The effects of peer feedback on the essay writing performances of EFL students

Eren Uymaz [a] *

[a] *First affiliation, Address, City and Postcode, Country*

Abstract

The aim of this study is to find out the effects of peer feedback on EFL students' written performances in essay writing. For this end, this experimental study was conducted with a group of students (n=8) studying at the English preparatory school of a state university in Turkey during the 2017-2018 academic year. Students received feedback from their peers for the four different essay tasks for which they produced a first draft and a second draft during the course of eight weeks. Students were also administered a written pre-test and post-test. The number of correct revisions in second drafts was calculated by using Conrad and Goldstein's (1999) taxonomy. The quantitative data coming from pre-test and post-test were analysed statistically with SPSS by conducting paired samples t-test. The results showed that peer feedback helped students write 69% of the feedback points provided by their peers correctly. Also, the written test results indicated a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test. In the light of these findings, it can be concluded that peer feedback can be an effective tool in improving students' correct revisions in second drafts and it may help EFL learners perform better in a written post-test

Keywords: feedback; peer feedback; L2 writing

1. Introduction

Feedback plays a crucial role to help a learner notice errors in a written text. It seems that no matter what the genre of a particular piece of text is, providing feedback is a part of L1 and L2 writing (Ferris, 2003; K. Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Pearce, Mulder, & Baik, 2009). According to Hattie and Timperley (2007), feedback is "information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding" (p. 81, parentheses are original). The presence of a feedback provider and a learner creates a mutual relationship, but it can be said that the agent takes on a more important role trying to pave the way for improvement of one's

---

* Corresponding author
  E-mail address: erenuymaz05@gmail.com

written performance. In this sense, the agent expects the feedback receiver to reach a desired level of performance with the help of concrete comments and suggestions (Boud & Molly, 2013; Glower & Brown, 2006; Wiggins, 1993). The feedback provider could be manifold, but teachers are seen as the main and most important source of feedback in L2 writing (Hyland, 2004; Lee, 2017). This is understandable especially in EFL contexts given that teachers are the expert and knowing ones for low-proficient learners who are still at the stage of acquiring the language.

However, when the sole source of feedback is the teacher, the writing activity itself might turn out to be a one-shot treatment where the teacher provides feedback and puts a grade on the paper to pass or fail the student. For this very reason, some writing scholars put forward the idea that writing is a process where a student can reorganize her/his ideas and correct committed errors on the way to the ultimate draft (Raimes, 1985; Susser, 1994; Zamel, 1976, 1982). This idea of writing in stages (pre-writing, actual writing and revising) justified the use of students' peers in the class as a feedback source and peer feedback activities have been widely used in ESL/EFL writing classrooms ever since (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Hansen & Liu, 2005; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Min, 2006; Tsui & Ng, 2000).

In addition to being an alternative or complementary for other sources of feedback, peer   feedback comes with advantages for language learners and teachers. The advantageous aspect of peer feedback was pointed out in a wide array of experimental studies both in ESL and EFL writing literature (Berg, 1999; Berggren, 2015; Diab, 2010; Hu, 2005; Hu & Lam, 2010; Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, & Huang, 1998; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger, 1992; Miao, Badger, & Zhen, 2006; Min, 2005; Rahimi, 2013; Ruegg, 2015; Tsui & Ng, 2000; Villamil & DeGuerrero, 1996, 1998; Wang, 2014; Zhao, 2010, 2014). Because of the advantageous use of peer feedback, it was intended to find out its effects on the written accuracy of EFL students in this research.y

1.1. The Advantages of Using Peer Feedback in EFL/ESL Classrooms

In the available literature concerning the advantages of peer feedback, it is reported that peer feedback can have an affective advantage over teacher feedback; that is it creates an emotionally better atmosphere in the classroom and creates a sense of relatedness among peers (Hu & Lam, 2010; Jacobs et al., 1998; Zhao, 2010, 2014). Also, some strand of research has shown that using peer feedback can increase student motivation towards the writing course and result in better revisions in subsequent drafts (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Miao et al., 2006; Wang, 2014). For teachers and students, peer feedback could be of great use to develop L2 writing teaching and learning (Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger, 1992; Min, 2005; Yu & Lee, 2015; Zhao, 2014). The

advantages of peer feedback could be that students would have more chances of getting feedback, address to an audience that is similar to their level, increase their self-evaluation skills and become autonomous learners (Hyland, 2000; Rollinson, 2005; Tsui & Ng, 2000; Villamil & DeGuerrero, 1998). Also, they could benefit from seeing their friends' errors by not committing the same errors in their written drafts (Chang, 2015; Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger, 1992; Zhao, 2010). The following part reviews some of the studies which showed the advantageous of peer feedback in L2 classrooms.

