

## Perceptual Change Toward Peer Response: How Writers Incorporated Feedback Into Revisions

Yutaka Fujieda

### Introduction

Feedback constitutes an important aspect of fostering the improvement of writing. It rates an effective and pedagogical means to encourage learners to facilitate further writing development. General feedback is employed in the form of written commentary and verbal interaction between teacher and student or among writers in the preliminary and last stage of drafts. Composition teachers, researchers, and scholars have acknowledged contributions of feedback to a powerful underpinning for autonomous learning as well as for revision processes. Thus, feedback is perceived as an essential element to help writers make better subsequent drafts (Ferris, 2003; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Hyland, F., 2000; Hyland, K., 2003; Hyland & Hyland, 2006a). Especially, both teacher and peer response have great potential benefits with regard to students' writing development.

Empirical research on various ways of response to writing considers feedback as a pedagogical approach both in and out of writing classes. Analyses of teacher written feedback, teacher-student conferencing, and peer feedback have identified both its strengths and weaknesses including such areas as direct and indirect grammatical error corrections (Ferris, 2006), criticisms of grammatical corrections (Ferris, 2002, 2003; Leki, 1991; Truscott, 1996, 1999; Zamel, 1985), negotiation of text meanings (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Liu, & Hansen, 2002; Nelson & Murphy, 1993), and cultural impact on writing development in collaborative sessions (Carson & Nelson, 1996; Goldstein, 2005). Although such critical views of each feature of feedback still remain controversial among writing scholars, feedback sessions seem valuable as an important and accessible task in writing classes.

However, the empirical research issues of feedback tend to focus too much attention on the surface level of student writing (e.g., accuracy, fluency of writing, and quality of texts). Little has been done to show how writers perceive the feedback and incorporate the written commentary as well as supportive interactions into their subsequent revisions. As a new research trend of response to writing in an area of

second language writing, feedback inquiry has recently shifted insight into the effects of feedback perception on writing including writers' behavior or beliefs toward types of feedback. Thus, writing teachers and researchers need to emphasize the necessity of fully taking into account the pedagogical purpose and practice of feedback as more social interactions involve personal standpoints rather than text-level development (Hyland & Hyland, 2006b).

This study examines the perceptions and incorporations of peer feedback; how Japanese EFL learners feel about peer written responses as well as how they utilize them when making revisions. The data is subsequently analyzed to find how writers' perceptions of peer feedback changed through collaborative sessions over the course of one academic year.

## **1. Review of the literature**

Studies of responding to student's writing have been conducted in ESL/EFL writing classrooms as a pedagogical key element of writing development. The general types of responses to writing contain teacher written and oral feedback, and peer feedback. The teacher written feedback puts comments in the margin of the drafts or on the last page of papers to revise the texts specifically and to correct the form of the writing. Verbal feedback, often called "writing conferences," is where teachers interact directly with learners and negotiate the meaning of texts face-to-face. Peer feedback aims at sharing critical opinions, suggestions, and ideas with peer writers.

### **1-1. Teacher Feedback**

Teacher feedback plays the leading role in students' writing processes and writing revisions although there is some criticism of teacher response. Among the various types of feedback, students tend to prefer teacher written responses because they view them of immense value in improving their writing proficiency. Generally, there are two types of teacher response, written feedback and oral feedback. Both give writers opportunities to develop the quality of subsequent drafts.

In previous studies of teacher response, various issues of teacher feedback are examined. Research on teacher feedback focuses primarily on grammatical error corrections and on the influence of teacher comments on the processes of writing (Ferris, 1995, 2002; Goldstein, 2005; Zamel, 1985). The results reflect a trend toward grammar treatment among students. Empirical studies of students' feedback preferences indicate that students generally expect teachers to emphasize grammatical corrections rather than meaning of the content (Hedgcock and Lefkowitz, 1992; Leki, 1991; Saito, 1994; Zhang, 1995). As opposed to the writers' preferences of feedback on mechanical accuracy, studies of teacher feedback express skepticism about grammatical error correction

(Griffin, 1982; Truscott, 1999; Zamel, 1985). Some researchers become ambivalent toward the advantages of grammar corrections from the results of the studies. Truscott (1996) reveals that grammar correction has little success in developing student writing. His argument allows teachers to pay much more attention not to remedying of sentence structures but to content over the writing process.

