32
4.3 Qualitative Results	42
5. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION	51
5.1 Introduction to Chapter 5	51
5.2 Discussion of the Results	51
5.3 Limitations	55

5.4 Recommendations for Further Research	56
5.5 Conclusion	57
REFERENCES	58
APPENDICES	61



LIST OF TABLES

Page:

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics on Participants' Gender.....	23
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics on Participants' Age.....	23
Table 3: Descriptive Statistics on Participants' First Language.....	23
Table 4: Writing Course Syllabus.....	24
Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 1 in the 1 st Questionnaire.....	32
Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 1 in the 2 nd Questionnaire.....	32
Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 2 in the 1 st Questionnaire.....	33
Table 8: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 2 in the 2 nd Questionnaire	33
Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 3 in the 1 st Questionnaire	34
Table 10: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 3 in the 2 nd Questionnaire 40.....	34
Table 11: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 4 in the 1 st Questionnaire 41.....	35
Table 12: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 4 in the 2 nd Questionnaire 41.....	35
Table 13: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 5 in the 1 st Questionnaire 41.....	36
Table 14: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 5 in the 2 nd Questionnaire 42.....	36
Table 15: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 6 in the 1 st Questionnaire 42.....	37
Table 16: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 6 in the 2 nd Questionnaire 43.....	37
Table 17: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 7 in the 1 st Questionnaire 43.....	38
Table 18: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 7 in the 2 nd Questionnaire 44.....	38
Table 19: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 8 in the 1 st Questionnaire 44.....	39
Table 20: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 8 in the 2 nd Questionnaire 44.....	39
Table 21: Statistics Summary Questionnaire 1 45.....	40
Table 22: Statistics Summary Questionnaire 2 45.....	40
Table 23: Paired Samples Statistics 45.....	41
Table 24: Paired Samples T-Test Results 45.....	41
Table 25: Taxonomy of Revisions 54.....	48
Table 26: Total Revisions by Type and Source.....	49

THE EFFECT OF TEACHER AND PEER FEEDBACK ON STUDENT'S WRITING

ABSTRACT

While teacher and peer feedback are common components of the process approach in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing classroom, the impact that feedback has on writing performance is yet to be determined. This study involved 16 EFL students enrolled in English Language Preparatory Programme (writing course) at Aydin University in Turkey. The research analysed the participants' essay drafts to determine the immediate effect that teacher and peer feedback had on their writing (i.e. the changes that students made to their drafts as a result of the feedback received). Students' drafts were carefully examined by utilizing the adapted version of Faigley and Witte's taxonomy of revisions. The results indicate that the majority of the changes that students made as a result of teacher and peer feedback were surface-level changes. However, it was evident that a number of meaning-level changes were also made and that those changes were mostly suggested by their teacher rather than peer.

In addition, this study intended to examine students' perceptions of both types of feedback and whether either one was more preferred by the students. The results suggest that the students seemed to be more responsive to teacher feedback, although peer feedback was also seen to be highly valued. Moreover, most of the participants felt that peer feedback was a successful complementation of teacher feedback as it allowed students to comment not only on weak areas (or mistakes) but also on strengths. Praise was said to encourage students to be more confident as writers and in some cases even motivated to write more. Finally, students in this study were introduced to computer mediated feedback (by using Google Docs) to investigate students' views about its effectiveness. All of the participants agreed that Google Docs was an effective and useful way to engage with feedback delivery.

Key words: *feedback, peer feedback, Google Docs*

ÖĞRETMEN VE AKRAN GERİ BİLDİRİMİNİN ÖĞRENCİLERİN YAZMASINA ETKİSİ

ÖZET

Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce öğrenilen sınıfın yazma dersinde, öğretmen ve akran geribildirimi süreç yaklaşımının ortak bileşenleri olsa da, geri bildirimin yazma performansı üzerindeki etkisi henüz belirlenmemiştir. Bu çalışma, Aydın Üniversitesi'nde İngilizce Hazırlık Programı'na (yazma kursu) kayıtlı 16 yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen öğrenciyi kapsamaktadır. Araştırma, öğretmen ve akran geri bildirimlerinin öğrencilerin yazıları üzerindeki hızlı etkisini belirlemek için katılımcıların deneme taslaklarını analiz etti (yani öğrencilerin alınan geri bildirimler sonucunda taslaklarında yaptığı değişiklikleri). Öğrencilerin taslakları, Faigley ve Witte'nin revizyon taksonomisi uyarlanmış versiyonu kullanılarak dikkatle incelendi. Sonuçlar, öğrencilerin öğretmen ve akran geribildirimi sonucunda yaptıkları değişikliklerin çoğunun yüzeysel seviyede değişiklikler olduğunu göstermektedir. Ancak, anlam düzeyinde bir dizi değişikliğin de yapıldığı ve bu değişikliklerin akranlardan ziyade öğretmenler tarafından önerildiğini aşıkardı.

Ek olarak, bu çalışma öğrencilerin her iki geri bildirim türüne ilişkin algılarını ve bunlardan birinin öğrenciler tarafından daha fazla tercih edilip edilmediğini incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Sonuçlar, akran geri bildiriminin de öğrenciler için çok önemli olduğunu gösterse de, öğrencilerin öğretmen geri bildirimlerine daha duyarlı olduğunu göstermektedir. Buna ek olarak, katılımcıların çoğu, öğrencilerin yalnızca zayıf alanları (ya da hataları) hakkında değil, aynı zamanda güçlü yönleri hakkında da yorum yapmalarına olanak tanıdığından, akran geri bildiriminin öğretmen geri bildirimlerinin başarılı bir tamamlayıcısı olduğunu düşünmektedir. Övgünün, yazar olarak öğrencileri daha özgüvenli olmaya teşvik ettiği ve hatta bazı durumlarda daha fazla yazma konusunda motive ettiği söyleniyor.

Son olarak, öğrencilerin onun etkinliği hakkındaki fikirlerini araştırmak için (Google Dokümanlar'ı kullanarak) bu çalışmadaki öğrencilere bilgisayar aracılı geribildirim tanıtılmıştır. Tüm katılımcılar, Google Dokümanlar'ın geri bildirim sağlama konusunda etkili ve yararlı bir yöntem olduğu konusunda hemfikirdi.

Anahtar kelimeler: *geribildirim, akran geribildirim, Google evraklar.*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction to the problem

College and university instructors in writing classrooms are continuously seeking ways to help students improve their writing skills. Traditionally in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, writing is regarded as both a process and product. However, recently there has been a move away from traditional approach to writing with more emphasis being given to writing as a process. In a process writing classroom, writing involves a series of steps including pre-writing, organizing, drafting, feedback and revision, which ultimately lead to the end product (Varaprasad, 2016). Therefore, to achieve the most favourable outcome in writing, the role of feedback is central. Although teacher feedback still continues to play a dominant role in most of the EFL writing classrooms, the significance of peer feedback can't be underestimated.

Despite growing body of research suggests that peer feedback is a beneficial activity and should be encouraged, many EFL teachers are holding back from taking the full advantage of it by implementing it in their classrooms. While the teachers have held their own reasons for not encouraging peer feedback, it's crucial to investigate students' views and perceptions of different types of feedback. Further research is needed that would cast light on students' perspectives of teacher and peer feedback and whether either feedback type is more favourable. Therefore, this study aims to explore EFL learners' perspectives at Aydin University in Turkey on different feedback types and the effect the feedback has on their revisions in multiple drafts writing classroom.

1.2 Background of the problem

Writing is a complex process which requires a combination of cognitive, semantic and linguistic skills (Chang, 2016). Aspects of good writing may include quality of content,

organization, overall flow and, at a more fundamental level, accurate and competent use of grammar. To facilitate the writing process and help students to develop their writing competencies more meaningful and structured feedback is required. Feedback in writing has traditionally been provided by teachers; however, with time, alterations in writing pedagogy together with research have reshaped the way feedback is being delivered. Teacher-given feedback practices have been largely supplemented with peer and self-assessment. What's more, recently with the development in technology computer-mediated electronic feedback has become a common practice.

Teacher feedback in both L1 and L2 writing contexts continues to play a significant role in spite of the many criticisms it received in early studies. Those studies mostly blamed teacher feedback for its over reliance on error correction (Truscott, 1996), which often resulted in students' negative attitude towards it and even unwillingness to take it into consideration (Semke, 1984). However, it was also found that when more meaningful content related, idea-based feedback was given it proved to be more effective (Ferris, 1997). This move away from a mechanical error correction to a more constructive, meaningful feedback which not only criticizes but also praises evolved as part of process-oriented writing approach. The shift towards a process-oriented writing has also made peer feedback more common.

Peer feedback, also known as peer review, peer editing, or peer response involves the exchange of written texts between two or more learners for oral or written feedback or response to the texts. The focus of peer feedback may be on local problems (i.e., grammar and vocabulary) or global problems (i.e., coherence and cohesion, organization of ideas etc.) or both local and global. Even the mode of feedback may be different: face-to-face or electronic (computer-mediated). The latter can be synchronous (live feedback; e.g. via online chat rooms or Google docs.) or asynchronous (e.g. via email or Microsoft Word).

1.3 Theoretical framework of the study

Peer feedback is informed by several theoretical frameworks: process writing, Vygotsky's social cognitive theory, collaborative learning theory and interactionist theory.

Process oriented writing is a multiple draft approach to writing. It consists of several stages which include pre-writing (i.e., generating ideas), first draft writing followed by a revision and writing the second draft. This may be repeated with writing multiple drafts ultimately resulting in a final draft (Keh, 1990). Vygotsky's social cognitive theory emphasises the significance of social interaction with peers for learning (Vygotsky, 1978). The theory suggests that writing follows inner speech, which implies that oral component plays a major role in the process of writing. Collaborative learning theory argues that learning is constructed socially through collaboration and dialogue. Peer feedback allows students to complete a writing task through meaningful dialogue and interaction with their peers (Hirvela, 1999). Interactionist theory of second language acquisition is another theoretical framework underpinning peer review. It suggests that the process of meaningful discussion and group work positively impacts students' language learning.

1.4 Statement of the problem

Writing has long been a neglected skill by many EFL teachers. Although there may be various reasons for this negligence, the implications are obvious. Inability to write competently is particularly painful for those seeking higher education where the medium of instructions is English. The importance of being competent in writing in academia can't be emphasised more. It's absolutely mandatory for university students to be able to express their ideas accurately and fluently in writing. Therefore, more effort needs to be spared to teach writing more effectively. To achieve this, teachers need to be cognizant of the skills and processes involved in writing and the role feedback in this process is critical. Traditionally feedback was solely the domain of the teacher. Although teacher delivered feedback is still often regarded as the most popular and effective (Yang et al., 2006), many teachers including me are wondering about the implications of peer feedback practices on student writing. Peer feedback which could be done either face-to-face or electronically is relatively new practice for many L2 learners in Turkey, which means their effect on learning and writing is yet to be established. Further studies are needed to explore what peer feedback entails, why and when it should be conducted. Provided that such practices

prove to be beneficial, students' traditional perception that teacher is the sole supplier of feedback will

need to be reconsidered. Students will need to be continuously trained, supported and encouraged to be involved in various forms of feedback to promote more autonomous and student-centered learning.

Many students continue to predominantly value teacher feedback, neglecting other types of feedback. Such students tend to mistrust or underestimate the potential of peer feedback. This may be mostly due to the fact that only few students are trained on how to deliver effective feedback. What's more, many students are unaware of what a rubric is and have little understanding of how their writing is assessed. It's therefore mandatory to get students involved in their writing process, make them feel more accountable for their own writing, show them how to enjoy the process of writing by providing necessary scaffolding and support.

1.5 Purpose of the study

In light of recent research highlighting the importance of different feedback types on students' writing it's important to explore students' perceptions of feedback. Therefore, the intent of this study is to investigate students' views on both teacher and peer feedback, to gauge the impact these feedback types have on their in-between draft writing processes. Furthermore, this study aims to introduce the students to computer mediated feedback (by using Google Docs), with the purpose to examine students' attitudes towards electronic (synchronous) mode of feedback.

To establish the impact teacher and peer feedback has on students' revision processes, students' essay drafts will be collected after each feedback type and carefully analysed. This study contributes to the existing research on feedback in L2 writing and may influence some teacher's teaching practices.

1.6 Research questions

This study will address the following research questions:

1. What are the effects of teacher and peer feedback on student revisions in multiple draft writing?
2. What are students' perceptions of teacher and peer feedback in writing?
3. What are students' views regarding the use of Google Docs for feedback?