Diab (2010) worked with 18 students in a control group and 22 students in an experimental group in an EFL setting to investigate whether trained peer feedback activities produce better revisions than trained self-editing activities for language errors like subject/verb agreement, pronoun agreement, wrong word choice and sentence structure (Diab, 2010, p. 87). The study shows that students in the peer feedback group committed fewer errors in subject/verb agreement and pronoun agreement than the self-editing group. Also, students in the peer feedback group showed instances of collaboration and meaning is negotiated between themselves, which is seen as an important opportunity for communicative behavior (Rollinson, 2005; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1996).

Berggren (2015) investigated how peer feedback can enhance Swedish lower-level secondary students' writing abilities (Berggren, 2015, p. 58). There were 26 students, who were in their eight year in a Swedish lower secondary school. Their levels ranged from B1 to B2 as defined by the Common European Framework for Reference (CEFR) (Council of Europe 2001). The participants were divided into two groups: Fifteen of them were in class A and eleven of them were in class B. Students' revision changes between first and second drafts were identified and categorized according to its structure and organization, content, vocabulary and grammar upon receiving peer feedback. Students also took a peer review training session before the study. The study indicated that students made a total of 495 revision changes in second draft. Out of 495 revision changes, 284 of them (57%) were the result of peer feedback. Results also showed that students increased their awareness of audience and genre and made changes on global aspects (content, organization) more than local aspects (grammar, vocabulary) (p. 63).

Berg (1999) found that peer feedback initiated critical thinking skills. When a student takes advice from the teacher, s/he accepts it without questioning its validity, but when feedback comes from a peer, s/he questions its validity, compares it with her/his own knowledge and then makes a decision (Berg, 1999, p. 232). This process makes the learner revisit the embedded knowledge in her/his cognitive load and might help enhance the linguistic capabilities.

Tsui and Ng (2000) conducted a research in a secondary school in Hong Kong with 27 Chinese EFL students to find out whether peer or teacher comments produce better revisions (Tsui & Ng, 2000, p. 147). The researchers aimed at identifying which feedback

type produced more revisions in subsequent drafts. At the end of the study, students who incorporated peer revisions more than the teacher comments found it beneficial to work with their friends while developing their writing. In peer sessions, students were able to explain what they meant in their texts to their friends, got help from their peers by making them explain their weak points and felt more comfortable with peer comments than teacher comments. This is mainly because peers are seen as more authentic audiences than teachers for students (Jacobs et al., 1998; Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger, 1992; Paulus, 1999; Rollinson, 2005). Thus, peer feedback has a great potential for collaborated language learning (Villamil & De Guerrero, 1996, 1998).

Miao et al. (2006) compared two classes, one of which received peer feedback and the other received teacher feedback. The statistical data on student texts and questionnaire indicated that students adopted teacher feedback more, but peer feedback was associated with a greater degree of student autonomy (Miao et al., 2006, p. 179).

1.2. Statement of the problem

English preparatory classes at tertiary level institutions in Turkey offer foreign language education to make students proficient enough to follow their studies in their prospective departments whose medium of instruction is, most of the time, English. While doing so, the main objective is to develop students' main skills (reading, listening, writing, and speaking) and subskills (vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation) in the particular language they are learning.

Most of the time, teaching writing has to be performed within limited amount of weekly classroom hours and in crowded classes with different L2 backgrounds. This might turn teaching writing into a burdensome process both for students and teachers because teachers are expected to teach writing, give feedback and grade student papers in this limited amount of time. This might result in teacher burn-out and academic fatigue for students. In addition, dealing with limited amount of written drafts becomes the common practice among teachers rather than working with multiple drafts due to time constraints.