The other dynamic way of giving teacher-student feedback is “writing conferences.” Writing conferencing is regarded as an alternative means of verbal feedback. It entails careful and specific response by the teacher to apply suggestions to subsequent drafts. This interactive technique aims at fostering students’ writing processes and facilitating writers’ comprehensive efforts to their later revisions. Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) mention that the reason for writing conferencing is to offer a more effective means to “communicate with students who are auditory, rather than visual, learners” (203). Writing conferencing provides learners with opportunities to reflect on the written products and to generate additional ideas deeply through direct interaction with teachers. Teachers can shift their position to that of a facilitator, an adviser, or guide for fostering written products (Reid, 1993).

While face-to-face conferencing with teachers is designed to help writers promote the texts and foster the ability of writing (Hyland and Hyland, 2006), this approach is contentious and divisive. Previous research on writing conferences represents this valuable interchange of ideas between teachers and students as a pedagogical tool, concluding that teachers can discuss the pros and cons of the writers’ written products and can follow the points to be revised (Ferris and Hedgcock, 2005; Hyland, F., 2000; Zamel, 1985). Meanwhile, some critics argue that problems such as inexperience with writing conferences, relationships between teachers and students, and cultural blocks have a negative impact. Goldstein and Conrad (1990) investigate teaching conferences with Chinese writers. Their results show that cultural factors strongly influence the conferences in a particular culture, and indicate that the inhibition of critical attitudes toward teachers as well as undue reticence during the interactions produce disadvantages.

## **1-2. Peer Feedback**

Peer response is a viable technique among writing teachers in L2 writing classrooms. Through peer response, students can gain more effective comments from a collaborative learning process to incorporate the written commentary into their subsequent drafts. Whereas peer feedback adopts a positive stance on the scaffolding of writing and plays a vital role in revising papers, some researchers criticize or demonstrate the drawbacks of peer feedback approaches.

Empirical research on peer feedback focuses primarily on the effect of peer feedback dealing with commentary analyses. Little attention has been paid to how learners manage the peer feedback for later revision work. Peer response influences the revisions of writing through providing more insightful comments on other's written products. Peer feedback sessions are advantageous for learners to reflect on their own drafts and examine their texts in-depth as well. This peer feedback approach also contains complex and controversial issues in institutes or classroom contexts (Liu and Hansen, 2002). For instance, multi-cultural learners in the classrooms, especially ESL settings, often have difficulties addressing suggestions and ideas to peers because of few peer feedback activities. Cultural factors influence the interactions with learners and the revision processes in the peer response workshop. Learners from Asian countries (e.g., China or Japan) become reluctant to remark on their products and are rather more likely to work toward maintaining a harmonious balance with others (Carson and Nelson, 1996; Goldstein, 2005). Such ideological aspects inhibit writers from negotiating the meaning of texts with their peers or improving writing quality with more specific advice.

Carson and Nelson (1996) examine the peer responses by Chinese ESL learners. They took video-tapes of the peer feedback activities and explored how the learners interacted with each other during the peer response work. This study reveals that Chinese learners harmonized with each other as the primary purpose of the collaborative session. Connor and Asenavange (1994) compare peer feedback with different types of comments such as teachers, tutors, and writers to discover the impact on ESL writers' subsequent drafts. The researchers find that peer feedback had few influences on revising although the other three comments were more effective. However, students sometimes became reluctant to share impressions with their peers for fear of hurting the other person's feelings.

Nelson and Murphy (1993) examine whether ESL writers adopted peer feedback into their revisions. Their findings demonstrate that the writers developed their compositions with peers' suggestions when peers facilitated in a supportive manner. The present study finds a similarity in the research results of Goldstein and Conrad (1990). Goldstein and Conrad investigate how teacher conferencing influenced students' subsequent drafts. Their research shows that students used the teachers' suggestions and ideas on their revisions in cases where teachers maintained an exclusive negotiation of meaning during the writing conferences.

Peer response still needs further inquiry into the effectiveness of writing development. Although much controversy over the benefits of peer feedback still exists,

many scholars affirm the validity of such interactive approaches in writing classrooms.