1.7 Definition of terms

Feedback- Hattie and Timperley (2007) state that feedback is "information provided by an agent regarding some aspects of one's task performance" (p.81). Narciss (2008) also defines feedback as "all post-response information that is provided to a learner to inform the learner on his or her actual state of learning or performance". (p.127).

Peer feedback, which is often referred to as, peer review, peer editing, peer response or peer evaluation, can be defined as "use of learners as sources of information and interactants for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained teacher, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing" (Liu and Hansen, 2002).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction to chapter 2

This chapter discusses theory and research related to the role of feedback in L2 writing. The aim of this chapter is to present critical and systematic review of the relevant literature, highlight the past and on-going debates in the field. The theoretical background presented in this chapter informs the research methodology of the current study, which is presented in the subsequent chapter.

The literature review below contains an overview of the following: (1) the role of corrective teacher feedback, (2) the role of peer feedback, (3) the effect of training, (4) computer-mediated peer feedback.

2.2 The role of corrective teacher feedback in l2 writing

Giving written corrective feedback, which is meant to amend grammatical errors in L2 writing classrooms, is a popular pedagogical practice. However, despite its popularity, the effect it has on learners' written accuracy over time is debatable. Some early studies found little evidence to suggest that correction is helpful. One study which caused a very strong reaction in the literature was conducted by Truscott (1996). In his paper titled: "The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes" that author argues that grammar correction in L2 writing is useless and even harmful and, therefore, should be abandoned. Truscott claims that correcting students' grammar may lead to stress and as a result demotivate students completely. He suggests that such practices are a waste of time and that the time should be better spent on something more pleasant and productive in writing. The author concludes by saying that since correction does not help accuracy and might even damage it, students would be better off if teachers abstained from it altogether. Such

researchers report that corrective feedback provided by teachers could be incomplete, one-sided, erratic and inaccurate.

Similarly, Cohen and Cavalcanti (1990) found that teacher-given feedback could only deal with approximately half of the issues that could have been dealt with. Some of the issues were either avoided or overlooked, suggesting that the teachers' feedback was incomprehensive. However, the researchers also mentioned that their research design didn't include any means to determine whether such omissions were the result of a deliberate action, an oversight or even the result of lack of knowledge about that particular issue.

Unlike the small-scale case study conducted by Cohen and Cavalcanti, Zamel (1985) carried out a study comprising a larger sample size. The study involved 15 teachers giving corrective feedback on a total of 105 ESL essays. In spite of being larger in scale, the study reported similar results: teacher feedback was mostly arbitrary and inconsistent with contradictory comments.

On the other hand, a considerable body of research exists that supports the view that corrective feedback could be useful and that students indeed reflect on it (Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2006; Haswell, 1983; Hyland, 2003). In a study conducted by Haswell (1983), the effects of "minimal marking" approach on students' writing were examined. The findings concluded that students took into account about 61% of the errors that were picked up by their teacher. Although all or most of the participants in Haswell's study were monolingual English speakers, similar studies with ESL students reported similar findings. For example, the results of Frantzen and Rissel's (1987) study, which comprised 22 ESL students in Spain, indicated that students corrected at least 75% of the errors that had been marked by their instructor.

One question that remains unanswered though is how explicit error feedback needs to be. Ferris and Roberts (2001) concluded that the explicitness of feedback didn't play a significant role in student ability to self-edit (i.e. less explicit feedback was as helpful as more detailed "coded" feedback). What they did find was that the group of students who received feedback considerably outperformed those who didn't in their ability to self-edit.

2.2.1 The influence of error feedback on student revision

In an attempt to measure the effectiveness of error correction on revision success rates several studies report positive results (Ashwell, 2000; Ferris and Roberts, 2001). In both of these studies, the experimental groups showed more considerable improvements than the control groups in the revision tasks. Although these studies have been criticised for not measuring the impact of error correction on the accuracy of new writings, the benefits of error feedback on between draft revisions is obvious.

Although it is interesting to examine whether students apply teacher feedback in writing tasks that they immediately revise, many researchers argue that studying the role feedback plays in helping students improve their writing over time is more important. Despite Truscott's (1999) major criticisms of teacher feedback, a significant body of research exists that proves beneficial long-term impacts of feedback on the writing process. Chandler (2003) found that teacher feedback on grammar and lexical errors had a considerable impact on students' writing accuracy as well as fluency over time. Similarly, Hyland (2003) who studied students' writing over the course of 14 weeks concluded that some language errors can be treated through feedback giving practices.

Some other studies which examined the longitudinal impact of feedback on students writing at the beginning and at the end of the treatment period, found that writing accuracy of the groups who received continuous feedback significantly improved. For example, in a study conducted by Ferris (2006) 55 students' writing progress was measured in five broad error categories during one semester. The results indicated that some progress in accuracy was achieved by virtually all students.

However, critics of this study emphasize that the lack of control group in this and similar studies impairs the effectiveness of the results and, therefore, the conclusion that error feedback alone contributes to the progress made in students' writing can be questioned. Liu (2008), claims that corrective feedback alone is not adequate enough to improve students' written accuracy over time and that micro sessions or writing workshops devoted to various types of writing errors may be necessary to develop students' writing competence.

2.2.2 Direct vs indirect feedback

To further examine the debate of corrective feedback in L2 writing, many research studies focused on which types of error correction are effective in dealing with which types of errors (Ferris and Roberts, 2001; Chandler, 2003, Ferris, 2006; Bitchener, 2008; Liu, 2008; Jamalinesari et. al., 2015). One type of error correction is called direct feedback. In this type of feedback, the instructor explicitly points out to the errors in writing by “providing the correct linguistic form for students” (Ferris, 2011, p.31). On the other hand, in indirect feedback the instructor indicates that an error has been made but it lets the student decide on how to fix the error. Again, the results of different studies present mixed findings. A number of studies found that indirect feedback was more helpful for students since it engaged students in greater cognitive processes, reflection and problem solving (Ferris, 1995; Ferris and Roberts, 2001; Ferris and Hedgcock, 2005; Jamalinesari et. al., 2015). It was found that the groups who were given indirect feedback far outperformed the groups who received direct feedback. It was also concluded that the students had received the latter form of feedback saw little progress and, in some cases, even regression in their writing abilities.

One study that stands out is the research conducted by Ferris (2006). The study is unique in that it examined the effects of direct and indirect feedback both in the short-term (in between drafts writing) and in the long-term (over the course of one semester). The results suggested that in the long-term, direct feedback led to more correct revisions than indirect feedback (88% against 77%). However, in the long run those students who mostly received indirect feedback saw a significant reduction in their error frequency ratio. It could be concluded from these findings that although direct feedback plays an important role in error correction in between drafts revisions, indirect feedback appears to be more effective in improving students’ overall accuracy over extended periods of time. What’s more, the students in the study seemed to opt more for indirect feedback citing this type of feedback most helpful.

On the other hand, some studies found only insignificant relation between the type of feedback and writing accuracy. Robb et al. (1986) compared four groups of students (one who were receiving direct feedback with three receiving indirect feedback). The results

indicated no major difference across the four groups, however, their accuracy levels were said to increase. Similarly, Liu (2008) reported that both feedback types were equally helpful in student self-editing practices. Although indirect feedback was effective in helping students reduce their morphological errors, direct feedback proved to be effective with grammar corrections.

2.3 The role of peer feedback

Another significant issue in L2 writing is the role of peer feedback. Peer feedback plays a major role in developing students' writing and empowering students to become more autonomous learners. In literature, the terms 'peer feedback', 'peer response', 'peer review' and 'peer editing' are often synonymous. In this study the term 'peer feedback' and 'peer review' will be used interchangeably. This study will utilise the following definition of peer feedback: "the use of learners as sources of information, and interactants for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained teacher, tutor or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing" (Liu & Hansen, 2002, p.1).

2.3.1 Theoretical perspectives on peer feedback in L2 writing classrooms

The use of peer feedback in writing is supported by a number of theoretical perspectives. Liu and Hansen (2002) maintained that peer feedback in L2 writing is informed by *process writing theory, cognitive, affective, socio-cultural and linguistic* perspectives.

Process approach to writing

Although writing is among the four skills that a language teacher aims to develop today, it has been the most neglected skill for quite a long time. Writing has been regarded either as not significant enough compared with speaking or simply too laborious to teach. In the late 70s and early 80s when North American institutions of higher education and other English-speaking countries started seeing non-native English-speaking students, the need to develop writing skills in these students to ensure success in their education became

evident. In an effort to develop students' writing competence, a new pedagogy accentuating teaching ESL writing beyond just language skills began to evolve. One approach that has been developed and has made a profound impact on the ESL writing pedagogy is known as process approach.

Unlike the traditional writing approach, where writing is often seen as a product (Lalande, 1982), a process-oriented writing classroom involves students producing multiple drafts on which they receive continuous and meaningful feedback from their instructors and peers (Barnett, 1989). The opponents of the traditional approach criticise it for it being "product" oriented and point out that the emphasis on correct grammar usage and style in a traditional class doesn't help students develop writing skills. They consider writing as a more laborious process of putting thoughts together which requires more competences than just linguistic skills. They view writing as a highly individual, complex cognitive process involving multiple stages: pre-writing, drafting, revising and editing.

Process approach to writing involves a number of distinctive benefits as it enables learners to be engaged in various forms of interaction during the process. Such benefits may include: (a) students reflecting on their roles as writers and readers, (b) students reflecting on the linguistic and rhetorical resources that writers need to possess to communicate meaning.

Writing is seen as a nonlinear and recursive process of meaning and transformation of knowledge (Flower and Hayes, 1981) which encourages peer interaction to help students improve their own writing and their peers.

Cognitive domain

From the cognitive and metacognitive perspective, peer feedback process which often involves higher order cognitive skills, enhances students' writing performance, promotes autonomy and audience awareness. These are significant foundations for writing competence.

A significant body of empirical research has found a link between peer revision and improved writing performance. For example, in a study done by Diab (2011) on Lebanese students, the group which exercised peer feedback produced considerably better-quality drafts than the group which did not. These findings support that of Kamimura (2006) who

reported that Japanese students benefited from peer feedback and demonstrated overall improvement in their writing quality.

Other studies intended to explore which areas of their writing students had seen most improvement in. The areas which students felt most improvement in included: global problems (i.e., recognising irrelevant ideas, suggesting supporting ideas and organization) and content building (Liu and Sadler, 2003; Yang et al., 2006; Ho, 2015). Besides, many benefits of peer feedback on feedback givers were reported and these included improved vocabulary and sentence structure (Zhao, 2014).

Furthermore, writing requires students to use higher order thinking skills. In order to develop and reinforce these skills peer reviews can be particularly helpful (Vigotsky, 1986). Peer reviewing prompts students to be involved in a series of complex tasks such as: identifying problem areas with the written text, clarifying the writer's intentions, sharing and evaluating different points of view, reconstructing meaning. Peer feedback encourages meaningful dialogue between the feedback giver and receiver, fosters self-reflection and analysis. These activities, without doubt, promote students' higher order cognitive abilities.

What's more peer reviews help students develop autonomy. Peer feedback sessions lead to students' enhanced sense of ownership of the written text partially because they don't regard their peers' feedback as authoritative as their teacher's (Biggs and Tank, 2007). This means student writers independently apply more critical evaluation to the suggestions received by selectively applying the suggestions they feel are most appropriate to them. In addition to the improvements in cognitive abilities, peer feedback enables students develop meta cognitive skills by cultivating their audience awareness (Zhao, 2014). Repeated feedback giving practices improve students' perceptions of good writing. Experienced feedback givers intuitively feel the good and poor features of the written text which helps them develop into more conscious writers themselves. In their own writing such students consciously apply the concepts they have learned by giving feedback.

On the other hand, despite the aforementioned benefits of peer feedback, a handful of research studies report certain drawbacks. Min (2008) reports that one such drawback relates to students' limited perspectives on what a good writing should include. According to Min, students often misinterpret the nature of peer feedback viewing it as a mechanical

process to correct grammar and format of the writing rather than an opportunity to discover and exchange ideas. Such perspectives often defeat the purpose, often resulting in less constructive feedback. This, ultimately, leads to students' inability to identify problem areas when revising their own work (Hu, 2005; Ma, 2010). From this evidence it can be inferred that peer feedback training is essential to maximize its benefits for students' writing development.