1.3. Purpose of the study

As for the tertiary level students, improving writing skills in English constitutes an important part of their academic lives because they are expected to show some degree of proficiency in writing academic papers in their related fields. It is important for them to put accurate and coherent pieces of written texts in the English language for their prospective studies. The researcher aimed at offering an alternative or complementary source of feedback for other feedback sources in tertiary level with the help of peer feedback. The present study aims to provide answers to the following research questions:

1.   To what extent does peer feedback help L2 writers produce correct revisions in second drafts?

2.   Does peer feedback create a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of the study group?.

2. Method

2.1. Research design

This research is a pre- and post-test experimental study conducted with a group of students (n=8) who received feedback only from their peers. The primary source of quantitative data is the students' written texts consisting of a first draft and a second draft. The other sources are quantitative pre-test and post-test (writing exam).

The school of foreign languages where this study was carried out does not follow a component-based language program. That is, there are no specific classroom hours for writing and teachers do not use a course book to teach writing in the classroom. Rather, each class has a total of twenty-three hours of English every week for eight weeks. The school administration gives a weekly syllabus to help teachers follow what should be taught in the classroom. In the weekly syllabus, teachers are directed about which pages to follow from the student's book and the workbook on each day from Monday to Friday. They can also see the grammar points which should be covered during the week. Photocopiable handouts are given to students for extra practice in reading, listening, writing, and grammar. According to the intermediate level syllabus of the school, students are expected to learn to notice the structure of an essay and write an opinion essay. The writing sections of the units in the student's book are omitted to engage students with essay writing rather than teaching them how to write a paragraph about memories or say a a formal e-mail. No specific classroom hours were allocated to teach writing in the intermediate level syllabus, so the researcher decided to spend three hours every week for the writing instruction so that the remaining twenty hours could be spent to cover the other parts in the weekly programme.

In the first week of the study, two hours were allocated for the peer review training session of the experimental group. The available research has pointed out that in order to conduct successful peer feedback practices, students need to take training on how to give peer feedback (Berg, 1999; Chang, 2015; Hu, 2005; Lam, 2010; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Miao et al., 2006; Min, 2005, 2006; Rahimi, 2013; Steendam et al., 2010; Zhu, 1995). This training period was much briefer and less elaborate when compared with peer feedback training sessions in other studies (e.g., Berg, 1999; Hu, 2005). The feedback training session had to be conducted for two class hours due to the heavy

curriculum to cover and time consuming preparation of L2 student writers for peer review. It was thought that a longer period of time for training could make the class fall back on the schedule and be impractical. In the first hour of the training, students were taught how to comment on the linguistic errors in a text by showing examples from teachers' comments on previous year's student papers. After that, the teacher wrote sentences on the board containing grammatical errors, and students tried to find the correct linguistic code for the error.

Students wrote their first drafts in the classroom and on the last day of every week, teacher researcher distributed the papers to one of the peers and asked the peer to try to locate the error by using the code list for errors. After this procedure was over, participants wrote their second drafts in the classroom. Finally, teacher researcher collected both drafts. This process was the same for the four essay tasks.

2.2. Population and Sampling

The population of the study consists of English class students that attended the English preparatory class at a state university in Ankara during the 2017-2018 academic year. The sample of the study consists of an experimental group and participants were intermediate level (B1) at the time of the study and they were randomly assigned to each class. That is, they got the university's placement test at the beginning of the 2017-2018 academic year and were placed to elementary level according to their scores in the placement test. In the following months to April, they successfully passed the elementary and pre-intermediate levels and earned the right to get an intermediate level education. These intermediate level students were randomly assigned to each class by the school administration. Class number 06 was selected as the experimental group. There were 8 students in total.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

2.3.1. Pre-Test and Post-Test

In order to see the level of the participants, a pre-test was administered. Also, a post-test was administered at the end of the study to see whether there is any progress and a statistically significant difference.

The writing test is an achievement test which was conducted during the classroom hour with an allocated amount of time. Students were asked to write an essay type of text on their opinions for the given topic in sixty minutes for the pre- and post-test. They were not allowed to use any kind of dictionaries and their cell phones were collected in order to prevent any cheating which could have affected their performance and reliability of the test. The topic of the pre-test was "Smartphones should not be allowed in the classrooms. Do you agree or disagree? Write an opinion essay of at least 180 words".

Students were asked to write the same type of essay (opinion essay) for the post-test, but this time the topic was "Online education is better than traditional classroom education. Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Write an opinion essay of at least 180 words."