## **2. Research on Peer Response**

Prior research has revealed that peer response holds both positive and negative views for learners' writing development. However, few analyses of incorporating peer feedback into later revisions are clearly shown. As mentioned above, Nelson and Murphy (1993) examine how writers utilized peer written feedback in their subsequent drafts after the peer feedback session and how they demonstrated effective revision success through the negotiation of meaning with their peers. Their research argues that successful peer feedback is possible through discussing the content of writing. Yet, their study pays little attention to the learners' perceptual change towards peer written feedback. Hence, the present study explores how the writers' perceptions of peer feedback influence incorporation of written commentary into the learners' revisions. Then, the present research delves into how peer responses positively/negatively alter the writers' perceptions in the writing classes over the course of one academic year.

### **2-1. Participants**

This research was done throughout the academic year of 2005 (April-July and October-January), including collecting the data and analyzing the results. A total of fourteen Japanese EFL freshmen (three male and eleven female) English majors participated in this research. Their English level is intermediate (TOEIC scores 400-495). The participants attended a required class, "Written English I & II" from 8:50 to 10:20 in the morning (for 90 minutes) every Friday. This course highlighted the development of writing ability in English through writing processes and aimed at producing content-based essays following a textbook.

The subjects were 18-19 years old and had been studying English as a foreign language more than six years. However, none of the participants had experience with paragraph writing or writing essays in English at high school. This was the threshold to writing content-based essays in English followed by writing structure in English.

### **2-2. Procedures**

In each semester, all of the subjects wrote four essays of various genres (e.g., personal diaries, favorite stores, life experiences, newspaper story critiques, expository essays). They produced a total of eight papers in the course of one year. The students spent two weeks doing pre-writing activities, generating ideas, reviewing the opinions in the textbook, organizing essay structures, and making a draft. After working on a draft for two weeks, the participants brought two copies of their drafts (anonymous) to hold peer feedback events and to receive written commentary from their peers. In each peer feedback session, all students randomly picked up one student's essay and a peer

feedback question sheet from a desk that the researcher prepared. They read the draft carefully and filled in the feedback sheet (expressing the good points, points to be revised, and suggestions). Commentary was written in Japanese as previous research studies illustrated that application of writer's native language in comments led to their making revisions (Nelson and Carson, 2006). After filling out the form, learners returned the paper and question sheet to the desk, and took a new draft and worksheet (This task continued for 90 minutes). The participants had this peer feedback workshop four times in each semester (for a total of eight times in one year). After the peer feedback session, the students received their feedback question sheet to utilize the written commentary in their revisions.

At the end of each semester, the researcher/author had interviews with all of the subjects (students had interviews twice in a year). They brought their drafts and the peer feedback worksheets which they received in the peer feedback activities in order to clarify the efficacy of the peer feedback which they received. The interviews were held for 20-30 minutes for each person in the author's office and were recorded with permission. During the interviews, the researcher addressed various questions to them underlying what types of response they received from their peers. The questions that the author raised were: (1) How did you feel about the peer feedback work? (2) Did you incorporate the peer feedback into the final revisions? Why or why not? In addition to these questions, another question (3) Do you feel there were changes in your perception toward peer feedback? Why or why not? was put. After all of the subjects' interviews, recorded data was transcribed and carefully analyzed. This investigation deeply explored the individual perceptions of peer feedback, behavior toward applications of the peer written commentary to each writer's draft, and changes in perception of peer response in the second semester based on prior records.

### **3. Result**

#### **3-1: Perceptions and Incorporation of Peer Written Feedback**

The results clearly show positive remarks about applying the benefits of peer feedback. A total of eight out of fourteen students considered peer feedback a valuable tool for improving their writing. The participants who experienced a positive impact on their writing revisions demonstrated that peer feedback suggested grammatical errors as well as vague points that the writer should reconsider. In addition to these critical issues, the subjects also mentioned that the positive comments from their peers gave them strong confidence toward writing in L2. Most of the participants favorably responded to the worth of peer written feedback during the interviews. Two students (students A and F) below vividly described the situation of their peer feedback activities:

(Student A):

T (Teacher): So, how did you feel about the peer feedback session? Was it successful for you?

