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Abstract

This study investigated student attitudes towards peer review in a university level English as a Second Language writing class. In each peer review session, students provided feedback on peer essays focused on content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics using a peer review worksheet. At the culmination of one semester implementing peer review on essay drafts, thirteen students completed a 40 item questionnaire rating statements on a 4-point Likert scale. The 40 items were divided into two parts. Part 1 included 16 statements focused on usefulness, motivation, and the five areas of writing. Part 2 comprised of 24 statements focused on enjoyment and student attitudes towards giving and receiving feedback. Results indicate favourable student perception on usefulness, motivation, enjoyment, and receiving feedback. Implications for teaching also discussed.
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Chapter I: Introduction

Peer review in the classroom has been researched and analysed in multiple ways. The first way in which peer review has been studied is whether or not peer review is beneficial for English language learners. If peer review in the ESL classroom is beneficial, then researchers have tried to answer the impact of improvement on individual student writings. Another way that peer review has been studied is the attitudes their students have towards peer review. Even though students tend to prefer teacher feedback versus peer feedback, the attitudes are not completely negative towards the peer review session. A third way that peer review has been studied is to compare drafts of writing; comparing the first draft to the final draft in order to see which areas students have improved as a result of peer review sessions.

Furthermore, some studies have researched the differences in final product regardless of training sessions or not. Another variable is the timing of peer review relative to the final draft deadline. By having peer review sessions in the early stages of the writing process, students can see other classmates’ writing topics. In this manner, their audience is more than just the teacher, tutor, and one classmate. The entire class is the potential audience for each of their papers.

If there are no benefits for students to use peer review in class, then perhaps peer review is a waste of valuable time in the classroom. But how does an instructor know whether or not to incorporate peer review into their classroom? If peer review was not viewed positively in the past, what steps can an instructor take to incorporate peer review into the classroom again?
Current research about using peer review in ESL classes has not led to many concrete findings. Researchers have looked at improvements in overall writing quality, attitudes towards peer review sessions, and improvements from rough draft to final draft. Although each researcher has their methodology for evaluation, useful strategies for implementation into the classroom are difficult to find. This study investigated student attitudes towards peer review—giving as well as receiving positive and negative feedback.

For this research, students were asked to reflect on their satisfaction with peer review sessions in each of the following categories: content and organization, vocabulary and language use, and grammar and mechanics. This thesis will add a link in the literature focusing on the attitudes students have towards peer review in regard to the five elements of writing: content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. Therefore, this study will have a narrow focus on student attitudes towards peer review without incorporating a comparison to teacher feedback. Student feedback to the usefulness of peer review on the five elements will give teachers insight into how to make peer review more meaningful and authentic to students’ learning and academic achievement.
Chapter II: Review of Literature

In the second language classroom, peer review has been utilized and analysed in a variety of ways. In the ESL program in which the data from the current study were gathered, one rubric is used for all assessments that can be modified for grading essay drafts. This rubric includes five areas of language on a continuum from meaning to form: content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. The focus of this section will be divided into two parts. The first part will focus on the findings related to content and organization, vocabulary and language use, and grammar and mechanics. The second part will focus on student attitudes towards peer review.

Content and Organization

The first area of focus on the rubric is content and organization. Content and organization are at the meaning-based end of the continuum. Studies show that peer review sessions that focused on the meaning end of the continuum tended to improve student writing holistically. When asked about ‘revision,’ students often responded that revision was correcting surface mistakes, thus overlooking the content of the piece (Kietlinska, 2006, p. 68). Students had to first realize the benefits of focusing on content in order to give productive feedback. Once students understood the rationale and received training, these students tended to make more changes in their essay regarding content (Kietlinska, 2006, p. 83). Min (2005) found that students made more changes overall, and specifically more detailed and organized when revising from their peer’s suggestions. Finally, in a study by Wigglesworth and Storch (2009), when students were allowed to discuss their work in pairs, the accuracy of the written
material increased when compared to previous individual written texts. When students are trained in using peer reviews, they can improve the meaning aspect of their writing.

Written works in English as a Second Language (ESL) classrooms pose difficulties for students in the area of organization. ESL students often follow the rhetorical conventions of their host country (Kietlinska, 2006, p. 68). One example of a time in which this may pose difficulties for students is when writing an essay. In the United States, writers directly state the meaning and rationale in writing. Other countries prefer to write in an indirect manner in which the reader makes sense of the writing. The United States is an individualistic country and writers are expected to clearly state the meaning for the reader (Hu, 2005; Rogers & Steinfatt, 1999). Meanwhile, in collectivistic cultures, the reader is expected to understand the writer’s meaning to ‘read between the lines.’ As a result, many ESL students may face an additional level of culture shock—writing in a direct manner (Fox, 1994).

As to planning and organization, Kietlinska (2006, p. 65) found that second language writers did less planning and had more difficulty organizing material when compared to native language writers. The stages of writing—brainstorming to rough draft; rough draft to final draft—are sometimes seen as a waste of time. Students want a writing topic and want to write as the ideas flow. The shortcuts students take here count for less planning—less time on idea generation and less supporting evidence. Organization of material can pose difficulties for second language users, too. In my observations, students are able to find and research topics sufficiently; however, the trouble arises when students need to group main ideas into paragraphs for a report.
Lundstrom and Baker (2009, p. 31) sees peer review and feedback as necessary preparation for quality writing as well as preparation for overall academic success. Students want their peers to comment on their essay’s organization. Even though students were expected to give and receive feedback, Min (2005) found that 40% of student writers wanted to receive comments on overall essay organization, but did not receive such feedback. Findings also reveal that peers responded solely to what was written on the paper without providing additional suggestions as to how the writer could have improved the organizational structure of the essay (Tsui & Ng, 2000, p. 163). When it came time for the teacher to comment on student essays, the teacher presented a “reorganization of chunks of text.” Student perceptions on teacher versus peer feedback are that teachers are more qualified than peers to give suggestions regarding organization (p. 167).