The written performance of the students was assessed by three independent raters. Two of the raters were teaching at the state university where this study was conducted and one of the raters was an outside rater who teaches English at preparatory level in another institution. All three of the raters are English instructors at tertiary level preparatory school of higher institutions. The assessment was performed analytically with the help of a writing rubric that was adapted from Demirel (2009) (See Appendix 1). The pre-test and post-test scores of the participants (see Appendix 2) were gathered and in order to see the reliability of the scale, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were statistically calculated through SPSS. The following table shows the results of the Pearson-Product Moment correlation coefficients

Table 1. Pearson product-moment Correlation Coefficients

		Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3
Rater 1	Pearson Correlation	1	,543*	,597*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	-	,030	,015
	N	16	16	16
Rater 2	Pearson Correlation	,543*	1	,748**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,030	-	,001
	N	16	16	16
Rater 3	Pearson Correlation	,597*	,748**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,015	,001	-
	N	16	16	16

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Different authors suggest different interpretations for the correlation coefficients, but Cohen (1988) suggests that correlation coefficients between .10 and .29 are small, between .30 and .49 are considered medium, and between .50 and 1.00 are considered large (Cohen, 1988, pp. 79-81). As seen in the above tables, coefficients are above .50,

which attests to a positive correlation among the raters. The coefficient values indicate the reliability of the assessment rubric.

2.3.2. Student Essays

Participants completed four writing tasks. They wrote two drafts for four different writing tasks. In two tasks, students were given a statement and asked to give their opinion about the statement in essay format. In the other two tasks, students were given a topic and asked to write about the topic's advantages and disadvantages by writing an advantage-disadvantage essay. Details about these four writing tasks are as follows:

1st essay task: In the first essay task, students were given four statements and asked to choose one. They were asked whether they agree or disagree with the following statements: "Strict parents raise their children well", "Young people who live at home with their parents have several advantages", "Modern technological devices have changed the way we communicate", "Watching TV or films is more enjoyable than reading books or magazines". In the essay, the students were expected to state their stance and support it with relevant ideas.

2nd essay task: In the second essay task, students were given two statements and asked to choose one. They were asked whether they agree or disagree with the following statements: "Love solves all the problems in a marriage", "Women are better teachers than men at primary school". In the essay, they were expected to state their stance and support it with relevant ideas.

3rd essay task: In the third essay task, students were given five statements and asked to choose one. They were asked to write about the advantages and disadvantages of the following topics: "Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using credit cards", "Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of being a tour guide", "Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of winning the lottery", "Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of e-books", "Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of being rich".

4th essay task: In the fourth essay task, students were given three statements and asked to choose one. They were asked to write about the advantages and disadvantages of the following topics: "Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of having an important position at work", "What are the advantages and disadvantages of living your whole life in your hometown?" and they were asked to write their opinions on the given statement "The Internet has improved the freedom of speech. What is your opinion?".

2.4. Data analysis

The researcher used the "SPSS 25.0" version to conduct statistical procedures. A paired samples t-test was conducted to see the difference between the pre-test and post-test of the study group. In order to find the inter-reliability of the three raters, the researcher used Pearson product-moment correlation. In order to see the number of valid feedback

points and correct revisions, the researcher and another colleague came together to decide which feedback is valid and which correction is successful and unsuccessful. There was 95% agreement on the number of valid feedback points and on the number of correct, incorrect revisions with ignored feedback. The researcher and another colleague classified revisions in terms of their success using Conrad and Goldstein's (1999) taxonomy as successful revision and unsuccessful revision. Conrad and Goldstein classified revisions as "successful revisions are those solving a problem or improving upon a problem area discussed in the feedback; unsuccessful revisions are those that did not improve the text or that actually further weakened the text" (p.154). When there was not any attempt to correct the error or when there was a refusal of the feedback by the student, the feedback point was classified as ignored. The number of total words, the number of valid feedback points, the number of successful-unsuccessful and ignored feedback points were counted one by one and checked with a red ink pen. After that, the numbers were put into Microsoft Excel for each student and percentages were calculated for the feedback points, correct revisions, incorrect revisions, and ignored feedback points.

3. Results

3.1. Results of the Number of Feedback Points and Correct Revisions in Students' Second Drafts (Research Question 1)

The number of words, valid feedback points, successful revisions, unsuccessful revisions, and ignored feedback was tallied and tabulated through Microsoft Excel. The related results for the four drafts for each student can be found in the following table.