SA (Student A): Well..., yes, it was great. I felt the effectiveness of peer feedback work.

T: Could you tell me more? Tell me about your... feelings or impressions.

SA: The feedback activity was a lot of fun and important. The commentary showed my unclear parts and some useful ideas to reorganize my paper. Of course, my peers gave me compliments with remarks. These expressions encouraged my writing ability.

T: So, did you incorporate the peer feedback into your next drafts?

SA: Yes, of course. I thought that I could add more details with the peers' descriptions on the question sheet (student A).

The female student A emphasized the importance of peer feedback as her voice revealed since she received commentary that offered so many details of her good points and suggestions for revising. She perceived the peer feedback as an effective means and then succeeded in developing her subsequent product. In addition to the case of student A, student F received some impressive ideas from her peers as well. She described in the interview that she tried to reconsider the entire structure of her paper to put more detailed ideas. Then, she deeply examined her next complete draft, with special consideration for her audience as her previous writing had been intended for the teacher rather than a wide range of audience. The peer feedback events bolstered her writing confidence with various useful suggestions and criticisms.

(Student F):

T: Through your feedback session, what did you feel about it? Any ideas?

SF (Student F): I need this kind of workshop more because I can get very thoughtful comments from my classmates. The feedback was important. I can revise my paper with their comments and will try to write clearly so that every classmate can understand my paper.

T: Finally, did you use the peer commentary while revising your draft?

SF: Absolutely! Basically, I changed the unclear sentences that my classmates mentioned. It took a bit of time to revise, but I believe that my draft was improved thanks to the peer responses (student F).

On the other hand, three students out of fourteen rejected the value of peer written commentary. In contrast, the writers who experienced a negative impact on their

revisions showed some common ideas about ineffective peer comments. They felt that the comments identified only impressions rather than suggestions. Moreover, the feedback that provided unclear suggestions and simple responses such as “Good,” “Interesting,” or “Good writing,” made the writers confused. Such unproductive feedback blocked the learners’ writing development, maintaining reluctant behavior for revisions. Two students, students J and K, clearly stated their pessimistic views of peer feedback during the interview:

(Student J)

T: So, how was the peer feedback session? Was it very effective for you?

SJ (Student J): Uhhhm, it’s very hard to say, seriously.

T: OK, don’t worry. Please tell me about your feelings... Yeah, go ahead.

SJ: The feedback I received was not effective at all. And...I think that the students could not directly suggest the bad points because they might feel it impolite to give criticisms. I know it’s hard to write criticism directly, but, you know, I need it to make my drafts much better. Yes, I really think so. Honestly, I could not use the peer feedback on the next draft at all because it was not so valuable (student J).

(Student K)

T: OK, I want to ask you about the feedback activity. How do you feel about that?

SK (Student K): Not useful at all! (Laughing). I just wonder why...

T: Well, so, can you tell me exactly about the impressions of your peer commentary?

SK: Sure...This peer feedback seems to be unproductive for me because it didn’t provide me with useful advice to revise my paper, to tell the truth. The peers just praised my writing like “Good,” or “Interesting story,” and so on. I checked the comments, thinking about “what?” You know, “what is interesting?” I am not sure what the good points are exactly and wonder how I should write more on the next draft.

T: Then, you could not incorporate the responses into your revisions, right?

SK: Unfortunately, no... I tried to use them, but most of the comments were praise. It was so difficult to revise with the comments (student K).

The male student J felt annoyed when he received such indirect and fuzzy suggestions. He expressed his thoughts on the reason for the peers’ negative attitude of



feedback. The factor would be the cultural habit of not saying things to hurt others, saying the ideas softly. As the study of Connor and Asenavange (1994) indicate, this cultural block impeded the negotiations of meaning during the collaborative tasks. In this case, such a cultural aspect strongly influenced the writer's behavior. The male student's expectation clashed with the peers' social identity, although the male student wanted to receive criticism from others.

The simple reaction bordering on back-channel feedback also bewildered the female learner, student K. The comments she was offered such as "Good," or "Interesting story" prevented her from improving her later revision and demotivated her attitude for further writing performance. She explained that these feedback notes should be disregarded as meaningless remarks.