**Language Use**

The second focus of the rubric is vocabulary and language use, which lies in the middle of the meaning-form continuum. For this research, students were asked to reflect on their satisfaction with peer review sessions in each of the following categories: content and organization, vocabulary and language use, and grammar and mechanics. While in the peer review sessions, second language users have opportunities to improve communication. Students are able to use and practice new vocabulary as well as use and practice new sentence structures. From one study’s results, neither the intermediate level givers nor receivers improved significantly in any area from peer review; however, they did improve in vocabulary from pre- to post-test (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009, p. 39). One reason could be that
those students who worked in pairs offered clarified vocabulary for a phrase in their peers’ paper (Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009, p. 459).

While vocabulary acquisition has shown important gains in language use, students need a clear reason for focusing on vocabulary. Vocabulary is the driving force for communicative activities in collaborative environments (Williams, 2006). Another instance of student attention towards vocabulary may be the rhetorical style of essay produced. For the persuasive essay mode, Villamil and de Guerrero (1998, p. 505) found that vocabulary was the most important concern in the writing process to establish reasoning; although, for the narrative mode, vocabulary was not of high importance due to the explanatory nature of the written piece.

Language use can be observed in student communications before and after peer review sessions. Min conducted training sessions to ensure quality feedback. The language students used prior to trainings were “short and impersonal.” After the training sessions, however, the students used language that was longer and more specific so as to communicate ideas. The communicative aspect continues with findings that suggest peer review sessions are useful for “clarifying thinking and expressing intended meanings” (Tsui & Ng, 2000, p. 163).

**Grammar and Mechanics**

The third focus of this peer review study revolves around grammar and mechanics, which are at the form end of the meaning-form continuum. In two writing modes, narrative and descriptive, Villamil and de Guerrero found that grammar revisions was the most attended to of the five writing elements (1998, p. 501). These findings were not surprising because the participants habitually focused on grammar in previous sessions. Research also
reveals student favouritism toward specific, elaborate comments on not only organization but also sentence structure and grammar, focusing less on mechanics and spelling (Kietlinska, 2006, p. 69; Tsui & Ng, 2000, p. 148).

Situations in which students discuss issues related to an aspect of language used in the essay are called language related episodes (LREs). When in paired discussions, LREs focusing on mechanics were discussed the least. The authors attribute minimal mechanical discussions to the lack of focus on more grammar-based tasks within the classroom (Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009, p. 456). Even though LREs focusing on mechanics were minimal, 81% of those mechanics LRE occurrences related to spelling (p. 458). Another interesting finding were the numbers of false repairs made in student drafts. False repairs are those changes in which the revision suggestion was incorrect. Villamil and de Guerrero found that students made the most amount of false repairs in grammar and mechanics (1998, p. 501).

**Student Attitudes towards Peer Review**

The second part of this review will address the attitudes of ESL students giving and receiving feedback in a peer review session. The second part of the research questions involves student attitudes towards giving and receiving positive and negative feedback.

For many reasons, training is a crucial element for establishing an open environment for peer review sessions. Training sessions may also reduce the potential negative attitudes of peer review (Hu, 2005; Min, 2005, 2006; Rollinson, 2005). Student reactions towards peer review can turn negative if the peer commentators are not open to critical feedback or are over-defensive. In addition, cross-cultural issues that may arise with satisfaction could relate to the students’ home culture. If a commentator is from a collectivist culture, they may avoid
giving negative comments to maintain interpersonal harmony (Hu, 2005, p. 326). Training sessions may lead to an increase in trust between peers which leads to more incorporations of feedback when compared to sessions prior to training, even with a self-perception of limited language abilities (Kietlinska, 2006; Min, 2005).

In order to see how satisfied students are with peer review, Xiao and Lucking (2008) used a Student Satisfaction Questionnaire. When compared to the control group, the results show increased “levels of satisfaction with peer assessment structure and peer feedback” (p. 191). When asked about attitudes towards general peer assessment activities, participating students reflected a positive attitude with a mean of 3.33 out of 4.0 (Wen & Tsai, 2006, p. 39).

One final observation about satisfaction with peer review is the importance of teacher comments. Overwhelmingly, students value teacher comments more than peer comments (Kietlinska, 2006). Only a few studies reflected value in both teacher and peer feedback (Kietlinska, 2006; Ozogul & Sullivan, 2009). Students perceive that feedback from instructors will guarantee quality because of the teacher’s authority (Tsui & Ng, 2000; Wangen, 2003). Nevertheless, those individuals focused on giving feedback resulted in improved writing overall (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009).

**Connecting the Literature with a University Level ESL Class**

By evaluating the research that has been conducted for peer review in the ESL classroom, more evidence can be brought to the attention of teachers in whether or not to impose peer review in the multiple-draft writing process. Therefore, a current university level ESL writing class is the target group for evaluating findings for affirming the use of peer review within the classroom.
In this setting, students were expected to write and submit their own papers as part of the university level ESL writing course requirements. In this manner, students had a chance to give and receive feedback in order to edit their work in a meaningful manner. In the long term, students may feel more comfortable towards peer review in other courses.