Table 2. The Number of Feedback Points and Its Effectiveness in Revisions

Peer Feedback Students	Words in Draft	Feedback Points	Revisions		
			Successful	Unsuccessful	Ignored
Student 1	707	66	54	8	4
Student 2	592	34	25	6	3
Student 3	571	39	22	6	11
Student 4	725	56	45	4	7
Student 5	727	67	55	8	4
Student 6	552	40	27	5	8
Student 7	703	52	26	11	15
Student 8	688	48	24	11	13

Total	5265	402	278	59	65
Percent of Previous Column	-	8%	69%	15%	16%

*Percentages are given to the nearest whole number.

As can be seen from the table above, peers provided 402 valid feedback points to each other. This figure comprises 8% of the total words written in eight drafts of four different essay tasks. Peer feedback group students responded to 278 (69%) of 402 feedback points correctly, 59 (15%) incorrectly and they ignored 65 (16%) of 402 feedback points.

3.2. Results of the Pre- and Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group (Research Question 2)

Analysis Participants' pre-test and post-test scores were statistically analysed with the help of the paired samples t-test. The following table shows the results of the paired samples t-test for the experimental group.

Table 3. Paired Samples t-test Statistics

	Mean	N	St. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pre-test	48,38	8	10,197			
				-4,000	7	,005
Post-test	64,38	8	10,967			

***p<0,05

As the above table indicates, there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of the study group. The significance level of ,005 (p<0,05) indicates that there is a meaningful difference in the writing performance of the peer feedback group students at the end of the study when compared to the outset.

4. Discussion

When the number of successful and unsuccessful revisions with the number of ignored feedback points is examined, we can see peers revised 69% of the errors correctly in the second drafts. In addition, peer feedback students ignored 16% of the total feedback points and they revised 15% of the errors incorrectly.

The reason why the students ignored the provided feedback might be numerous. They may have refused the feedback given by their peers or they might simply have forgotten to correct the error. L2 learners, especially the ones in EFL environments, might have a tendency towards ignoring or rejecting the feedback provided by their friends (Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger, 1992; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Zhang, 1995). However, it was observed during the peer feedback sessions that peer feedback activities provided students a chance to discuss the error and possible corrections together with their friends. This discussion process may have decreased the number of ignored feedback points. When peers could not understand a feedback point or could not find ways to correct the error, they could find the chance to construct meaning-making with their peers and this "peer-talk" happened in their L1 (Turkish), which might have eased the revision process for the most problematic parts. While they were working on the error to correct it, they transferred their knowledge to each other and this resulted in correct revisions more than 50% of the errors. If they had a point that they could not understand, they did have the chance to elaborate on that topic by asking questions to their peers orally in their L1.

Participants of this study not only increased their awareness about the use of correct linguistic forms but also became more autonomous learners by being responsible for their own learning without a teacher. These findings are consistent with previous research of Miao et al. (2006), Rollinson (2005), Diab (2010) who found better revisions for peer feedback receivers in subsequent drafts.

When we compare the pre- and post-test results independently from each other, the progress is statistically significant. Therefore, it can be said that the study group developed their writing skills at the end of the study thanks to peer feedback. The meaning-making opportunities that the peer feedback group had may have contributed to their performances to write better essays. During the peer talk, they elaborated on every problematic point in their first drafts on organization, vocabulary, grammar, and content. The use of L1 between peers may also have increased interaction and knowledge sharing.

5. Conclusion and Implications for Teaching

The immediate effect of peer feedback on the number of correct revisions is because of the fact that peers constructed the whole process of brainstorming, producing and evaluating together and this helped them to take more responsibility for their own learning. When we compare the student gains between pre- and post-test, it was seen peers made progress in overall scores of the essays.

The most important implication that can be drawn from this study for the language practitioners is that peer feedback has a great potential to be used in the classrooms. It challenges the idea of the traditional language classes that teachers can be the only reliable source of feedback for L2 writing. With the implementation of peer feedback, teachers take the facilitator role in the feedback process. Students gather more autonomy and thus become more responsible for their own learning. Since peers that would be working together generally happen to be in the same classroom and share the same level of language proficiency, the interaction between them could turn out to be more beneficial for the both parties.