Affective domain

There is a mounting body of research both in L1 and L2 writing which suggests that peer feedback practices empower students by making them more confident writers. In an earlier study conducted by Tang and Titchcott (1999) involving ESL students of different proficiency levels, all participants reported that peer feedback helped them increase their self-confidence. Likewise, a more recent study conducted by Ge (2011) revealed similar results. The study involved 36 Chinese students who said were willingly assuming responsibility and enjoying the process of challenging each other's comments during the peer review sessions. These practices were said to contribute to their overall feeling of self-confidence.

On the contrary, a number of studies exist which disprove peer reviewing potential to develop students' confidence as they cite students' clear preference for teacher feedback over peer feedback (Zhang, 1995; Hu, 2005; Guardado & Shi, 2007).

Socio-cultural domain

One more area where peer feedback has shown to bring about a number of advantages is socio-cultural domain. Peer review process enables L2 learners to immerse themselves in a facilitative socio-interactive environment which promotes social support and scaffolding from other peers (Hu and Lam, 2010). One of the advantages in this domain is that peer feedback results in the creation of a conducive learning environment for writing. In her findings, Zhao (2014) reported that equal social status among peers means a more relaxing atmosphere. Such a non-threatening atmosphere enables students to freely engage in the dialogue, critique and challenge feedback givers' perspectives without being worried of the consequences. This allows for more interactive and in-depth peer discussion.

Another outstanding social benefit that peer feedback brings is that it creates a sense of a wider audience. Due to the fact that there are more students than teachers in the classroom,

student writers are exposed to more varied and abundant feedback. These variations in feedback might result from differences in culture, age, personal experiences etc. thus supplying the students with broader perspective on the topic (Rollinson, 2005). Consequently, student writers develop the habit of considering the audience when writing their texts.

An additional advantage is that peer feedback improves various social and communication skills. These include “negotiation skills and diplomacy, verbal skills” expressing criticism and responding to it, justifying opinion, objectively evaluating suggestions (Topping et al., 2000, p. 151). Their study conducted on 12 ESL students examined how students negotiated their intended meaning during peer feedback sessions. They found that such negotiations strengthened students’ communicative power.

Having said that, a number of studies warn about so-called ‘cultural issues’ as the main hurdle in peer review (Hyland, 2000; Hu and Lam, 2010; Yu, Lee and Mak, 2016). This is particularly evident in non-western cultures, where students may not feel at ease or even be biased in giving feedback (Carson and Nelson, 1996; Liu & Hanson, 2002). In a study by Carson and Nelson, Chinese students held back from giving critical comments to avoid hurting their peers’ feelings and disagreement. Another issue that constrained students from participating in peer feedback was found to be the teacher-centered culture. Students from such cultures expect their teacher to be the only authority in the classroom and, therefore, would be reluctant to accept other viewpoints different from the teacher’s (Ren & Hu, 2012; Zhao, 2010).

Linguistic domain

The last domain which is affected by peer feedback is related to linguistic competence. A number of studies have found that peer feedback fosters authentic and interactive environment in which students learn to communicate their ideas effectively, which ultimately leads to improvement in multiple linguistic skills. For instance, Vorobel and Kim (2014, p.715) showed that spoken negotiations in peer review sessions brought “multifaceted benefits for L2 students”, which included development of their speaking and listening competencies. These findings confirm that the use of L2 in peer review students to “consolidate and reorganize knowledge of the L2 in structural and rhetorical

aspects and to make this knowledge explicit for each other's benefit" and as a result enhances their language awareness (De Guerrero and Villamil, 2000, p. 65).

In contrast, some studies have pointed out to students limited linguistic competencies which results in students struggling to give clear and effective peer feedback (Hu, 2005; Hu & Lam, 2010). As these students are still developing their own skills in the target language, they may not be able to express their opinions clearly or give advice or identify errors when giving feedback. This notion is well supported by the study of Kamimura (2006) who has found that peer feedback doesn't play a significant role in improving students' fluency, both in high and low proficiency students.

2.4 The effects of training

Training plays a pivotal role in the success of peer feedback. For students to be able to provide more meaningful and precise feedback sufficient training is required (Chang, 2015; Min, 2005).

There have been two distinct research designs (i.e., intra-group and inter-group) to examine the effects of peer feedback training. The former compares performance before and after training, while the latter between trained and untrained groups. There were also variations in terms of quantity and quality of feedback provided. Researchers in some studies (e.g. Tsui and Ng, 2000; Rothschild and Kligenberg, 1990) chose to give no or very little training (this involved giving out checklists or rubrics with little explanation of how to use them). However, in some other studies (e.g. Allen and Mills, 2014, Min, 2005; Rahimi, 2013) researchers provided extensive training (this involved teacher modelling, watching videos etc.). The results indicated that the groups which received little to no training tended to produce poorer quality feedback than the groups which were trained. The untrained groups could only focus on local issues, such as grammar, vocabulary and spelling, while the trained groups demonstrated their ability to give higher quality feedback in addressing both global and local issues. These results have been achieved regardless of the research design (i.e., inter or intra-group), duration of training and format.

Min (2005) set out to examine how training affected the amount of feedback students give. The study yielded interesting results. Initially, the participants engaged with peer feedback following strict guidelines given by the teacher. This led to “mostly perfunctory comments” made by peers as they were meant to only answer the questions on the teacher’s checklist (Min, 2005, p.297). The researcher then decided to provide the participants with more intensive training sessions which involved four hours of in class training and one hour of one-to-one conferences between the teacher and student. The results showed a substantial difference in the number of comments students provided. Not only students could give more comments, but also their quality was significantly better leading to more meaningful feedback delivery.

A recent study by Rahimi (2013) produced similar results. The study (involving EFL Iranian students) investigated the impact of peer feedback training on the quality of feedback, revision and writing in the long-term. One group assigned to a trained group and the other an untrained group. Prior to the training, the two groups produced similar quality feedback, while after the training the trained group were able to produce more meaningful and balanced feedback focusing both on local and global problems effectively. This quality feedback resulted in higher quality writing of the trained group compared with the untrained group. What’s more, the trained group witnessed a significant improvement in their writing demonstrating higher quality writing than the other group. Overall, studies suggest that adequate training and scaffolding are prerequisites for successful peer feedback in L2 writing. What’s more, sufficient training has been found to improve students writing quality both in short-term and long-term.

2.5 Computer-mediated peer feedback

Instant access and large capacity of information storage have given rise to technology integration into peer feedback activities. Recently, Chen (2016) published a literature review of 20 research studies dealing with technology-supported peer review. The author carried out a comparative review of the characteristics as well as the pros and cons of computer-mediated peer feedback.

Characteristics of technology supported peer feedback activities can be classified into three aspects: interaction patterns, discourse patterns and language use and teacher's and student's roles.

First, interaction patterns. It was found that the participants who were engaged in online peer feedback demonstrated greater and more equal participation than those who were involved in face-to-face feedback (Sullivan and Pratt, 1996; Savignon and Roithmeier, 2004; Liu and Sadler, 2013). This increased participation rate was cited to be the result of a less threatening environment which the Internet provided with. It was also found that when students engaged in online feedback, they remained more task focused and exhibited greater attention to the writing task (DiGiovanni and Nagaswami, 2001). Finally, it was concluded that this feedback mode boosted student motivation and participation in the writing class (Cheng, 2007).

The second aspect was related to discourse patterns and the usage of language. The data analysis revealed that the language used in online feedback was more flexible. On top of that, some comments appeared to be more focused and explicit (Fitze, 2006). What's more, some comments given in Word were deemed to be more thoughtful. Finally, some discourse appeared to focus more on content discussion rather than error correction (Liu and Sadler, 2013).

The third aspect involved the teacher's and student's roles. Although the teacher's role in computer given feedback was less domineering than in the traditional face-to-face feedback, teachers could monitor students' interaction more closely and intervene whenever it was necessary. This allowed teachers for more instant feedback and leverage to influence students' motivation in the process. What's more, by means of technology teachers seemed to scaffold and model the feedback process more effectively and efficiently (Cheng, 2007). Students, on the other hand, demonstrated more active engagement in discussions: they provided more suggestions, replied to comments and provided constructive criticism more willingly. All of these imply that students in this mode of feedback process showed more interactive competence and better control of the discussion.

The benefits and drawbacks of computer mediated peer feedback sessions can also be grouped into three categories, namely: the affective, practical and technical.

As for the affective benefits, technology led feedback reduced pressure and significantly reduced the feeling of worry about students' non-native accents and prejudice caused by social norms. Furthermore, this mode of feedback was particularly beneficial for students' whose cultural norms discouraged peer feedback in a physical classroom environment (Liu and Sadler, 2013).

The practical benefits of conducting peer feedback electronically included a more customised, self-paced environment. It allowed students to respond spontaneously and freely, to reflect on their ideas. On the contrary, some disadvantages were also found. One drawback of computer-based feedback was found to be the issue of rapidly added comments. These comments typed in haste often resulted in confusion as they lacked clarity. Besides, some students pointed to the fact that the process of typing comments was time consuming and the comments provided were often deemed superficial (Liu and Sadler, 2013).

The technical benefits involved different learning opportunities from technology enhanced peer feedback activities. For instance, the comments provided electronically could be easily saved for further use or reflection. Commenting on the Word document proved to be more efficient. Students cited the fact that the Word format gave them more space to write their comments on; and that they would prefer to get feedback electronically rather than receiving a paper full of comments in red ink and crossed out sentences. However, some pitfalls related to technical issues were obvious. These included unreliable or slow connection, cumbersome access to chat rooms or blogs etc. (Cheng, 2007; Huang 2004). On top of that, lack of verbal communication which was essential for intercultural communication in peer feedback activities caused participants negative reaction towards technology driven computer feedback (Liu and Sadler, 2013).

While the link between online peer feedback and increased learning opportunities outside the classroom was established, some studies found that it didn't necessarily lead to students' enhanced motivation, engagement and autonomy (Cheng, 2009). In a study conducted by Guardalo and Shi (2007), Canadian ESL students expressed mixed feelings about online peer feedback. The participants reported that commenting online and exchanging opinions were more challenging than face-to-face interaction. Moreover,

many students said that they were hesitant to write back to reviewers to clarify or discuss meaning, making online feedback a one-way process.

2.5.1 Synchronous and asynchronous modes

Another important consideration related to computer mediated feedback involves the two different peer feedback modes: asynchronous and synchronous. Although a number of earlier studies have investigated the impacts these two modes have on the efficacy of peer feedback (Honeycutt, 2001; Liu and Sadler, 2003; Tuzi, 2004), more recent studies have also demonstrated interest in the field (Lin, 2005; Liang, 2008; Chang, 2009). The results, overall, demonstrated that both modes have their own merits. Synchronous computer mediated feedback allowed participants for more instantaneous responses. It was also reported as more interactive and dynamic. Furthermore, it was found to be more suitable for brainstorming ideas for writing. Asynchronous electronic feedback, on the other hand, allowed participants to take time to think and reflect better on their ideas. Students particularly favoured this mode of feedback as they could engage with it at their own pace. In addition, it was less psychologically pressuring for many students compared to the synchronous peer interaction (Liu and Sadler, 2003; Lin, 2005). Besides, participants appeared to be more willing to respond or feedback with more open criticism to their peers via asynchronous discussions.

Chang (2009) adopted a case study approach to investigate EFL students' participation in peer feedback activities and, in particular, students' perceptions of synchronous and asynchronous modes of feedback. The results revealed that despite students' degree of engagement being high in both modes, some discrepancy was noticed related to the types of comments students wrote. It was found that the comments given through synchronous feedback emphasized more local problems, while comments via asynchronous feedback focused on both local and global problems. Lin (2005) also explored the effects of the two feedback modes on facilitating students' revision processes. The results indicated that the students' subsequent revisions were not directly affected by the mode of feedback they had received.

The existing research suggests that computer-mediated peer feedback deserves to be in the EFL writing classroom. The benefits of conducting feedback in such a way include affective, technical and practical. Computer-mediated and online peer feedback was found to increase student engagement compared to face-to-face peer feedback. Besides, it allows students for a certain degree of autonomy and gives students flexibility over the discourse they choose to use during the feedback activities. However, to ensure the efficacy of computer mediated feedback teacher training is essential.