**Research Question**

What are student attitudes toward peer review when giving feedback and receiving feedback on their essays—specifically towards the five areas of writing: content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics?
Chapter III: Methodology

From January to April 2010, my ESL class was attended by 13 matriculated university students. All 13 students participated in peer review sessions and data was collected. Of the 13 student participants, 8 were males and 5 were females. Students enrolled in a 4.0 university credit writing course. Students were expected to attend class 4 hours each week in addition to coursework outside of class. During this 15-week semester, students engaged in two peer review sessions throughout the writing process for each of three essays for a total of six peer review sessions. More specifically, the peer review sessions occurred after the first and second drafts of each essay for the purpose of improving the essay prior to the submission of the final draft. Throughout the duration of the semester, students engaged in 6 hours of peer review sessions. The data collected is a reflection of the peer review process spanning the duration of one semester.

Participants

I taught one section of a regional university level ESL writing course in the upper Midwest that consisted of 13 students and all students participated in this study. Thirteen participants is not a large data group; nevertheless, other researchers have had similarly small numbers. Paulus (1999) conducted her study with 11 undergraduate international students as well as Min (2005, 2006) and Villamil and de Guerrero (1998). Both of the studies by Min each had a total of 18 participants. Villamil and de Guerrero had 14 intermediate-level ESL participants.

In order to collect background information about each student, I created a student profile sheet. Information collected include: gender, home country, native language,
experiences learning English inside and outside of the United States, and experiences using peer review in any classroom setting prior to this course. For the complete sheet, see Appendix A.

The participants in my ESL course vary in regard to diverse language backgrounds, diverse foreign language experiences, and differing lengths of time spent in the United States. These students came from many diverse countries, including Bangladesh, China, Ethiopia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, and Tanzania. As well, students came to the United States speaking many native languages which included (in the same order as home countries): Bangla; Chinese, Cantonese; Amharic; Bahasa, Malay; Burmese; Urdu, Arabic; Kiswahili, Sukuma, Kerewe.

Second, these students have had diverse foreign language experience in learning English. Some students have studied English in the United States before being enrolled in this university level ESL writing class. Some have only spent time learning English in their home country as a foreign language student. Length of time spent in the United States was also different for each student. As previously stated, some students have had previous experiences learning English in an English-speaking country, while others have only had a few weeks’ exposure since arriving in the United States.

**Instruments**

When students were engaged in peer review training sessions for the first two essays, students used the Peer Review Worksheet in feedback sessions. When the peer review sessions occurred for the third, argumentative, essay, students used the Argumentative Peer
Review Evaluation Sheet. The final instrument was the Peer Review Satisfaction Questionnaire finished after the semester completing the peer review trainings.

During each of the peer review sessions, students were to use a Peer Review Worksheet to locate key points of the essay. I created this worksheet for students to focus on specific aspects of their peers’ writing that reflected the grading rubric focusing on content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. For example, the thesis statement in the introduction supports having a clearly stated content objective. In each of the body paragraph sections, students must identify the topic sentences that lead each paragraph’s content. Also of importance are transition statements that increase cohesion in student writing, supporting the language use component. Additionally, this outline format allows both the reader and the writer a quick synopsis of the organization and flow of the essay.

The familiarity of the worksheet also supported students by establishing a routine (Hu 2005; Min 2005, 2006). Student responses on this worksheet were solely for the writer’s purpose to review their peer’s feedback. Data from the worksheet was not collected for the purpose of this thesis research. Overall, the Peer Review Worksheet revealed student abilities to find information in their peer’s writing in order to give feedback on a holistic scale. For the complete worksheet, see Appendix B.

The second part of the peer review session was the Argumentative Peer Review Evaluation Sheet, which was adapted from Hansen and Liu (2005). This evaluation sheet also had students locate topic sentences, similar to the Peer Review Worksheet, but this form had an additional component for students to evaluate clarity and to make suggestions for improvement. For example, question three asked students to select the writer’s position, either
for or against the topic. If the reader and writer disagreed on the answer to this question, then the writer did not clearly state their position. As such, the remaining questions guided the reader and writer to pinpoint areas of weakness; specifically, in terms of body paragraph content and organization. No specific data was collected from this evaluation sheet; rather, it was used as a student task sheet to focus on analysing their peer’s argumentative essay. For the complete worksheet, see Appendix C.

Upon finishing the peer review session, students completed a Peer Review Satisfaction Questionnaire, which was adapted from Xiao and Lucking (2008). One week after the final drafts were turned in, students filled out this questionnaire reflecting upon the procedures from the peer review sessions throughout the fifteen-week semester. By incorporating this questionnaire with this study, I have collected information on two aspects of the peer review session. The first part includes statements on the questionnaire evaluating peer review sessions as a whole. The second part of the questionnaire inquired about the peer review session from two perspectives, as a giver and receiver of information. For the complete questionnaire, see Appendix D.

Procedure

To set up the classroom routine conducive for peer review, training sessions were determined to occur on the first two of three required essays. Students in this university level ESL course were required to write three essays. The structures of essays were: compare and contrast, cause and effect, and persuasive. These students participated in peer review sessions on the first two essay styles, which led students to have a more productive peer review session on the final essay. These training sessions provided more accurate feedback results when
compared to studies in which students did not have any prior training (Hu, 2005; Min, 2005, 2006).