Peer feedback training is an essential part of the peer feedback activities because most L2 learners are not aware of how to provide feedback to each other as students. They are generally used to getting feedback from their teachers and when teachers come up with the idea of doing peer feedback, the students might resent from doing such activities. Peer feedback training activities give students an insight about the feedback process and help them become more aware of what they are writing. Also, they get more audience awareness because their texts would be seen by other agents different from their teachers.

In short, peer feedback has a great potential to be used in feedback practices for the writing course of tertiary level EFL students. It creates a collaborative learning environment and this helps students share their knowledge and close the gap between them. It increases student autonomy and makes students more responsible for their own learning. Peer feedback changes the common belief among the students that it is only the teacher who can give feedback. Peer feedback results in more student gains in the number of correct revisions in the second drafts and helps students develop their writing in an eight-week period.

References

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

Berggren, J. (2015). Learning from giving feedback: A study of secondary-level students. ELT Journal, 69(1), 58-70. doi:10.1093/elt/ccu036.

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: the challenge of design. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 38(6), 698-712. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2012.691462.

Chang, C. Y. (2015). Teacher modeling on EFL reviewers' audience-aware feedback and affectivity in L2 peer review. Assessing Writing, 25, 2-21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2015.04.001.

Cohen, J. W. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd edition). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrance Erlbaum Associates.

Conrad, S. M., & Goldstein, L. M. (1999). ESL student revision after teacher-written comments: Text, contexts, and individuals. Journal of Second Language Writing, 82(2), 147-179.

Council of Europe (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Demirel, E. T. (2009). An investigation of a complementary feedback model for L2 writing: Peer and teacher feedback versus teacher feedback. Doctoral Dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Diab, N. M. (2010). Effects of peer- versus self-editing on students' revision of language errors in revised drafts. System, 38, 85-95. doi:10.1016/j.system.2009.12.008.

Ferris, D. R. (2003). Response to student writing: implications for second language students. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrance Erbaum Associates.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrance Erbaum Associates.

Glower, C., & Brown, E. (2006). Written feedback for students: Too much, too detailed or too incomprehensible to be effective? Bioscience Education, 7(1), 1-16.

Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. ELT Journal, 59(1), 31-38. doi: 10.1093/elt/cci004.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81-112. doi: 10.3102/003465430298487.

Hu, G. (2005). Training Chinese ESL student writers for effective peer review. Asian Englishes, 8(2), 64-76. doi: 10.1080/13488678.2005.10801167.

Hu, G., & Lam, S. T. E. (2010). Issues of cultural appropriateness and pedagogical efficacy: exploring peer review in a second language class. Instructional Science, 38(4), 371-394. doi: 10.1007/s11251 -008-9086-1.

Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. Language Teaching Research, 4(1), 33-54.

Hyland, K. (2004). Second Language Writing. New York, NY: Cambridge University.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing: An introduction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues (pp. 1-20). New York, NY: Cambridge University.

Jacobs, G. M., Curtis, A., Braine, G., & Huang, S. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. Journal of Second Language Writing, 7(3), 307-318.

Lam, R. (2010). A peer review training workshop: Coaching students to give and evaluate peer feedback. TESL Canada Journal, 27(2), 114-127.

Lee, I. (2017). Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts. Singapore: Springer.

Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 18, 30-43. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002.

Mangelsdorf, K., & Schlumberger, A. (1992). ESL students response stances in a peer review task. Journal of Second Language Writing, 1(3), 235-254.

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

Miao, Y., Badger, R., & Zhen, Y. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. Journal of Second Language Writing, 15, 179-200.

Min, H. T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. System, 33, 293-308. doi:10.1016/j.system.2004.11.003.

Min, H. T (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. Journal of Second Language Writing, 15, 118-141. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2006.01.003.

Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(3), 265-189.

Pearce, J., Mulder, R., & Baik, C. (2009). Involving students in peer review: Case studies and practical strategies for university teaching. Center for the Study of Higher Education The University of Melbourne. Retrieved from https://melbournecshe.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/1761518/Student_Peer_Review.pdf.

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(1), 67-89. doi: 10.1177/1362168812459151.

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. TESOL Quarterly, 19(2), 229-258.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. ELT Journal, 59(1), 23-30. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.01.004.

Ruegg, R. (2015). The relative effects of peer and teacher feedback on improvement in EFL students' writing ability. Linguistics and Education, 29, 73-82. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.12.001.