2.6 Summary

It's evident from the literature that peer feedback plays a significant role in the development of L2 writing skills. A number of studies have established the link between peer feedback and its effects on students' cognitive and meta-cognitive abilities. These include students' ability to identify problem areas, evaluate different perspectives, accept or reject suggestions. Furthermore, engaging with peer feedback has been reported to bring a sense of audience awareness which is, no doubt, an essential skill every good writer needs to have. Besides that, peer feedback has been found to impact students' self-confidence in a positive way. Some students have also emphasized that peer feedback allows for a favourable, threat free atmosphere in which they could thrive as they engage in meaningful negotiations and dialogue.

On the other hand, some studies warn about the possible risks of peer feedback. These may relate to students' inability or unreadiness (mainly due to linguistic constraints) to provide meaningful feedback. Similarly, some students may abstain from constructively critiquing their peers' writing due to social or cultural concerns.

Overall, there is enough evidence to suggest that peer feedback is beneficial both for the feedback giver and receiver, although certain limitations or challenges exist which are worth considering when deciding to implement it. With this in mind it may be logical to assume that peer feedback training plays a big role in offsetting some of these challenges.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction to chapter 3

This chapter discusses research methodology and design adopted in this study. It presents information about the participants and setting, data collection instruments as well as data analysis methods. This chapter is comprised of the following sections: research questions, research methodology and design, participants and setting, instrumentation, data collection procedure, data analysis procedure.

3.2 Research questions

Based on thorough analysis of the literature, there was a need to further explore the impact that teacher and peer feedback has on students' revisions in multiple draft writing. Furthermore, a need for exploring students' perceptions of the two feedback types was identified. Finally, current study intended to find out students' perspectives on using Google Docs as a tool to facilitate feedback delivery. Thus, the following research questions were developed:

1. What are the effects of teacher and peer feedback on student revisions in multiple draft writing?
2. What are students' perceptions of teacher and peer feedback in writing?
3. What are students' views regarding the use of Google Docs for feedback?

3.3 Research methodology and design

Mixed method approach was chosen to investigate the impacts that teacher and peer feedback have on students' revision processes in writing. To provide a more comprehensive analysis of the research questions both quantitative and qualitative data

needed to be collected. To measure students' perceptions of peer and teacher feedback each data type supplemented one another. Quantitative data was collected through conducting surveys using a questionnaire. The questionnaire developed to examine students' perceptions of feedback types and their roles was administered twice (at the beginning and at the end of the course). As Cotterall (1995) maintains learners' beliefs and attitudes have a deep impact on their learning behaviour and, therefore, need to be gauged prior to any intervention to occur. First time the questionnaire was given at the start of the course to evaluate students' initial perspectives on feedback and the role it plays in the writing classroom. Students were asked to fill in the same questionnaire again at the end of the course. The results from the two questionnaires were collated and analysed.

Qualitative data was obtained through semi-structured interviews. The interviews were conducted at the end of the course online¹. What's more, students' writing drafts were collected during the course for further analysis of impact teacher and peer feedback has on them.

3.3.1 Participants and setting

The study was conducted at Aydin University in Turkey with 16 students enrolled at the English Preparatory Programme under the School of Foreign Languages Department. It is a mandatory programme aimed at students whose level of English is not sufficient to go straight into faculty education. All of the participants who took part in this study were at B2 (upper-intermediate) level. The writing course taught as part of the programme was compulsory to all students enrolled in the programme and lasted over 7 weeks. The researcher was not involved in teaching, but acted in the capacity of the research observer. Teacher feedback was always given by their own instructor, while the researcher had to intervene when the peer review sessions were held. Also, the researcher administered the questionnaires as well as interviews.

The tables below illustrate information about the participants based on their gender, age and first language spoken. As can be seen the study comprised 9 male and 7 female

¹ Weeks 6 and 7 were taught online due to the outbreak of COVID-19

participants aged between 18 and 25 years old. Turkish was the most common language with 4 participants speaking Arabic and 1 Persian as their first language.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics on Participants' Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	9	56.3	56.3	56.3
	Female	7	43.8	43.8	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics on Participants' Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18.00	4	25.0	25.0	25.0
	19.00	4	25.0	25.0	50.0
	20.00	3	18.8	18.8	68.8
	21.00	1	6.3	6.3	75.0
	22.00	2	12.5	12.5	87.5
	23.00	1	6.3	6.3	93.8
	24.00	1	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics on Participants' First Language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Turkish	11	68.8	68.8	68.8
	Arabic	4	25.0	25.0	93.8
	Persian	1	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

The course met 2 times a week with each session lasting for 2 hours for 7 consecutive weeks. The objective of the course was to equip the students with the skills necessary for writing in academic context. These include develop students' academic vocabulary, improve accuracy, generate ideas, promote self-correction, peer review, encourage re-writing and producing multiple drafts. The table below presents rough course syllabus.

Table 4: Writing Course Syllabus

Week	Essay Type/Topic	Output
1	Basic Essay Structure The 5-Paragraph Essay (pp. 3-13)	5- Paragraph Essay- 1 st and final drafts
2	Opinion Essay (pp. 23-31)	Opinion Essay- 1 st and final drafts
3 Pop-Quiz 1	Descriptive Essay (pp. 14-22)	Descriptive Essay- 1 st and final drafts
4	Cause and Effect Essay (pp. 32-41)	Cause and Effect Essay- 1 st and final drafts
5 Midterm	Cause and Effect Essay	
6 Pop-Quiz 2	Compare and Contrast Essay (pp. 42-55)	Compare and Contrast Essay- 1 st and final drafts
7 ELAT	Compare and Contrast Essay	

The course began by looking at the essay structure with an emphasis on a 5-Paragraph essay. Each essay paragraph was looked at separately, followed by a sample essay given to the students. Students learned to identify paragraphs and their role within the essay. A lot of attention in the first lesson was given to Introduction, in particular thesis statement writing. Body paragraphs and the role of supporting sentences were then reviewed. After that students were given an essay prompt, which they started writing their first draft on (in-class). The draft was then teacher reviewed and students were given time to rewrite it before final submission.

Starting from week 2 students began to conduct peer feedback. The initial training (done in week 1) involved students getting to know what a rubric is and how to use it. They were also given a peer feedback form to evaluate their peers' writings. Peer feedback wasn't solely limited to having students check each other's writing, it also involved students helping each other in generating ideas and taking part in brainstorming sessions. During the course students were encouraged to produce multiple drafts of their essays by taking the feedback (both from the teacher and peers) into consideration. After writing their first draft, students took part in a guided peer review session to give each other feedback on the quality of their writing. They would then produce their second draft that was reviewed by their instructor, followed by a final draft that was ultimately turned in for assessment. In weeks 6 and 7 students were introduced to Google Docs and how to deliver feedback remotely (i.e. electronically) by using them. Students were instructed to not only look at the surface errors (such as grammar and spelling) but also at global issues (such as overall meaning and flow of ideas). The feedback sessions using Google Docs happened distantly and synchronously. Their writing instructor was also involved in these sessions.

3.3.2 Peer feedback sessions

As per literature review, training plays a crucial role in the success of peer feedback. Therefore, all students were given an adequate amount of training. The training was conducted in the first week of the course, with peer review sessions starting in the second. The researcher conducted the training and the peer review sessions with the writing instructor acting as a facilitator.

During the training students learned about the objectives and significance of peer feedback. Also, students learned about the role rubric plays in assessment and were shown how to use it when evaluating their peers' as well as self-work. In addition, students were also introduced to peer feedback/evaluation form which they were given to fill in, in each subsequent peer review session. After some modelling and whole class discussion students were engaged in their first peer feedback session.

During each peer feedback session, the researcher paired students to allow for greater and more intensive discussion opportunities about each other's writing. Each student was

given one peer feedback form together with a copy of the rubric. Students were instructed to read their partner's essay, fill in the feedback form with the relevant comments. They were also asked to grade the essay based on the criteria set out in the rubric. The pairs would then discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the essays they had reviewed. Their teacher was available to provide any immediate assistance needed. Students were allowed to exchange their drafts multiple times for more feedback practices. During those sessions students were strictly encouraged to be as critical as possible; however, at the same time complimenting on the evidence of good writing.

In weeks 6 and 7 peer feedback was delivered online by using Google Docs. Each student had to upload their first draft of their essay on a Google Doc and share the link with the rest of the class. Anyone willing to comment could take part and leave their feedback right in the doc. This allowed students for more opportunity to be engaged with feedback delivery.

After each peer feedback session, students had a chance to rewrite their drafts. The second drafts were then collected for teacher feedback. Each peer feedback session was complemented by teacher feedback, which was given on the second draft after students had received peer feedback. Teacher feedback involved a coding system which used to facilitate error correction. The teacher also provided short comments as well as questions about the essay. The feedback addressed both the content and the form of the writing. After receiving teacher feedback the students were asked to rewrite their drafts based on the feedback received.

3.3.3 Research instruments

For the purpose of data collection this study chose to utilise the following instruments: Taxonomy of Revisions adapted from Fraigley and Witte (see Appendix A), a questionnaire on students' perceptions of feedback (see Appendix B), a semi-structured interview (see Appendix F) and a researcher diary to reflect on the experiences.

3.3.4 Taxonomy of revisions

Taxonomy of revisions was adapted from the one designed by Fraigley and Witte (1981). This taxonomy categorizes the revisions into two categories: surface change (also known as local change) and meaning change (also referred to as global change). The surface change revisions imply formal changes of the writing without the change in meaning (i.e. spelling, punctuation, tense modifications etc.). The meaning change revisions, as the name suggests, involve changes which alter the meaning of the written text (i.e. additions, deletions and substitutions).

In order to establish reliability in categorising the types of changes made to the written drafts, the researcher asked an independent rater to analyze samples of the written texts according to the taxonomy. The researcher also analysed the same data samples. After the agreement has been reached the researcher analysed the remaining drafts herself.

3.3.5 Questionnaire

In order to examine students' perceptions of different feedback practices and their attitudes towards teacher and peer given feedback a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire was developed. The questionnaire included 8 questions and included points ranging from 1 to 5: 1- Strongly disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Not sure, 4- Agree and 5- Strongly agree (see Appendix B). The survey included questions on rubric, the role of teacher and peer feedback, whether students would prefer one feedback type over another and a question on Google Docs as a feedback delivery tool. The questionnaire was given in the first and the last week of the course.

3.3.6 Semi-structured interview

The interview contained 8 questions. The aim of the interview was to elicit students' experiences of teacher and peer feedback activities. To find out what their perceptions of different forms of feedback were and whether they found them beneficial (i.e. whether they have learned from the activities). Besides, some interview questions aimed at finding out if students gave preference to either teacher or peer feedback. Also, the interview

included questions about the use of Google Docs as an example of technology mediated feedback. The interviews were conducted at the end of the course online. 15 students agreed to be interviewed. All interviews were conducted in English, were recorded and transcribed for further detailed analysis.

3.3.7 Peer feedback form

In each peer feedback session students were provided with a peer feedback form to facilitate the feedback process (see Appendix D). After having finished their first draft the students would exchange their drafts with that of their peers and fill in the feedback form. The peer feedback form included an essay checklist together with some space to provide comments on. The checklist included questions about the overall organization of the essay (which was compiled in accordance with the essay scoring rubric). The second half of the peer feedback form asked to provide comments on the strengths and weaknesses as well as some suggestions on improvement. Finally, the feedback form asked to grade the essay based and to justify that grade based on the rubric provided (see Appendix E).

3.3.8 Researcher's diary

The researcher was physically on the campus for the whole duration of the course (except the last two weeks when the sessions took place online). Researcher's role was observational except the times when the peer feedback training and feedback delivery was taking place. The researcher wrote their reflections on everything that was going in the classroom. Particular attention was given to interaction patterns, students' reaction to teacher feedback and peer feedback. Students' degree of involvement with both feedback types was reflected.

3.4 Data collection procedures

Once the permission from the Aydin University's administration to conduct the study, collect and analyse data was granted, the implementation of this research study started. Data collection methods were as follows.

To track the students' perceptions of peer and teacher feedback two surveys were conducted. The first questionnaire was given in lesson one. The objective of this survey was to find out what students already knew about the role feedback plays in writing, to establish whether the students were familiar with peer feedback and rubric used for assessment. To track whether students' perceptions of peer feedback changed and to assess the outcome(s) of the intervention the same questionnaire was sent out at the end of the course (week 7).

To evaluate the impact teacher and peer feedback had on writing drafts, students' copies of the essay drafts were collected every lesson. These were logged electronically and further analysed. Teacher feedback involved pre-determined coding system (which students were already familiar with) and was done on students' drafts. Peer feedback was carried on feedback forms and delivered orally. The peer feedback forms and evaluation sheets were also collected on a regular basis.