After writing the first drafts, all of the students were required to bring a hard copy of their essays to the classroom for peer review sessions. The first two essays were training sessions so that students would know what to anticipate in the peer review sessions. For this study, attitudes towards giving and receiving feedback spanned the duration of one semester. Students were able to give more objective feedback to the Satisfaction Questionnaire than if the students completed the Satisfaction Questionnaire after only participating in the first peer review session. Another factor for choosing this essay was the style, argumentative, which required outside resources. This is important because students could focus on a) whether or not the argument had a strong thesis statement, and b) whether or not the argument followed a logical order.

Students were paired with a classmate of differing language proficiency levels to engage in authentic conversations around writing. Once in the peer review session, students were handed the Peer Review Worksheet. The worksheet was the first part of the peer review session. Immediately after the Peer Review Worksheet, students were given the Peer Review Evaluation Sheet. The purpose for this evaluation sheet was for the reader to give comments to what they identified in the previous worksheet. This grading sheet asked for clarity, organization, and coherence in writing.

A Peer Review Satisfaction Questionnaire was administered upon completion of their final drafts of the essay, which provided an answer to the research question. The rationale for administering the Satisfaction Questionnaire after the final draft was finished was to allow
students to answer the section about receiving feedback more thoroughly. This gave students reflection time after receiving feedback to either incorporate or ignore peer suggestions.

**Analysis Procedure**

The research question focused on student attitudes toward peer review when giving feedback and receiving feedback on their essay in the areas of content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. The primary instrument used to collect data was the Peer Review Satisfaction Questionnaire. Each statement was rated 1 to 4 on a Likert continuum scale. Two scales were used depending on the statement categories: “Never to Always” or “Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.” This instrument answered this question in a number of ways.

The questionnaire statements were divided into categories. Part 1 categories included statements that related to the peer review sessions in the areas of content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. These categories also included statements focusing on usefulness and motivation. Part 2 categories included statements specifically as a giver and as a receiver of feedback. These categories included attitudes towards: the enjoyment of peer review sessions, giving feedback, receiving feedback, giving negative feedback, giving positive feedback, receiving negative feedback, and receiving positive feedback.

Once students answered the questionnaire items, the scores were entered into a spreadsheet. All thirteen participants answered all questionnaire items. Once the information was in the spreadsheet, I generated the overall average scores per statement in both Part 1 and Part 2. Then I calculated the average score for the category, selecting the appropriate item numbers. After the overall average was calculated, I segregated the data to focus on male
versus female average responses. Finally, I selected data for analysing the overall standard deviation as well as by gender breakdown.

In terms of analysing the interview responses, all interview sessions were recorded for review to ensure all information was accurately recorded. The responses were entered into a separate spreadsheet to look for trends. Common themes were highlighted in the spreadsheet to ensure discussion of the results.
Chapter IV: Findings

In regard to the research question, questionnaire items were grouped together with a mean score based on a Likert scale from 1 to 4 points. A score of 1 meant Strongly Disagree, 2 meant Disagree, 3 meant Agree, and 4 meant Strongly Agree. In addition, I compared male averages with female averages. Of the 13 total student participants, 8 were male and 5 were female.

The satisfaction questionnaire was also divided into two parts: Part 1 focused on usefulness, motivation, and the five areas of writing (content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics). Part 2 focused on attitudes towards giving and receiving both positive and negative feedback. For the list of statements for this category and all categories that follow, see Appendix D.

Part 1 usefulness category included three statements, numbered by questionnaire item, as follows:

1. The peer review sessions were useful for improving writing skills.
2. The peer review sessions were useful for writing better essays.
3. The peer review sessions helped me improve my essays.

These three statements are broad for a general overview to see if peer review is perceived as useful during students’ class time.

Results show that students perceived the overall usefulness of peer review with an average score of 3.51, when the maximum is 4.0, and an overall standard deviation average of 0.57. As to gender differences, males leaned toward Strongly Agree with an average of 3.67 and average standard deviation of 0.49. Females averaged below the group average with a
score of 3.27 and an average standard deviation of 0.61. See Table 1 and Figure 1, respectively, below.

Table 1

*Questionnaire Statements Focused on Overall Usefulness: N = 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The peer review sessions were useful for improving writing skills.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The peer review sessions were useful for writing better essays.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The peer review sessions helped me improve my essays.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.51</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Usefulness](chart.png)

*Figure 1. Average scores for questionnaire items focused on usefulness.*

Part 1 motivation category also included three statements, numbered by questionnaire item, as follows.

7. The peer review sessions made me want to complete the essay on time.

10. The peer review sessions motivated me to produce my best work.

14. The peer review sessions made it feel comfortable to talk about writing.
For student perceptions about peer review being a motivating factor for writing, the average score is 3.50 where the maximum is 4.0, and an overall standard deviation average of 0.71.

This result is halfway between Agree and Strongly Agree. As to gender, males averaged slightly higher than average with a score of 3.63 and an average standard deviation of 0.58. Females averaged lower than the group average with a score of 3.30 and an average standard deviation of 0.90. See Table 2 and Figure 2, below.

Table 2

*Questionnaire Statements Focused on Overall Motivation: N = 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The peer review sessions made me want to complete the essay on time.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The peer review sessions motivated me to produce my best work.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The peer review sessions made it feel comfortable to talk about writing.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 2](image-url). Average scores for questionnaire items focused on motivation.
Now, the focus changes to two of the five areas of writing: content and organization.