The other three participants had an ambivalent position toward the effect of peer feedback, describing that they tended to utilize peer comments on the stipulation that written feedback make specific proposals on the content. Otherwise, the learners disregarded their peers' opinions as ineffectual and worthless commentary.

(Student N):

T: I want to hear your frank opinions of the peer feedback workshop. Do you think that the collaborative work was successful for you?

SN (Student N): Well, actually it is very difficult to say, "Yes." I got 4 sheets from my classmates, and two students of the four wrote lots of helpful ideas for me. These are very nice. I'm so happy. But, look at these sheets (Pointing to the sheets). Very short comments, right? These two types of feedback were not helpful at all. So, I can't say that this peer feedback was either useful or unsuccessful.

T: I see. So, you applied only the helpful comments to your draft.

SN: That's right. I could not use everything (student N).

As this female student N mentioned, she felt there was a major gap in the degree of feedback quality. She indicated that the direct opinions actually provided the writer with opportunities to expedite the revisions. Contrastingly, the behavior of her peers such as the allusion to her written product confused her. She had much difficulty in applying all the commentary to her next draft as well as determining the effectiveness of peer response. It is apparent that the commentary which is both valuable and vague results in restraining students from gauging the potential for subsequent progress in revisions.

### 3-2: Perceptual Change of Peer Feedback

Perceptual change toward peer feedback basically sustained the same result as the one which students previously felt in the first stage. The eight writers who valued peer feedback and utilized the commentary in the revisions took a firm stand on the significance of peer feedback. The major change was that four students, one of whom had disagreed to, and three of whom had become ambivalent about peer feedback, tended to have a positive attitude toward peer response. Therefore, a total of twelve students felt the worth of peer feedback in the last result.

While interviewing all the participants, the researcher asked them about their impressions of peer feedback sessions as well as about whether or not they changed their perceptions of peer feedback. Student J, who had considered peer feedback as ineffective, and student M, who had been on neutral ground, offered descriptions of their perceptual change.

(Student J)

- T: Did you change your ideas about peer feedback? Last semester, your attitude was so negative. I just wondered if your feelings toward peer response have changed.
- SJ (Student J): Yes, now I think that peer feedback is very important.
- T: Really? Your idea was so different. Why do you feel so?
- SJ: It is because I believe that my classmates' attitudes changed. Last semester, they couldn't give opinions well in the peer feedback workshop. So I did not like the peer response. But, in the second semester, I received very useful comments and suggestions on my poor points as well.
- T: Could you revise your paper with the comments?
- SJ: Right. It was so easy to rewrite my paper. (student J)

(Student M)

- T: ... I see. Then, do you have a positive view of peer feedback?
- SM (Student M): Yes. I really feel so.
- T: Any reason? Please tell me.
- SM: I think that peers became used to the peer feedback activities. So, comparing the commentary with that of the first semester, I got so many comprehensible suggestions. Plus, the teacher told us about the importance of providing both suggestions and poor points before starting the activity (student M).

Through reflecting on the voices of writers who changed to a more positive attitude, this result implied that many participants were gradually trained in peer response and acknowledged the role of peer feedback that requires a socialization process as well as supportive scaffolding (Vygotsky, 1978).

#### **4. Discussion**

In the previous primary research on efficacy of peer feedback, various researchers examined the development of the text level; how writers improved the quality of the paper with detailed ideas and accuracy. However, this study emphasizes how each learner sensed the peer response and incorporated the peer commentary into his/her later revisions rather than how learners were capable of developing the texts with comments. Moreover, this analysis tried to observe perceptual changes through a one-year-long cooperative undertaking.

As this inquiry clearly proves, most of the participants took a forward-looking stance. Eight writers endorsed the ideas of peer feedback, adopted their colleagues' suggestions or opinions, and retained an emphasis upon peer written commentary. Four subjects who were strictly against the statements from their peers or had equivocal opinions in the past were budged from their position on disapproving or had non-committal perspectives of peer written feedback. In sum, although a few students kept their indecisive attitudes, it can be seen that peer written response has a salutary effect on students' writing.