To provide a more in-depth perspective on how students viewed the role of peer and teacher feedback and the effects each type of feedback had on their writing, semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions were conducted at the end of the course. The questions mainly asked the participants to reflect on their experiences with peer feedback sessions.

3.5 Data analysis procedures

For the quantitative analysis, the researcher performed an analysis on the participants questionnaires. Descriptive statistics was used to assist with the presentation of data description. The quantitative data were aggregated and analysed through IBM SPSS software (version 24). Descriptive statistics included frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations. Paired samples *t-test* was conducted in order to compare the results

of the first and second questionnaire and to determine if the difference was statistically significant.

For the qualitative data, the researcher used records of the interviews. Each interview was recorded to assist in further analysis. Each interview was transcribed to facilitate the data interpretation. Thematic analysis was then applied. The thematic analysis included repeatedly highlighting keywords and categorizing them using pre-identified themes. Once data collection started, the process for looking for recurring keywords began. To ensure the validity and objectivity of the data analysis an external linguist was employed. Once the researcher and the external expert identified the themes emerging from the transcripts, independent analysis began.

3.6 Validity

In general, validity refers to principles used to establish whether or not the research under question is of good quality (Trochim, 2006). Internal validity relates to legitimacy of the findings within the research (Trochim, 2006).

To ensure validity all of the research instruments were agreed with the experts in the field. Qualitative data analysis involving thematic analysis was done by two independent linguists. The emerging themes were pre-identified separately. Then the two experts came together to agree on commonalities to perform further data analysis. Quantitative data was collected through a questionnaire which had also been pre-agreed. The questionnaires were distributed during class times and sufficient time was given to fill them out. To ensure confidentiality names were not collected.

3.7 Credibility

Credibility relates to principles used to decide whether or not the study under inquiry is plausible and integral (Stringer, 2014). To build and achieve data trustworthiness, the researcher utilised data triangulation involving multiple sources, methods, and perspectives. This study involved the triangulation of data sources including a pre and

post questionnaire, student writing drafts, interviews, and a mixed method approach to achieve maximum reliability



4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1 Introduction to chapter 4

The principal aim of this study was to explore students' perceptions of teacher and peer feedback on their in-between draft writing. The subsidiary aim was to investigate whether students gave a strong preference to either type of feedback. A mixed method approach in obtaining and analysing data was adopted. This chapter contains the research questions followed by quantitative results and qualitative results.

4.2 Quantitative results

Quantitative data were collected through a questionnaire that was given twice to the participants at the beginning and at the end of the course. The questionnaire was used to capture students' perceptions of teacher and peer feedback. This questionnaire included 8 statements (see Appendix). The constructs included (1) understanding of the assessment criteria used in writing, (2 and 3) use of rubric, (4) perceptions of teacher feedback, (5 and 6) perceptions of peer feedback, (7) evaluation of teacher versus peer feedback and (8) use of Google Docs as a computer assisted form for feedback delivery. The questionnaire included Likert Scale from 1- *Strongly Disagree* to 5- *Strongly Agree*. The researcher used descriptive statistics to assist with the presentation of data descriptions. IBM SPSS Statistics version 24 was used for data analysis. The descriptive statistics for each statement in both Questionnaires are presented below.

Statement 1: I understand the criteria that my teacher is going to use to assess my writing.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 1 in the 1st Questionnaire

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Not Sure	4	25.0	25.0	37.5
	Agree	8	50.0	50.0	87.5
	Strongly Agree	2	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

From this table it can be seen that 2 respondents in the first questionnaire didn't understand the assessment criteria used by their teacher for writing. 4 more students said that they were not quite sure about it. However, 10 respondents knew how their writing was assessed. These results are predictable given the fact that the current study was conducted in track 3 of the academic year, meaning that the students had been exposed to writing assessment criteria prior to the start of this course. So, in percentage terms, 37.5% of those surveyed weren't quite sure about how their writing was assessed, with 62.5% expressing that they were either familiar or knew very well what criteria was used to mark their writings.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 1 in the 2nd Questionnaire.

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Not Sure	1	6.3	6.3	6.3
	Agree	9	56.3	56.3	62.5
	Strongly Agree	6	37.5	37.5	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

Table 6 indicates that at the end of the study virtually everyone in the class understood the criteria used for assessing their writing. Only 1 student reported that they still were unsure about it. During the 7-week writing course the students had a chance to learn about the criteria their teacher used to assess their written work. The students were continuously given writing samples together with the assessment criteria (rubric) and were asked to do the analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of those samples.

Statement 2: I know what a rubric for writing is and how to use it.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 2 in the 1st Questionnaire

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	5	31.3	31.3	31.3
	Disagree	4	25.0	25.0	56.3
	Not Sure	3	18.8	18.8	75.0
	Agree	4	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

As can be seen from the Table 7, 9 respondents said they didn't know what a rubric for writing is and how to use it. 3 respondents said they were not sure about it and only 4 students expressed that they were familiar with it. This means that the majority of the students weren't exposed to a writing rubric before. However, at the end of the course the vast majority of the students reported that they knew what the rubric for writing is and how to use it (see Table 8). This is expectable as the students were shown the writing rubric in the first peer feedback session. Furthermore, every subsequent session the students were encouraged to use the rubric when giving peer feedback and justifying it. In fact, the writing rubric was embedded into the peer feedback form.

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 2 in the 2nd Questionnaire

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Not Sure	1	6.3	6.3	6.3
	Agree	8	50.0	50.0	56.3
	Strongly Agree	7	43.8	43.8	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

Statement 3: I think writing rubric is helpful.

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 3 in the 1st Questionnaire

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Disagree	1	6.3	6.3	18.8
	Not Sure	9	56.3	56.3	75.0
	Agree	2	12.5	12.5	87.5
	Strongly Agree	2	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

As for the next statement in the questionnaire asking whether students find writing rubric helpful, the majority (9 students) felt unsure about it. Furthermore, 3 more of the respondents said they either disagreed or strongly disagreed. However, only 4 people believed that it was helpful. This is not surprising as the majority said they didn't know what the rubric is in the previous question (see statement 2 in questionnaire 1).

Table 10: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 3 in the 2nd Questionnaire

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Not Sure	4	25.0	25.0	37.5
	Agree	3	18.8	18.8	56.3
	Strongly Agree	7	43.8	43.8	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

At the end of the course, more students recognized the helpfulness of the writing rubric (3 “agreed” with 7 more who “strongly agreed”). Nevertheless, there were still quite a few who either were hesitant (4 students) or disagreed (2 students). This reluctance to accept the benefits of rubric may be explained by the common notion that the rubric is exclusively for the teacher's use and that it has little value for students.

Statement 4: Teacher feedback is beneficial in writing.

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 4 in the 1st Questionnaire

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	8	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Strongly Agree	8	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

Table 11 illustrates students' views on the benefits of teacher feedback in writing. It is interesting to observe that all of the participants supported the idea that teacher's feedback is beneficial. Such statistics may be explained by the fact students in Turkey are reliant on teacher a great deal and tend to value teacher feedback highly. However, it is striking to notice that one student changed their opinion to a more neutral in the second questionnaire (see Table 12).

Table 12: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 4 in the 2nd Questionnaire

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Sure	1	6.3	6.3	6.3
	Agree	5	31.3	31.3	37.5
	Strongly Agree	10	62.5	62.5	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

Statement 5: I know what peer feedback is and why it's given.

Table 13: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 5 in the 1st Questionnaire

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Disagree	2	12.5	12.5	25.0
	Not Sure	8	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Agree	3	18.8	18.8	93.8
	Strongly Agree	1	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

The results for statement 5 are more spread out. 4 students said that they didn't know anything about peer feedback (2 of them expressed that they strongly disagreed). 8 of the participants were not sure about it. In total 4 students reported that they knew what peer feedback is and why it's given. From this it may be concluded that only a few students were exposed to peer feedback prior to this study. The results from the second questionnaire suggest that virtually everyone in the group (15 people) acknowledged that they understand what peer feedback is and the rationale behind it. Only 1 student reported some hesitance.

Table 14: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 5 in the 2nd Questionnaire

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	6.3	6.3	6.3
	Agree	7	43.8	43.8	50.0
	Strongly Agree	8	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

Statement 6: Peer feedback is more beneficial than teacher feedback.

Table 15: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 6 in the 1st Questionnaire

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Not Sure	12	75.0	75.0	87.5
	Strongly Agree	2	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

The results for this question are mixed. The majority (12 students) said that they were not sure about it. This result is anticipated, as only few students were familiar with peer feedback at the start of the course. 2 students said that they disagreed, however another 2 said that they strongly agreed. The second questionnaire presents mixed results too. 2 of those surveyed chose “strongly disagree” with 3 more who said that they disagreed. 1 person was unsure and 7 agreed. 3 of the respondents picked “strongly agreed”. This is quite a surprising result given the fact that students naturally tend to trust teacher feedback more. This might be explained by Hawthorne effect coming into play.

Table 16: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 6 in the 2nd Questionnaire

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Disagree	3	18.8	18.8	31.3
	Not Sure	1	6.3	6.3	37.5
	Agree	7	43.8	43.8	81.3
	Strongly Agree	3	18.8	18.8	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

Statement 7: I'd prefer to receive teacher feedback only.

Table 17: Descriptive Statistics for Statement 7 in the 1st Questionnaire

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Disagree	7	43.8	43.8	43.8
	Not Sure	3	18.8	18.8	62.5
	Agree	5	31.3	31.3	93.8
	Strongly Agree	1	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

Table 17 shows that 7 of the respondents expressed their disagreement to receive teacher feedback only. This is surprising giving the fact that many students didn't know about peer feedback. 3 students were not sure about this and 5 agreed with 1 more who strongly agreed. The results of the second questionnaire reveal that although fewer students disagreed, more expressed uncertainty about the issue (6 students). What's more, about the same number of students either agreed or strongly agreed (4 and 3 respondents respectively). This is quite unexpected again as it contradicts the results for the previous question, where most of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that peer feedback was more beneficial than teacher feedback.

Table 18 Descriptive Statistics for Statement 7 in the 2nd Questionnaire

					Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	6.3	6.3	6.3
	Disagree	2	12.5	12.5	18.8
	Not Sure	6	37.5	37.5	56.3
	Agree	4	25.0	25.0	81.3
	Strongly Agree	3	18.8	18.8	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

Statement 8: I know what a Google Doc is and how to use it in giving feedback.

Table 19 Descriptive Statistics for Statement 8 in the 1st Questionnaire

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Disagree	3	18.8	18.8	31.3
	Not Sure	5	31.3	31.3	62.5
	Agree	3	18.8	18.8	81.3
	Strongly Agree	3	18.8	18.8	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

As regards the Google Docs as a tool for giving and receiving feedback, only 6 students said they knew about it and how to use it. 5 people said they were not sure with 5 more who didn't know what Google Docs are and how to use them. The data obtained in the second questionnaire indicate that everyone in class became familiar with Google Docs. This is not surprising as everyone had a chance to engage with the use of Google Docs to give/receive feedback.

Table 20 Descriptive Statistics for Statement 8 in the 2nd Questionnaire

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	10	62.5	62.5	62.5
	Strongly Agree	6	37.5	37.5	100.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	

The following two tables provide comprehensive summaries of the data collected from the two questionnaires. It is worth noting that the means for each statement have increased. Only statement's 4 mean hasn't changed much. In both questionnaires students' positive opinion regarding the usefulness of teacher feedback has remained almost unchanged.

Table 21: Statistics Summary Questionnaire 1

	Stateme nt1	Stateme nt2	Stateme nt3	Stateme nt4	Stateme nt5	Stateme nt6	Stateme nt7	Stateme nt8
Mean	3.6250	2.3750	3.0625	4.5000	2.9375	3.1250	3.0000	3.1250
Std. Deviation	.88506	1.20416	1.12361	.51640	1.06262	.80623	1.03280	1.31022
Minimum	2.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
Maximum	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

Table 22 Statistics Summary Questionnaire 2

	Stateme nt_1	Stateme nt_2	Stateme nt_3	Stateme nt_4	Stateme nt_5	Stateme nt_6	Stateme nt_7	Stateme nt_8
Mean	4.3125	4.3750	3.9375	4.5625	4.3750	3.3750	3.3750	4.3750
Std. Deviation	.60208	.61914	1.12361	.62915	.80623	1.36015	1.14746	.50000
Minimum	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	4.00
Maximum	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

4.2.1 Paired t-test result

To find out whether there is a significant difference between the 1st and 2nd questionnaire regarding students' perceptions of teacher and peer feedback a paired T-test was conducted.