For the list of statements for this category and all categories that follow, please see the corresponding tables and Appendix D. Student satisfaction with peer review when focusing on content and organization averaged 3.38 out of a maximum 4.0, slightly higher than Agree. The overall standard deviation average is 0.71. Males averaged 3.58 and an average standard deviation of 0.52. Females averaged 3.07, below the average, and an average standard deviation of 0.88. See Table 3 below.

Table 3

*Questionnaire Statements Focused on Content and Organization: N = 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The peer review sessions helped me write clear thesis statements.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The peer review sessions helped me develop content in my essay.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The peer review sessions helped me organize my essay better.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 3.38 0.71

The next two areas of writing, vocabulary and language use, scored lower than content and organization, at 3.25, thus placing a lower perception towards vocabulary improvements. Males averaged higher than average with a score of 3.59 and an average standard deviation of 0.64. Females averaged lower at a score of 2.7 and an average standard deviation of 1.14. See Table 4 below.
Table 4

*Questionnaire Statements Focused on Vocabulary and Language Use: N = 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The peer review sessions helped me use better vocabulary in my essays.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The peer review sessions helped use better sentences in my essays.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The peer review sessions helped me improve grammar in my essays.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The peer review sessions helped me improve word order in my essays.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, student perceptions of peer review to help improve grammar and mechanics averaged 3.08 with an overall standard deviation average of 1.03. Males averaged 3.38 and an average standard deviation of 0.75. Female average scores were 2.6 and an average standard deviation of 1.18. See Table 5 below.

Table 5

*Questionnaire Statements Focused on Grammar and Mechanics: N = 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The peer review sessions helped me learn more about grammar.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The peer review sessions helped me correct grammar mistakes.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The peer review sessions helped me correct spelling errors in my essays.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.03</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For an overall picture of the perceptions students have on the usefulness of peer review in the above mentioned categories, see Figures 3 and 4 below.
Part 2 shows the results of student attitudes towards giving and receiving feedback.

The first section asked students about enjoyment while in the peer review sessions. There were four items in this section, numbered by questionnaire item, as follows.
1. I enjoyed giving my classmate feedback on their essay.

4. I enjoyed receiving feedback from my peer on my essay.

7. I looked forward to the peer review sessions.

10. During the peer review sessions, I enjoyed interacting with my classmate.

On average, students enjoyed the peer review sessions, giving an average score of 3.58 with a maximum of 4.0, and an overall standard deviation average of 0.60. Males averaged 3.69 with an average standard deviation of 0.48 while females averaged 3.4 with an average standard deviation of 0.77. For an overview of these results, see Table 6, below.

Table 6

*Questionnaire Statements Focused on Overall Enjoyment: N = 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I enjoyed giving my classmate feedback on their essay.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I enjoyed receiving feedback from my peer on my essay.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I looked forward to the peer review sessions.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>During the peer review sessions, I enjoyed interacting with my classmate.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second section asked about student attitudes towards giving feedback in general—improving thesis statements, organization, vocabulary, and grammar. Scores averaged 3.37, which means participants agreed with the statements that giving feedback helped improve their own writing. The overall standard deviation averaged 0.81. Males averaged 3.72 with an average standard deviation of 0.46 while females averaged 2.8 with an average standard deviation of 0.93. See Table 7 below.
Table 7

*Questionnaire Statements Focused on Giving Feedback: N = 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving feedback helped me write better thesis statements in my essays.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Giving feedback helped me organize my essays better.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Giving feedback helped me improve vocabulary in my essays.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Giving feedback helped me use grammar better in my essays.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average** 3.37 0.81

The third section asked about student attitudes towards receiving feedback in general—improving thesis statements, organization, vocabulary, and grammar. The results show a slightly higher rating than agree with an average score of 3.31 and an overall standard deviation average of 0.94. Males averaged 3.69 with an average standard deviation of 0.66 while females averaged 2.7 and an average standard deviation of 1.04. See Table 8 below.

Table 8

*Questionnaire Statements Focused on Receiving Feedback: N = 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Receiving feedback helped me write better thesis statements in my essays.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Receiving feedback helped me organize my essays better.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Receiving feedback helped me improve vocabulary in my essays.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Receiving feedback helped me use grammar better in my essays.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average** 3.31 0.94
The fourth section inquired about student attitudes towards giving negative feedback, asking about comfort when giving negative comments. The average is 1.97 with an overall standard deviation average of 0.64. Males averaged 2.08 with an average standard deviation of 0.68 and females averaged 1.8 with an average standard deviation of 0.57. These results indicate all students’ comfort levels of giving negative feedback because the statements are all written in a negative format. So, a score of 2.0 means students disagree with statements indicating discomfort with giving negative feedback. Students are, in fact, comfortable giving and receiving negative feedback. See Table 9 below.