Steendam, E. V., Rijlaarsdam, G., Sercu, L., & Bergh, H. V. D. (2010). The effect of instruction type and dyadic or individual emulation on the quality of higher-order peer feedback in EFL. Learning and Instruction, 20, 316-327. doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.009.

Susser, B. (1994). Process approach in ESL/EFL writing instruction. Journal of Second Language Writing, 3, 31-47.

Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? Journal of Second Language Writing, 9(2), 147-170.

Villamil, O. S., & DeGuerrero, M. C. M. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Social-cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. Journal of Second Language Writing, 5(1), 51-75.

Villamil, O. S., & DeGuerrero, M. C. M. (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. Applied Linguistics, 19(4), 491-514.

Wang, W. (2014). Students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing: A longitudinal inquiry. Assessing Writing, 19, 80-96. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.008.

Wiggins, Grant P. (1993). Assessing student performance: exploring the purpose and limits of testing. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Peer Feedback in second language writing (2005-2014). Language Teaching, 49(4), 461-493. doi:10.1017/S0261444816000161.

Zamel, V. (1976). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English. TESOL Quarterly, 10(1), 67-76.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. TESOL Quarterly, 16(2), 195-209.

Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. Assessing Writing, 15, 3-17. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2010.01.002.

Zhao, H. (2014). Investigating teacher-supported peer assessment for EFL writing. ELT Journal, 68(2), 155-168. doi:10.1093/elt/cct068.

Zhu, W. (1995). Effects of training for peer response on students' comments and interaction.

Written Communication, 12, 492-528.

Appendix A. Assessment Rubric For The Pre-Test And Post-Test

*0 point for off-topic essays   .   * 0 point for different type of essay

Organization-20	15-20	All parts of the essay are present. There is a well-structured introduction, body and a conclusion. All paragraphs have topic sentences and supporting sentences. Parts of the essay work together to make the message clear.
	10-14	All parts of the essay are present but not very well developed. E.g. at least one topic sentence has more than one controlling idea. And at least one supporting sentence is indirectly related to the topic sentence.
	5-9	At least one part of the essay is missing. Ideas are not accurately developed. Topic sentences lack controlling ideas. Supporting sentences are missing or completely unrelated with the topic sentence.
	0-4	Very weak structure. Paragraphs are not divided properly or they are too short to explain an idea completely.
Content-20	15-20	The essay is completely related to the given topic. Has enough depth to interest the reader. Addresses all aspects of the given issue.
	10-14	The essay deals with the topic given but a few unrelated ideas are presented.
	5-9	The essay is partly related to the given topic. Mildly interesting to read. Does not address the issue completely.

	0-4	The essay is either unrelated to the given topic or the content is so weak that it does not raise interest in the reader.
Style-15 Spelling	5	Decide according to the number of spelling mistakes.
Punctuation	5	Decide according to the number of punctuation mistakes.
Neatness	5	How well is the essay organized on paper? How well does it follow the format required?
Grammar-25	21-25	Few grammar errors that do not interfere with understanding. Effective control of sentence structure, verb formation, agreement of tenses. Effective control of articles and pronouns.
	16-20	Errors which sometimes interfere with understanding. Some control of sentence structure, verb formation, agreement of tenses. Some control of articles and pronouns.
	11-15	Frequent errors that often interfere with understanding. Problems in sentence structure, verb formation, agreement and tenses. Inadequate control of articles and pronouns.
	6-10	Frequent grammar errors make some portions of the essay incomprehensible. Very limited control of grammatical structures.
	0-5	The essay contains major and repeated errors. Many unclear sentences. Little or no control of sentence structure and verbs.
Vocabulary-15	11-15	Variety and accuracy in word choice, correct word formation.
	6-10	Reasonable use of vocabulary, some control of word formation.
	0-5	Noticeable simple, limited and misused vocabulary with many problems in word formation.

Appendix B. Pre-Test and Post-Test Results of the Experimental Group

Experimental Group							
	Pre-test Scores				Post-test Scores		
Subjects	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Average	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Average
1	60	47	63	57	78	55	58	64
2	48	16	33	32	64	50	63	59

3	54	50	70	58	75	48	74	66
4	50	28	52	43	68	32	35	45
5	58	44	42	48	67	41	69	59
6	55	52	70	59	78	57	88	74
7	46	32	32	37	71	89	85	82
8	51	37	70	53	76	52	71	66

Copyrights