Table 23: Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
		Mean			
Pair 1	Quest_1	3.218750	8	.6196197	.2190686
	Quest_2	4.285938	8	.4723818	.1670122

Table 24: Paired Samples T-Test Results

		Paired Differences			95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower	Upper			
Pair	Quest_1 Quest_2	-.8671875	.6609631	.2336857	-1.4197665	-.3146085	-3.711	7	.004

From the results of the t-test it can be seen that the p-value is .004 which is less than .005. Thus, it can be inferred that the results of the questionnaire are statistically significant, which means that present findings may be generalizable to a larger sample.

4.3 Qualitative results

The interviews were conducted at the end of the course in week 7. All 15 interviews were done in English, online via WhatsApp. All of the interviews were voice recorded and then transcribed. The prepared transcripts were carefully analysed for common themes which were subsequently coded. In the end, the themes were organised, categorised and labelled. Here're the results from the interviews.

4.3.1 Interview results

Question 1: How did you feel about the peer feedback sessions?

All of the students said that taking part in the peer feedback sessions was a new and overall positive experience. Only one student in the group reported that the sessions weren't very useful for her. When she was asked to elaborate on her answer, she made it clear that she didn't benefit from getting peer feedback as her level of English was significantly higher and hardly anyone could "find mistakes" in her writing. Having said that, she said that she enjoyed giving feedback a lot and that other students could benefit from her comments. Two of the interviewees reported overall positive but somewhat neutral experience. They both said that the quality of the sessions "depend on who you work with" as some of the peers "don't take it seriously". In spite of this, they found peer review helpful and interesting. All other students (12) spoke highly of the peer feedback sessions and said they found them either "useful" or "helpful". These two adjectives were continuously mentioned by the respondents. Interestingly, 5 of those interviewed said that peer feedback helped them improve their essay quality which resulted in "higher" grades overall. One person rated peer feedback highly as she said it gave her the opportunity to negotiate better and be more confident to ask for help, as she would often feel nervous to approach her teacher. This is what she said: "I often feel hesitant to ask my teacher about my mistakes but with my peers it's so comfortable and easy". On top of that, all students without exception, highlighted the fact that peer feedback included praise, not only criticism. They said they favoured it and that it was something they were not used to doing. Overall, it can be concluded that peer feedback sessions together with being a new experience for all of the participants have proved to be productive and useful.

Question 2: How did peer feedback affect your writing process overall?

This was quite an intriguing question as the researcher wanted to find out what impact peer feedback had on the writing as a process, overall. Rather than having students comment on the aspects of the writing (i.e. grammar, content, organization etc.) that have been affected by peer feedback, the researcher wanted to see if students' motivation for writing, level of confidence as a writer etc. have been affected and if so how. As in question 1 most students valued the contribution peer feedback sessions had on their writing process. 10 students reported that these sessions helped them become more

confident writers. They all said that they “understood the structure of the essay better and said that their writing grades improved”. They all believed that the improvement in grades was the result of the peer feedback corrections.

What’s more, one of the students even said that it took him significantly less time to write up an essay than it would normally take him. He said that this was because the peer feedback sessions helped him become a “more autonomous and self-sufficient writer”. In addition, 3 participants said that they were more willing to produce new drafts after they had received peer feedback. They said the comments they received from their peers encouraged them to write more and boosted their interests in writing. Furthermore, two students responded that they found it easier to discuss their writings with the teacher after they had been exposed to peer feedback. They reported higher levels of confidence as they said they were “more confident to ask the teacher” about their mistakes and even felt ready to “disagree with the teacher” at times.

Question 3: What areas of your writing (i.e. grammar, vocabulary, organization etc.) have been mostly affected by the peer feedback sessions?

13 respondents said that peer feedback has affected their in-between draft writing to various degrees. 9 of them reported that their peers mostly commented on their grammar errors. They said that their peers could pick up mistakes related to wrong tense usage, subject verb agreement, use of articles etc.

Out of these 9 people, 3 said that peer feedback helped them improve their organization of ideas and achieve better flow. This is what some of them said:

Respondent 1: “I learned to organize my ideas better and transit more smoothly”

Respondent 2: “My peers commented a lot on my organization. They also helped me write my conclusion more effectively”

One person mentioned that peers helped him significantly in generating ideas. Reportedly, he often struggled to come up with ideas for writing. This is what he said: “I often had difficulty thinking of ideas for my essays. Peer feedback was very helpful to solve this problem.

Only two people said that their writing has not been affected much by peer feedback. One of them said: “My English level is a little bit higher than others, eventually my peers couldn’t comment on my essays”. However, the same person emphasised the fact that some students would often notice her high level of writing and point out her strengths. Despite this, all of the respondents agreed that giving feedback was beneficial for their own writing as they learned how to use writing rubric and were more aware of the writing standards. Overall, continuous engagement with peer feedback made the students more conscious of the assessment criteria used by the teacher which helped them be more alert to their own mistakes.

Question 4: How do you feel about teacher feedback? Do you always take into account when writing drafts?

All 15 of those surveyed said that they value teacher feedback. The responses were all along these lines: “I think teacher knows everything”, “teacher feedback is great”, “teacher feedback is very useful for me”. However, two of the respondents expressed their concerns saying that they sometimes feel hesitant to ask their teacher for feedback finding it more comfortable to discuss it with their peers.

As regards the second half of the question, everyone said they always take their teacher feedback seriously and it helps them improve their drafts. One person said: “teacher’s feedback is very important. I always take it into account what my teacher says. Teachers are professional so they know better”. Another person expressed a similar idea: “I really like teacher feedback, whenever I write my essay my teacher gives me very good comments and sometimes circles my grammar mistakes. It is very beneficial to me”.

From what the students said it’s obvious that teacher feedback plays a crucial role in students’ writing and they do consider it seriously. However, not all of the respondents feel at ease to discuss their writings with their teacher.

Question 5: Which feedback: peer or teacher, did you find more beneficial for your writing? Why?

All of the respondents said that teacher feedback was more beneficial for them than peer feedback. When they were asked to provide the reason, they thought that way the responses varied.

Respondent 1 said: “Teacher feedback was more useful because it provides a higher chance to get a higher grade”. Respondent 2 said: “Teachers are more professional than my peers. They have more knowledge about the subject”. 8 more responses were very similar to this. They all believed that teachers are more competent and have more leverage to influence their writing process than their peers and therefore considered it to be more effective. 2 students responded by saying that peers don’t take it seriously and often provide very superficial feedback without looking deep. 2 students said that they “didn’t trust peer feedback” and that they would still “ask the teacher” for the confirmation. Having said that, most students acknowledged the significance of peer feedback and ranked it as useful (as per question 1).

Overall, it can be concluded that the students tend to appreciate teacher feedback more. This tendency is mainly explained by the notion that the teacher plays a far more significant role in the class. Students see their teacher as the authority and the knower in the room. Furthermore, the fact that the teacher is the one who has the power to affect their eventual grade makes the students more willing to recognize teacher’s feedback as having more value than peer feedback.

Question 6: Did you feel that peer feedback successfully complemented teacher feedback (i.e. did it address the points that teacher feedback didn’t)?

14 of those interviewed agreed with this question. 4 of the respondents said that peer feedback allowed students to be aware of their strengths and not only the weaknesses. This may be explained by the fact that peer feedback forms prompted them to comment on their peers’ strong sides together with weak areas. This is what they said:

Respondent 1: “Peer feedback was interesting because my peers commented on my strengths. My teacher hasn’t done this before”

Respondent 2: “Teachers always tell us our mistakes, but my peers told me about my good points too”

Respondent 3: “Peers helped me see my strong points”

Respondent 4: “Peer feedback was good. Thanks to it I learned about both my mistakes and strong sides”.

4 more students said that peers sometimes could see the points that they teacher didn’t use to comment on. They mostly referred to the quality of the ideas and overall organization of the essay.

3 students reported that the brainstorm sessions together with their peers helped them generate ideas and made the pre-writing process a more interesting and engaging activity. They also felt that giving/receiving peer feedback prior to teacher feedback resulted in fewer errors picked up by the teacher.

Only one student said that peer feedback didn’t prove to complement teacher feedback.

Question 7: What did you most like about Google Docs to give/receive feedback?

All of the students who participated in the Google Docs review sessions reported high levels of satisfaction with the new mode of giving and receiving feedback. What’s more for all of them, except 2, this was a new experience.

The positive comments given could be broadly classified into the following categories:

a. convenience and efficiency: “it’s easy to use”, “it’s quick and easy to use”, “you can give feedback distantly”, “you can keep all the feedback in one place”, “it’s instantaneous”

b. usability: “you can access your feedback at any time”, “you can comment and reply easily”, “it is great when everyone feedbacks live”.

c. non-threatening environment: “you can give/receive more feedback because people don’t feel scared to comment”, “not threatening”, “you can comment and not be afraid”. The respondents agreed that they could “freely express themselves” in a comfortable and “creative” way. All of this allowed the participants to “take their time” to think more carefully and to provide with more feedback than they would normally do face-to-face. However, some had to agree that not all of the feedback was useful.

Some other comments included were that Google Docs forced everyone to participate since it was obvious who was taking part and who was just sitting there passively without contributing at all.

All of these indicate numerous benefits that Google Docs can offer in providing synchronous feedback.

Question 8: What did you least like about Google Docs to give/receive feedback?

This question didn't elicit much reaction. Most of the negative feedback about Google Docs as a method for giving/receiving feedback related to the fact it took a bit of time to get used to it. This indicates that adequate training is required to achieve the most favourable outcome. One person could also make a valid point by saying that this mode of feedback, which lacks face-to-face elements, led to slightly lower quality feedback. Since the students couldn't communicate verbally (as they were only limited to written commentary) some misunderstanding could arise.

4.3.2 Taxonomy of revisions

The students of the current study were encouraged to produce multiple drafts by making necessary revisions to their drafts after receiving teacher and peer feedback. Each draft was then carefully analysed to establish the types of revisions students made to their either resulting from peer feedback or teacher feedback.

Each draft was analysed by using Faigley and White's taxonomy of revisions. According to this taxonomy each revision can be classified as either a surface change (which includes formal changes or meaning-preserving changes) or meaning change (i.e. microstructure and macrostructure changes). See Table 25.

I. Surface Changes (Do not affect meaning. No new information is brought to the text.)	
A. Formal Changes (editing)	
	(1) Spelling/Capitalization
	(2) Tense/number/modality
	(3) Abbreviations/contractions
	(4) Punctuation
	(5) Formatting
	(6) Morphological Changes
B. Meaning Preserving Changes (Paraphrase the original concepts by making them implicit or explicit without altering the meaning. No new information is brought to the text.)	
	(7) Additions (information was previously inferred but is now explicit)
	(8) Deletions (information was previously explicit but now must be inferred)
	(9) Substitutions (elements are traded)
	(10) Permutations (elements are rearranged)
	(11) Distributions (a single unit becomes more than one unit)
	(12) Consolidations (multiple units are combined into one unit)
II. Meaning Changes (Affect the concepts and meaning by bringing new information to the text.)	
A. Microstructure Changes (Simple adjustments or elaborations of existing text). Do not affect the gist or the direction of the ideas.	
	(13) Additions
	(14) Deletions
	(15) Substitutions
	(16) Permutations
	(17) Distributions
	(18) Consolidations
B. Macrostructure Changes (Change the text's overall direction and gist. Will affect the way the text will be summarized.)	
	(19) Additions
	(20) Deletions
	(21) Substitutions
	(22) Permutations
	(23) Distributions
	(24) Consolidations

Table 25: Taxonomy of Revisions (Adapted from Faigley & White, 1981)

The descriptive statistics for revision results is summarized in the table below (see Table 26). The 16 students made a total of 989 revisions to their essay drafts. Of these revisions 675 (68.2%) were considered surface changes. These included formal changes (284) together with meaning-preserving (391). The remaining 314 changes (31.8%) were

meaning revisions (of these 214 were microstructure changes with a further 100 constituting macrostructure).

It is also worth noting that of the total number of changes made to the drafts, 427 (43.2%) were made as a result of peer feedback and 562 (56.2%) were teacher feedback influenced. The biggest number of changes made as a result of both teacher and peer feedback were meaning-preserving revisions. These accounted for 227 and 164 changes made (40.4% and 38.4% respectively). In contrast, macrostructure changes were the least common and accounted for 69 (12.2%) and 31 (7.2) respectively.