Table 9

*Questionnaire Statements Focused on Giving Negative Feedback: N = 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I do not feel comfortable giving negative feedback to my peers.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I do not like to give negative feedback on my peer’s essay.</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I avoid giving negative comments to my peers.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifth section inquired about student attitudes towards giving positive feedback, about comfort and enjoyment giving positive comments to peer writings. The average score is 3.13 and an overall standard deviation average of 0.80. Males averaged 3.29 with an average standard deviation of 0.66 while females averaged 2.87 with an average standard deviation of 0.95. See Table 10 below.
Table 10

*Questionnaire Statements Focused on Giving Positive Feedback: N = 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I feel comfortable giving positive feedback to my peers.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I like to give positive comments on my peer’s essay.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I enjoy giving positive feedback to my peer’s writing.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudes towards receiving negative feedback were asked throughout the sixth section. Similar to giving negative feedback, receiving negative feedback is also a somewhat uncomfortable event with an average score of 1.79 and an overall standard deviation average of 0.91. Males averaged 1.88 with an average standard deviation of 0.87 and females averaged 1.67 with an average standard deviation of 1.03. Again, the items were written in negative statements to identify discomfort when receiving negative feedback, if any. In general, students disagreed that these statements were uncomfortable. Thus, I can infer that students were comfortable with the activity. See Table 11 below.

Table 11

*Questionnaire Statements Focused on Receiving Negative Feedback: N = 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I do not like to receive negative feedback on my essay.</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I do not feel comfortable receiving negative comments on my essay.</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I do not enjoy receiving negative comments on my essay.</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.91</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, the attitudes towards receiving positive feedback were asked. Statements included feelings of pride and enjoyment when reading peer comments. The average score is 3.09, which means students generally agreed to the statements in this section. The overall standard deviation averaged 0.58. Males averaged slightly higher than the mean at 3.17 and an average standard deviation of 0.68. Females averaged slightly lower than the mean at 2.97 and an average standard deviation of 0.51. See Table 12 below.

Table 12

*Questionnaire Statements Focused on Receiving Positive Feedback: N = 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean (max = 4)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I like to receive positive feedback on my essay.</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I feel proud when I receive positive comments on my essay.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I enjoy receiving positive feedback from my classmates.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 3.09 0.61

For an overall picture of the student attitudes towards giving and receiving positive and negative feedback, see Figures 5 and 6 below. As an observation, the two areas for giving and receiving negative feedback show that female students are more willing to accept and give negative feedback. For all other categories, female students averaged below the group average.
Figure 5. Overview of Part 2 questionnaire items with gender breakdown.

Figure 6. Overview of Part 2 by questionnaire item.
**Interview Findings**

From the interview questions (see Appendix E), students overwhelmingly incorporated feedback based on peer feedback. When asked if any other outside help influenced the final draft, six students sought help from the classroom teacher as well as the university Writing Center staff in addition to the feedback from peers. Nine students did not reject comments or suggestions from their peer. This indicates a strong belief that their peers are capable of giving quality feedback and a belief that those things were worth changing. See Figure 7 below.

*Figure 7. Results from the one-on-one interview.*
Chapter V: Discussion

Student Attitudes towards Peer

Review—elements of writing. Peer review within the ESL classroom has shown value to improve student writing in the areas of writing elements. Content and organization resulted in more positive effects in students’ minds than grammar and mechanics. Kietlinska (2006) found that content and organization were challenges to writing in a second language, while at the same time, peer review feedback led students to improve organization. Specifically in the domain of content and organization, student attitudes towards item number 2 that states, peer review sessions helped write clear thesis statements, received the highest ranking of 3.54 out of 4.0. On the other hand, the highest domain of grammar and mechanics was item number 9 that states, peer review sessions helped me learn more about grammar, received the highest ranking of 3.15 out of 4.0. One possible reason for this outcome could be the peer review worksheet focused on content, organization, and transitions as opposed to specific grammar elements.

One student commented about the focus of the peer review sessions in the areas of writing elements. This student felt that the peer review session was helpful overall but not helpful in regard to grammar improvements because that student felt their whole class was learning grammar at the same level. This observation conflicts with what Tsui and Ng (2000) and Kietlinska (2006) found that students favoured elaborate comments on grammar.

Review—affective factors. In Part 2, students rated enjoyment of peer review sessions the highest, at 3.58 out of 4.0. Within this section of statements, students enjoyed interacting with peers the most. The high ranking in enjoyment may be due to the familiarity of the
expectations in the peer review sessions. As Hu (2005) and Min (2005, 2006) suggested, training sessions potentially reduce negative attitudes towards peer review. Also, the interaction between students in a structured language environment proved to be as enjoyable as it was productive.

Secondly, student ranking of giving general feedback focused on the five areas of writing including: content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. The next two highest sessions were giving feedback and receiving feedback, with scores of 3.37 and 3.31 out of 4.0, respectively. Students supported the statements that directly impact thesis statements and vocabulary within the essays.

Also evident from the results of Part 2 questionnaire items, the raw data shows that students ranked giving and receiving negative feedback the lowest scores. Although the numbers look low, the attitudes are still positive towards giving and receiving negative feedback from peers. Student scores on statements regarding giving negative feedback averaged 1.97 out of 2.0. The lowest rated item in this category was a general dislike giving negative feedback, with a score of 1.92 out of 2.0. So, in general, students are comfortable giving their peers general negative feedback on writing. Receiving negative feedback was also rated low, with an average score of 1.79 out of 4.0. Similarly, this dislike towards negative statements indicates a level of comfort receiving negative feedback from peers.

As to student affective factors influenced by the peer review session, students were overwhelmingly positive in their reflection of this experience. This overall positive end result is reflective of participant satisfaction as reported from Xiao and Lucking (2008). Many comments from the interview include that peer review is helpful for thesis statements, content
development, and organization as well as having a second pair of eyes to look more objectively, critically, and clearly. Some students realized areas to change within their own essay while in the peer review session and took this as a learning experience. Similar to Kietlinska (2006) and Min (2005), training students into a routine of peer review sessions was important because they helped establish trust amongst students. Specifically, these sessions allowed students a safe environment to learn from one another and grow as academic writers.