Table 26: Total Revisions by Type and Source

Types of Revisions	Peer Feedback	Teacher Feedback	Total
Formal	134	150	284
Meaning-preserving	164	227	391
Total Surface Revisions	298	377	675 (68.2%)
Microstructure	98	116	214
Macrostructure	31	69	100
Total Meaning Revisions	129	185	314 (31.8%)
Total Revisions	427(43.2%)	562(56.2%)	989 (100%)

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction to chapter 5

This chapter discusses the study conclusions and recommendations. The following items are addressed in this chapter. Discussion of the results, limitations, recommendation for further research and conclusion.

5.2 Discussion of the results

To answer the research questions, this study collected both quantitative and qualitative data to answer these research questions.

5.2.1 Research question one

This discussion answers the following question. What are the effects of teacher and peer feedback on student revisions in multiple draft writing? Analyses of students' essay drafts and semi-structured interviews were conducted to address this question.

Comprehensive analyses of students' drafts revealed that both teacher and peer feedback had extensive impact on students' revision processes. The results indicate that the most common type of changes that were made to the drafts were related to surface changes (meaning preserving changes, in particular). These included rephrasing concepts, additions to the existing texts etc. without affecting the overall meaning.

The interviews yielded similar findings. The interviewees reported that peer feedback helped them see the mistakes related to tense usage, subject-verb agreement etc. These findings are consistent with that of Diab (2011), who investigated the effectiveness of peer and self-feedback in reducing language errors in writing on Lebanon students.

Despite the high percentage of surface changes, it's worth noting that students could also comment on the meaning-changing level, although less frequently than the teacher would. This indicates that students were able to apply higher order thinking when peer reviewing writing samples. This could be explained by the fact that all of the participants received initial training on how to conduct peer review. The trainings involved the use of rubric and peer feedback forms, which could have prompted the students to comment on beyond surface changes. These findings were also replicated in other studies done by Liu and Sadler, 2003; Yang et al., 2006.

Another very commonly cited benefit of peer feedback on students' writing was that it helped them develop confidence in writing as they became more aware of the essay structure and organization. Students reported that they could actively engage in discussion with their peers and negotiate terms more freely than they would do with their teacher. Likewise, teacher given feedback had a great impact on students' revision processes. While more revisions were made as a result of teacher feedback, the types of changes made were similar to those made after receiving peer feedback. The biggest number of corrections were meaning-preserving and other surface changes. Teacher feedback mostly concentrated on issues related to spelling, tense, aspect and form. On the semantic level: substitutions, additions and deletions. What's more, teacher feedback contained more suggestions for meaning changes at both microstructure and macrostructure level. These included identifying irrelevant ideas and suggestions to refine them, adding coherence and improving overall flow of the essay etc.

Overall, both peer and teacher feedback had a significant impact on students' essay drafts revisions. While both feedback sources mostly affected surface revisions, more meaning revisions were made as a result of teacher feedback.

5.2.2 Research question two

This discussion answers the following question. What are students' perceptions of teacher and peer feedback in writing? To address this question quantitative data (from the questionnaire) and qualitative data (from the interviews) were analyzed.

While both types of feedback were used by the students, teacher feedback was clearly prioritized more. It was apparent from the interviews that students valued teacher feedback more because they often considered the teacher as the “knower”. The participants said that they often take teacher feedback into account and apply it in their writing. Another reason why they tended to take teacher feedback so seriously was (as they said) that it helped them to earn higher grades. A number of other studies in literature reported similar results. For example, a study by Yang et al. (2006) in the Chinese EFL context found that 90% of the participants applied teacher feedback to their writing compared to only 60% of peer feedback. What’s more, teacher’s feedback is particularly valuable to those students whose language proficiency level is significantly higher than the rest of the class. This means peer feedback can only be of little value to such students. The results of the questionnaire also indicated that students seemed to appreciate teacher feedback more as all of the participants said it was beneficial for them.

On the other hand, while peer feedback was a new concept for most of the participants, continuous exposure to peer feedback during the course made everyone aware of this type of feedback. As regards students’ views about, the respondents spoke highly of peer feedback and pointed out different benefits of it. Almost all of those interviewed strongly felt that peer feedback successfully complemented teacher feedback and that it allowed them to focus/comment on the areas which their teacher didn’t.

Another finding in favour of peer feedback was the fact that it allowed students to not only comment on their weaknesses but also on their strengths (something that their teacher reportedly did little of). Also, peer feedback was found to be especially helpful in situations when students felt hesitant to ask their teacher. It seemed to be easier for students to discuss certain elements of their writing with their peers rather than teacher. Overall, this study reveals that students’ writing experience with the peer feedback sessions can help students increase the quality of their draft writing.

5.2.3 Research question three

This discussion answers the following question. What are students' views regarding the use of Google Docs for feedback? To address this question quantitative data (from the questionnaire) and qualitative data (from the interviews) were analyzed.

Overall, all of the students said that they found Google Docs a useful platform to give/receive feedback. The three biggest cited advantages related to its use were:

1. convenience and efficiency
2. usability
3. non-threatening environment

Convenience and efficiency. The fact that you can comment on one's writing distantly (e.g. from home) and in real time appealed to the participants a lot. They found this feature very useful and time saving. What's more, multiple people commenting on the Doc at the same time makes the quality of feedback more meaningful and valuable as different people can comment on different aspects of your writing at the same time.

Usability. Students reported a great degree of satisfaction with how feedback is delivered and stored. They all recognized the importance of saving comments for future use and Google Docs provided excellent opportunity to do so, as all of the feedback is automatically saved and stored in one place. The saved document could be easily reached, printed or revisited when necessary. A study by Fitze (2006) produced very similar findings.

The participants felt that commenting on Google Docs created a non-threatening, safe environment for them allowing for "freer and more creative" feedback. Students expressed that they didn't feel any pressure either from their peers or teacher which resulted in more feedback being given.

Some other views were expressed during the interviews that are worth mentioning. Students said that they felt an increased sense of responsibility for taking part in feedback sessions using Google Docs because the visibility in technology made the teacher and others know who was contributing and who wasn't keeping up with the class. This in turn alters the teacher role by making them less dominating in controlling students' interactions and intervening right away when necessary. This is especially positive as it allows for

more student-centered, personalized learning experience by making them active participants.

On the other hand, one obvious drawback was found that given the synchronous nature of feedback delivery (i.e. all participants commenting on the same Doc at the same time), rapidly added comments on the computer screen created some confusion. Furthermore, the large quantity of feedback didn't always mean high quality. Some of the hastily written comments didn't prove to be useful and had to be often ignored. This finding comes in line with a study by Liu and Sadler (2003) who found that computer generated feedback from synchronous conversations tended to be superficial in quality.

5.3 Limitations

The sample for this study involved one class of students (16) who were enrolled on a 7-week academic writing course as they revised in the context of multiple-draft process writing approach. This is a rather short time span to measure the implications that the feedback has on students' long-term writing performance. Since the primary goal of this study was to determine the impact that feedback has on students' drafts writing, the findings cannot be extended to the effect this feedback has on overall writing performance. A further (longitudinal) study needs to be done to examine such effect.

Although feedback and peer review trainings have been conducted in this study, the nature and techniques of such trainings may vary from teacher to teacher. This means that different results may be obtained provided that a different form of training is given. Furthermore, the fact that the trainings were given by the researcher might have affected the objectivity of this study to a certain extent. Besides, student participants were aware that they were observed as part of a research study, which may have resulted in a different behaviour and thus affected the results.

In spite of the limitations outlined above, the combination of data collection and analysis implemented in this research provide some understanding of a typical L2 writing classroom and the impact that teacher and peer feedback has on their revision processes. This insight may prove to be a valuable contribution to the existing knowledge of the effects of feedback on writing development.

5.4 Recommendations for further research

Based on the findings of this study the following recommendations for further research could be made. Since this study has examined the immediate impact of peer and teacher feedback on text revision and writing performance, in future, it could be worthwhile considering the long-term impact of these feedback types on students' writing. Longitudinal studies should be conducted to investigate the role of peer feedback in mediating writing development. A more thorough quantitative data analysis could be done to measure the impact peer feedback has on students writing over a longer period of time, like a year or more.

In addition, since training plays an important role in peer feedback activities, more research is needed to examine the role teachers play in this and how much scaffolding is required to achieve the most favourable outcome. This is especially true with computer mediated feedback where students may require more intensive training.

Besides, a further inquiry into the face-to-face versus computer-mediated feedback modes may be required. Technology has become to play a considerable role in many writing classrooms and its potential to facilitate how feedback is delivered/received has yet to be further explored. The concept of virtual classrooms is becoming increasingly popular (given the recent circumstances with the outbreak of COVID-19 around the globe) meaning that all of the feedback is taking place electronically. It can be valuable to explore both teachers' and students' perceptions of online delivered feedback to further act upon the findings to streamline its delivery.

A final recommendation for further research is how to bridge the gap between research and practice with regard to peer feedback in L2 writing. While a growing body of research is suggesting numerous benefits of peer feedback, in many writing classrooms students still rely on teacher feedback meaning that peer feedback is largely ignored. Thus, more research is needed to explore why peer feedback research hasn't adequately informed classroom practice and how this research can be used to motivate L2 writing teachers to adopt it more extensively in their classrooms.

5.5 Conclusion

In L2 writing context the role of feedback (whether teacher or peer delivered) is absolutely critical. Although the participants in this study seemed to recognize teacher feedback more, they well acknowledged that peer feedback played an important role too. The consensus was that peer feedback successfully supplemented teacher feedback in a way that it allowed peers to pick up on the issues that their teacher didn't notice. Besides, students expressed their satisfaction with the fact that the peer feedback also focused on praise and that receiving positive comments from their peers proved to be a stimulating experience for many participants. On top of that, students' engagement with peer reviews yielded positive results as it helped most of the participants to improve their writing quality between drafts.

This study also concludes that students' training during the peer feedback sessions is significant. The results indicated that the students who participated in the training were able to focus and comment on global areas rather than local (surface) areas only.

This study also examined students' views on the use of technology mediated feedback (Google Docs), which was a new experience for most of the participants. The results revealed that all of the students found Google Docs a useful and practical tool in delivering peer feedback. They all appreciated the potential that technology has in facilitating feedback giving practices which associated with a convenient use, efficiency and practicality.

REFERENCES

- Ashewell, T.** (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multi-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of second language writing*, 9, 227-258
- Barnett, M.A.** (1989). Writing as a Process. *The French Review* 63: 31-44.
- Biggs, J.B. & Tang, C.** (2007). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. (3rd Ed.). Maidenhead: McGraw Hill Education & Open University Press.
- Bitchener, J.** (2008) Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 102-118.
- Bruffee, K.A.** (1984). *Collaborative Learning and the "conversation of mankind"*. College Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chandler, J.** (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 writing. *Journal of second language writing*, 12, 267-296
- Chang, C. F.** (2009). Peer review through synchronous and asynchronous CMC models: A case study in a Taiwanese college English writing course. *The JALT CALL Journal* 5.1, 45-64.
- Cheng, M.C.** (2007). Improving interaction and feedback with computer mediated communication in Asia EFL composition classes: A case study. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 4(1), 65-97.
- Cohen, A., & Cavalcanti, M.** (1990). Feedback on written compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. *Second Language Writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 155-177).
- Diab, N.M.** (2011). Assessing the relationship between different types of student feedback and the quality of revised writing. *Assessing Writing* 16.4, 274-292. *English*, 46 (7), 635-652.
- Exploring peer review in a second language writing class. *Instructional Science*, 38, 371-394. *Feedback. System*, 31 (2), 217-230.
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J.S.** (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, & practice* (2nd Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ferris, D.R.** (2006). *Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short and long term effects of written error correction*. Cambridge, U.K. Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D.R., & Roberts, B.J.** (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 161-184.
- Ferris, D.R., and Roberts, B.J.** (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 161-184
- Fitze, M.** (2006). Discourse and participation in ESL face-to-face and writing electronic conferences. *Language Learning 7 Technology*, 10(1). 67-86.

- Flower, L. S., & Lam; Hayes, J.R.** (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-387.
- Frantzen,D., & Rissel, D.** (1987). Learner self-correction of written compositions: What does it show us? In B. VanPatten, T.R. Dvorak, & J.F. Lee (Eds.), *Foreign language learning: A research perspective* (pp. 92-107). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House
- Guardado, M., & Shi, L.** (2007). ESL students' experiences of online peer feedback. *Computers and Compositions*, 24, 443-461. *Doi: 10.1016/j.compcom.2007.03.002*
- Haswell, R.H.** (1983). Minimal marking. *College English*, 45, 600-604.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H.** (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 1(77), 81–112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>.
- Honeycutt, L.** (2001). Comparing e-mail and synchronous conferencing in online peer response. *Written Communication* 18, 26-60.
- Hu, G.** (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language Teaching Research* 9, 321-342.
- Hu, G., & Lam; Lam, S. T. E.** (2010). Issues of cultural appropriateness and pedagogical efficacy:
- Huang, M.** (2004). *The use of process writing and internet technology in a Taiwanese college English writing class: A focus on peer review* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.
- Hyland, F.** (2003). Focusing on Form: Student Engagement with Teacher
- Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H., Azizifar, A.** (2015). The Effects of Teacher-Written Direct vs. Indirect Feedback on Students' Writing. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.018> *Social and Behavioral Sciences* Volume 192, 24 June 2015, Pages 116-123 *Journal* 66: 140-149.
- Kamimura, T.** (2006). Effects of peer feedback on EFL student writers at different levels of English proficiency: A Japanese context. *TESL Canada Journal* 23.2, 12-39.
- Lalande, J. F.** (1982). Reducing Composition Errors: An Experiment. *The Modern Language*
- Liang, M, Y.** (2008). *SCMC interaction and EFL writing revision: Facilitative or futile?* *Proceedings of E-learn 2008*. Chesapeake, VA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE), 2886-2892.
- Lin, J. Y.** (2005). Synchronous and asynchronous conferencing: A comparison of two modes of online ESL peer response and their effects on student talk and subsequent text revision. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Liu, J. & R. Sadler** (2003). The effect and affect of peer review in electronic versus traditional modes on L2 writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 2, 193-227.
- Liu, J. and Hansen, J.** (2002) *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*, the University of Michigan Press: Michigan.
- Liu, Y.** (2008). THE EFFECTS OF ERROR FEEDBACK IN SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching*, Vol. 15, 65-79
- Ma, J.** (2010). Chinese EFL learners' decision-making while evaluating peers' texts. *International Journal of English Studies* 10.2, 99-120.
- Min, H. T.** (2008). Reviewer stances and writer perceptions in EFL peer review training. *English for Specific Purposes* 27, 285-305.

- Narciss, S.** (2008). Feedback strategies for interactive learning tasks. In J. M. Spector, M. D.
- Nelson, M. M., & Schunn, C. D.** (2009). The nature of feedback: How different types of peer
- Rahimi, M.** (2013). Is training student reviewers worth its while? A study of how training influences the quality of students' feedback and writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 17, 67-89
- Robb, T., Ross, S., and Shortreed, I.** (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 83-93
- Stringer, E.** (2014). Action research (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Sullivan, N., & Pratt, E.** (1996). A comparative study of two ESL writing environments: A computer-assisted classroom and a traditional oral classroom. *System*, 29(4), 491-501.
- Tang, G. M., & Tithecott, J.** (1999). Peer response in ESL writing . *TESL Canada Journal*, 16(2), 20-38. Doi:10.18806/tesl.v16i2.716
- Trochim, W. M.** (2006). The research methods knowledge base. Retrieved from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/>
- Truscott, J.** (1999). The case for "the case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 111-122.
- Truscott, J.** (1996). The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. *Language learning* 46, 327-369
- Tuzi, F.** (2004). The impact of e-feedback on the revisions of L2 writers in an academic writing course. *Computers and Composition* 21, 217-235.
- Varaprasad, C.** (2016). In-class peer feedback: Effectiveness and student engagement. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 3 No. 2
- Vygotsky, L.S.** (1987). Thinking and speech. In R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (eds.), *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky; Vol. 1: Problems of general psychology*. New York: Plenum, 39-285.
- Yang, M., R. Badger & Z. Yu** (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 15.3, 179-200.
- Zamel, V.** (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79-102.
- Zhao, H.** (2014). Investigating teacher-supported peer assessment for EFL writing. *ELT Journal* 68.2, 155-168.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. TAXONOMY OF REVISIONS*

I. Surface Changes (Do not affect meaning. No new information is brought to the text.)

A. Formal Changes (editing)

- (1) Spelling/Capitalization
- (2) Tense/number/modality
- (3) Abbreviations/contractions
- (4) Punctuation
- (5) Formatting
- (6) Morphological Changes

B. Meaning Preserving Changes (Paraphrase the original concepts by making them implicit or explicit without altering the meaning. No new information is brought to the text.)

- (7) Additions (information was previously inferred but is now explicit)
- (8) Deletions (information was previously explicit but now must be inferred)
- (9) Substitutions (elements are traded)
- (10) Permutations (elements are rearranged)
- (11) Distributions (a single unit becomes more than one unit)
- (12) Consolidations (multiple units are combined into one unit)

II. Meaning Changes (Affect the concepts and meaning by bringing new information to the text.)

A. Microstructure Changes (Simple adjustments or elaborations of existing text). Do not affect the gist or the direction of the ideas.

- (13) Additions
- (14) Deletions
- (15) Substitutions
- (16) Permutations
- (17) Distributions
- (18) Consolidations

B. Macrostructure Changes (Change the text's overall direction and gist. Will affect the way the text will be summarized.)

- (19) Additions
- (20) Deletions
- (21) Substitutions
- (22) Permutations
- (23) Distributions
- (24) Consolidations

**Adapted from Faigley and Witte, 1981*

APPENDIX B. STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Please fill in with this questionnaire to the best of your ability.

Your first language: _____

Your gender: _____

Your age: _____

For each of the statement below tick the box that most accurately describes your feeling.

	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Not Sure 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
1. I understand the criteria that my teacher is going to use to assess my writing.					
2. I know what a rubric for writing is and how to use it.					
3. I think writing rubric is helpful.					
4. Teacher feedback is beneficial in writing.					
5. I know what peer feedback is and why it's given.					
6. Peer feedback is more beneficial than teacher feedback.					
7. I'd prefer to receive teacher feedback only.					
8. I know what a Google Doc is and how to use it in giving feedback.					

APPENDIX C. ESSAY CHECKLIST

	Questions?	YES	NO
	The essay consists of three parts: introduction, body and conclusion.		
	The introduction contains clear background information and the topic of the essay.		
	The introduction has an engaging hook.		
	The introduction has a clear thesis statement.		
	Each body paragraph contains one main idea.		
	The main idea of each paragraph is supported by details (examples, details).		
	My essay has a clear conclusion which effectively sums up the main points of my body paragraphs.		
	The essay flows smoothly and the ideas are logically connected.		
	The essay accurately uses grammatical and lexical forms.		

APPENDIX D. PEER FEEDBACK FORM

Assessor's Name: _____

Date: _____

What are the main strengths of the essay?

What are the main weaknesses of the essay?

What suggestions for improvement can you give?

What grade would you give to this writing? Justify it by using the rubric.

APPENDIX E. ESSAY RUBRIC

Criteria	3 Above Standard	2 Standard	1 Below Standard	0
Introduction	Hook is engaging and introduces the topic. Background information is relevant and concise. There is a thesis statement that clearly states the purpose.	Hook is somewhat engaging. Background information is mostly relevant. There is a thesis statement that clearly states the purpose.	Hook is not clear or doesn't present. Background information is mostly irrelevant. Some of the elements of a thesis statement are missing.	No attempt has been made.
Body Paragraphs	There are clear topic sentences. Supporting details are great and perfectly develop the main idea.	Topic sentences are mostly clear. Supporting details are mostly relevant and good.	Topic sentences are somewhat unclear. Supporting details are mostly irrelevant or don't support the topic sentence.	No attempt has been made.
Conclusion	Restates the main idea of the essay very well. Doesn't introduce any new ideas. Rephrases the thesis.	Restates the main idea fairly well. Perhaps too short or too long. Does not rephrase the thesis well.	Fails to restate the main idea or contains irrelevant information.	No attempt has been made.
Grammar and Vocabulary	Grammar and vocabulary are used perfectly well. There are no mistakes.	Grammar and Vocabulary are mostly used correctly. There are some mistakes.	Grammar and Vocabulary aren't used correctly. There are many mistakes.	

APPENDIX F. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How did you feel about peer feedback sections?

Did you find them useful why? why not?

2. How did receiving peer feedback affect your own writing process?

3. How do you feel about teacher feedback, do you always take into account when writing drafts?

4. Which feedback: peer or teacher did you find more useful? Why?

5. Do you agree that peer feedback complement teacher feedback? i.e. Does peer feedback address the points that teacher feedback doesn't?

6. What areas of your writing: grammar, content, organization, etc. have been mostly affected by peer review sessions?

7. What did you most like about using Google Docs to give feedback?

8. What did you least like about using Google Docs to give feedback?

APPENDIX G. TEACHER FEEDBACK SAMPLE



Good!

78

Extreme Sports

Have you ever ^{SP} about why people ^{are} attracted or addicted to extreme sports? Mountain climbing without equipment, jumping between buildings, etc. ~~I~~ these sports are nonsense to some people. And some people think ~~I~~ people who do ~~I~~ these sports are mad. But I think ~~I~~ they are not mad or crazy. Because there are reasons why they love these sports. They love these sports... (3 reasons)

First of all, they like the experience of near death situations. when they ^{TNS} get through these situations, they feel like they ^{TNS} beating the death. According ^I to research ^I, feeling of anxiety cause a person to be self-confident. ? (see me)

Secondly, most of them are addicted to adrenaline. They love to put themselves in dangerous situations. These situations ^{SP} cause ^I an increase of the dopamine hormone, and they feel happy ^I in the end. Hanging from a high building or walking on a rope between two mountains can be given as examples.

page 12

APPENDIX H. PEER FEEDBACK SAMPLE

Essay checklist:

Name & Surname: Buket Korotas

Date:

Questions?	YES	NO
The essay consists of three parts: introduction, body and conclusion.	✓	
The introduction contains clear background information and the topic of the essay.	✓	
The introduction has an engaging hook.	✓	
The introduction has a clear thesis statement.	✓	
Each body paragraph contains one main idea.	✓	
The main idea of each paragraph is supported by details (examples, details).	✓	
The essay has a clear conclusion, which effectively sums up the main points of my body paragraphs.		X
The essay flows smoothly and the ideas are logically connected.	✓	
The essay accurately uses grammatical and lexical forms.	✓	

Peer Feedback Form

Assessor's Name: Gökçe Arıoğlu
 Date: 11.03.2020

What are the main strengths of the essay?
It explains so many things about Tsunami

What are the main weaknesses of the essay?
Just small grammar mistakes

What suggestions for improvement can you give?
You could write a stronger conclusion paragraph

What grade would you give to this writing? Justify it by using the rubric.
85

APPENDIX I. ETHICAL APPROVAL



T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Sayı : 88083623-020
Konu : Etik Onayı Hk.

Sayın DILFUZA BAKHTIYAROVA

Tez çalışmanızda kullanmak üzere yapmayı talep ettiğiniz anketiniz İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Etik Komisyonu'nun 01.10.2020 tarihli ve 2020/08 sayılı kararıyla uygun bulunmuştur.

Bilgilerinize rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır
Dr.Öğr.Üyesi Alper FİDAN
Müdür Yardımcısı

21/10/2020 Yazı İşleri Uzmanı

Tuğba SÜNNETCİ

Evrakı Doğrulamak İçin : <https://evrakdogrula.aydin.edu.tr/enVision.Dogrula/BelgeDogrulama.aspx?V=BEND37UIJ>

Adres:Beşyol Mah. İnönü Cad. No:38 Sefaköy , 34295 Küçükçekmece / İSTANBUL
Telefon:444 1 428
Elektronik Ağ:<http://www.aydin.edu.tr/>

Bilgi için: Tuğba SÜNNETCİ
Unvanı: Yazı İşleri Uzmanı



RESUME

Personal Information

Name: Dilfuza BAKHTIYAROVA

Education

2018-2020 Master Of Arts, English Language and Literature, Istanbul Aydin University, Turkey.

2003-2007 Bachelor Of Arts, English Philology, The Uzbek State World Languages University, Uzbekistan

Nationality: Uzbekistan

Work Experience

2007-2008 Pedagogical College, English Instructor, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

2010-2013 Freelance English Instructor

Language Skills

Russian	Uzbek	English	Turkish
Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good