While the peer review session was a success, the interview revealed areas for consideration. One student’s perception of her partner’s writing ability influenced her choice of incorporating feedback. Her perception of her partner’s writing level was lower than her own. She would have preferred a peer review partner whose writing was similar to her own. A second student mentioned motivation of her classmates to do peer review. This student felt that peer review is a nice exercise, but observed some students who did not take the activity seriously. She felt that her reviewer zoomed through the experience and wrote random comments without thinking deeply into the essay they were commenting on.

**Implications for Teaching**

The findings in this research study reveal the usefulness of peer review sessions in a university level ESL writing course. In general, students in my class felt positive attitudes towards peer review sessions analysing peer writing. Students who participated in the peer review sessions as a regular routine in the writing classroom found peer feedback both enjoyable and productive.

In educational settings, teachers should provide students with specific and concrete tasks to complete to help focus on the five aspects of writing, specifically content,
organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. To maximize the effectiveness of peer review, educators should establish a classroom routine addressing the frequency and the procedure of peer review sessions. One suggestion for educators would be to have students participate in peer review sessions after each draft of a writing piece. Also, provide students with a worksheet guiding the expectations for providing feedback.

**Limitations of Study**

The results found herein could not be concluded without including a few disclaimers. First, this study focused on one university level ESL class composed of thirteen students. All of these participants were adults with high school degrees. Although the student population was diverse in prior peer review experiences, this population sample is not enough to make generalizations to other second language classrooms. Other populations might have different attitudes. Second, the study participants came from only one class. Had students from other sections been involved, the sample collection would have been more closely relatable to the population as a whole. In addition, university classrooms in which peer review sessions were not utilized would also provide a comparable comparison to the results found in this study. Third, limitations arise in regard to student proficiency levels. The student participants in this study were highly proficient second language users. If students were not as proficient in their production of the English language, the results may show differently. Considering avenues for future research, researchers may choose to focus on one or more of the abovementioned limitations.
Chapter VI: Conclusion

The research question investigated what student attitudes are toward peer review when giving and receiving feedback on essays specifically towards the five areas of writing: content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. Results show that students are generally positive towards the peer review process in a second language classroom.

Students had a general agreement with many categories of Part 1, including usefulness and motivation. In addition, students showed positivity towards feedback on content/organization. Students also agreed with many categories of Part 2, including giving and receiving general feedback, giving and receiving negative feedback, and giving and receiving positive feedback.

Additionally, results indicate student attitudes are most positive towards usefulness and enjoyment. Positivity towards usefulness was especially evident in statements about giving feedback to classmates and self-perception that peer review sessions helped improve essays. Peer review sessions also resulted in high scores in overall enjoyment.

Students in my university level English as a Second Language writing class enjoyed the peer review sessions to improve writing throughout the semester. The routine was established early into the semester that peer review sessions were worthwhile activities. As a result, students actively engaged in providing feedback for their classmate. Students were both givers and receivers of feedback on essays throughout one semester. From this research, I feel confident that my students were okay with the peer review process in a second language classroom. Peer review sessions can help guide students towards metacognitive awareness about essay writing.
Summary of Findings

The research question focused on student attitudes towards giving and receiving feedback through peer review writing. For this research, students were asked to reflect on their satisfaction with peer review sessions in each of the following categories: content and organization, vocabulary and language use, and grammar and mechanics. The literature identified peer review training sessions as one indicator that led to positive attitudes at the culmination of writing projects (Min, 2005, 2006; Rollinson, 2005). Kietlinska (2006) and Ozogul and Sullivan (2009) found that students appreciated and valued peer feedback as much as teacher feedback. The students in this writing class also found similar benefits. Therefore, the results from this study support the literature in finding a process of implementing peer review while gaining the most student satisfaction.

Student feedback in regard to the usefulness of peer review on the five elements of the writing rubric will give teachers insight into how to make peer review more meaningful and authentic to students’ learning and academic achievement. One important connection from the school structured peer review sessions to real life is the collaboration expected of adults in professional environments. Students and adults alike will encounter individuals who will provide feedback and it is important for students to understand that positive and negative feedback is important for personal and professional growth.
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Appendix A: Student Profile

1. What is your gender? _____ Female _____ Male
2. What is your age? ________________ years
3. What country are you from? __________________________________________
4. What is your native language? _______________________________________ 
5. How long have you spent learning English in your home country? ___________ years 
   _______________ months
6. How long have you spent living in the United States? _____ years _____ months
7. How long have you spent studying English in the United States? _______ years 
   ___________ months
8. Have you had any experience learning English in an English-speaking country? _____ Yes 
   _____ No
    If yes, please explain: _________________________________________________ 
9. Have you done peer review in any course previous to this class? _____ Yes _____ No
   a. If yes, in how many classes have you done peer review? _________________
      If yes, where have you done them? (In the U.S.? Back home?) 
   ________________________________________________________________
Appendix B: Peer Review Worksheet

As the **Writer**: (Name) ________________________________

1. I have difficulty with: _____________________________________________________________

2. I am not sure about: _____________________________________________________________

As the **Reader**: (Name) ________________________________

**Introduction**: What strategy (strategies) does the writer use to introduce the topic? (Statistics, anecdote (story), historical information, etc.) ________________________________

1. Put a star next to the thesis statement.
2. Does the thesis statement reflect all three of the topics of this essay? If not, make a suggestion to clarify the thesis statement: ________________________________

**Body Paragraph 1**: Counter argument / Argument (Circle one)

3. Underline the topic sentence.
4. Body Paragraph 1: Supporting examples:
   a. _____________________________________________________________
   b. _____________________________________________________________
   c. Do these supporting examples relate back to the thesis statement? If not, give a suggestion: ________________________________

5. ___ in each transitional word/phrase(s) in this paragraph.

**Body Paragraph 2**: Argument

6. Underline the topic sentence.
7. Body Paragraph 1: Supporting examples:
   a. _____________________________________________________________
   b. _____________________________________________________________
   c. Do these supporting examples relate back to the thesis statement? If not, give a suggestion: ________________________________

8. ___ in each transitional word/phrase(s) in this paragraph.

**Body Paragraph 3**: Argument

9. Underline the topic sentence.
10. Body Paragraph 1: Supporting examples:
    a. _____________________________________________________________
    b. _____________________________________________________________
    c. Do these supporting examples relate back to the thesis statement? If not, give a suggestion: ________________________________

___
11. _____________________________________________________________________________

**Body Paragraph 4**: Counter argument / Argument (Circle one)

12. **Underline** the topic sentence.

13. **Body Paragraph 1: Supporting examples:**
   a. _____________________________________________________________________________
   b. _____________________________________________________________________________
   c. Do these supporting examples relate back to the thesis statement?  
      If not, give a suggestion: _____________________________________________________________________________

14. **Box** _____________________________________________________________________________

**Conclusion**: What strategy (strategies) does the writer use to conclude the essay? (Statistics, anecdote (story), history, suggestion for the future, etc.)

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix C: Argumentative Peer Review Evaluation Sheet

1. What did you like best about my topic? Why?

_____________________________________________________________________________

2. Was it clear from the thesis statement what the problem was? If not, what needs to be changed to make it clearer?

_____________________________________________________________________________

3. Based on my thesis statement, what position am I taking on this argumentative topic? “X” the appropriate statement:
   ____________ I am FOR this topic
   ____________ I am AGAINST this topic

4. Were all three body paragraphs relevant to the thesis statement? Where they well supported? Where can I add more detail and support?

_____________________________________________________________________________

5. Were the three body paragraphs in a logical and effective order? How should I reorganize these paragraphs to make my essay more effective?

_____________________________________________________________________________

6. What transition words or phrases should be added (or deleted) to help you follow my essay better?

_____________________________________________________________________________
Appendix D: Peer Review Satisfaction Questionnaire

Part 1. Satisfaction with the Peer Review Sessions

**Directions:** Put an X inside the box that best fits your feelings towards each of the following statements.

**For statements 1-6, use the following scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The peer review sessions were useful for improving writing skills.
2. The peer review sessions helped me write clear thesis statements.
3. The peer review sessions were useful for writing better essays.
4. The peer review sessions helped me develop content in my essay.
5. The peer review sessions helped me improve my essays.
6. The peer review sessions helped me organize my essay better.

**For statements 7-16 use the following scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td><strong>Always</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The peer review sessions made me want to complete the essay on time.
8. The peer review session helped me use better vocabulary in my essays.
9. The peer review sessions helped me learn more about grammar.
10. The peer review sessions made me want to produce my best work.
11. The peer review sessions helped me use better sentences in my essays.
12. The peer review sessions made me improve grammar in my essays.

13. The peer review sessions helped me correct grammar mistakes.

14. The peer review sessions made it feel comfortable to talk about writing.

15. The peer review sessions made me improve word order in my essays.

16. The peer review sessions helped me correct spelling errors in my essays.

Part 2. Satisfaction of Giving and Receiving Feedback

For statements 1-12 use the following scale:

|_____1_____|_____2_____|_____3_____|_____4_____|
| Never     |        |        | Always   |

1. I enjoyed giving my classmate feedback on their essay.

2. Giving feedback helped me write better thesis statements in my essays.

3. Receiving feedback helped me write better thesis statements in my essays.

4. I enjoyed receiving feedback from my peers on my essay.

5. Giving feedback helped me organize my essays better.

6. Receiving feedback helped me organize my essays better.

7. I looked forward to the peer review sessions.

8. Giving feedback helped me improve vocabulary in my essays.

9. Receiving feedback helped me improve vocabulary in my essays.

10. During the peer review sessions, I enjoyed interacting with my classmate.

11. Giving feedback helped me use grammar better in my essays.

12. Receiving feedback helped me use grammar better in my essays.
For statements 13-24, use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. I did not feel comfortable giving negative feedback to my peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I felt comfortable giving positive feedback to my peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I did not like to receive negative feedback on my essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I liked to receive positive feedback on my essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I did not like to give negative feedback on my peer’s essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I liked to give positive comments on my peer’s essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I did not feel comfortable receiving negative comments on my essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I felt proud when I received positive comments on my essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I avoided giving negative comments to my peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I enjoyed giving positive feedback to my peer’s writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I did not enjoy receiving negative comments on my essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I enjoyed receiving positive feedback from my peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Follow-up Interview

1. What was your initial reaction to the feedback you received from your peer?

2. I will have two specific examples picked out in which the student incorporated a suggestion as well as one example where the student did not incorporate feedback. I will ask why they incorporated one suggestion and rejected the other suggestion.

3. Can you tell me what you think about peer review in general?