The findings suggest the possibility of further research on perception of peer response. The first issue is to introduce interactive feedback and to see the difference of the affect between peer written commentary and oral interactions. This exploration utilizes only peer written comments, not applying peer verbal interactions to the peer feedback sessions. The result implies a stark difference between the use of commentary and interactions if this research employed negotiations with peer interactions. Furthermore, a deeper analysis of peer feedback influence could be conducted; how will each feature of feedback (both written comments and verbal) alter the writer's perceptions of feedback as well as affect his/her further writing behavior?

Another issue is to investigate how trained peer feedback influences writers' perceptions. None of the subjects in this investigation had training in peer feedback before. Therefore, as the research participants mentioned during the interviews, they had never shared ideas with their classmates in English classes. This inexperienced collaboration work with their peers caused a negative impact on providing thoughtful comments in this research. A few students described that they received reluctant responses in the peer work and became strongly aware of the peers' lukewarm attitude

toward giving feedback. In fact, such disinclination of suggesting ideas may be an aspect of Oriental cultural behavior which believes direct statements to be discordant with good human rapport (Carson and Nelson 1996). However it is problematic to regard such avoidance of ingenuous opinions as a mere cultural factor (Nelson and Carson, 2006; Olga and Guerrero, 1996, 2006; Spack, 1997). Therefore, writing teachers require more preparation and planning time to give learners adequate training to circumvent the cultural labels. In explanation, teachers need to explain the role of peer feedback since students have received no sufficient peer feedback techniques such as conveying their attitude and offering some helpful criticism. Then, learners gain substantial experience through cooperative activities and have the ability to exert a positive influence on their own writing (see Berg, 1999).

Finally, research on peer response of perceptual change can emphasize more individual aspects. In this current study, all participants (fourteen students) in a writing class were investigated, and illustrated their practical consequences of perceptual change as well as utilization of peer written commentary. For future studies, deeper exploration of individual learner's beliefs and behavioral change toward peer feedback will be prospective as longitudinal or ethnographic studies, as Hyland and Hyland (2006b) approached "feedback not only communicates beliefs about writing, language, or content but also expresses and negotiates human relationships" (222).

This novel inquiry into the perceptual change toward peer response is still being undertaken among researchers. Scholars have several considerations and factors to consider, however, it merits further research on the perception of peer feedback containing written and verbal responses. This research trend will provide new background in the field of second language writing.

## **5. Conclusion**

This study highlighted a research investigation of peer feedback; how Japanese EFL writers felt about peer written commentary as well as how they applied it to their subsequent draft. In addition to these issues, this study explored how each writer changed his/her conception of peer feedback through peer feedback workshops over the course of one year. The result revealed that most of the participants valued peer feedback. Eight writers out of fourteen took a positive stance toward peer feedback, three rejected the importance of peer response, and the other three sustained neutral opinions. Four students changed their negative and ambivalent stance to peer feedback into affirmative feelings. Consequently, it was demonstrated that peer written response had a salutary effect on students' writing, even though two students remained non-committal.

## References

- Berg, Cathrine, E. "The Effects of Trained Peer Response on ESL Students' Revision Types and Writing Quality." Journal of Second Language Writing 8 (1999): 215-241.
- Carson, Joan, G, and Nelson, Gayle, L. "Chinese Students' Perceptions of ESL Peer Response Group Interaction." Journal of Second Language Writing 5 (1996): 1-19.
- Connor, Ulla, and Asenavage, Karen. "Peer Response Groups in ESL Writing Classes: How Much Impact on Revision?" Journal of Second Language Writing 3 (1994): 256-276.
- Ferris, Dana. "Students Reactions to Teacher Response in Multiple-Draft Composition Classrooms." TESOL Quarterly 29 (1995): 33-53.
- , Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing. Ann Arbor: The University Of Michigan Press, 2002.
- , Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2003.
- Ferris, Dana, & Hedgcock, John. eds. Teaching ESL Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice 2nd ed. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005.
- Goldstein, Lynn, M. Teacher Written Commentary in Second Language Writing Classrooms. Ann Arbor: The University Of Michigan Press, 2005.
- Goldstein, Lynn, M, & Conrad, Susan, M. "Student Input and Negotiation of Meaning in ESL Writing Conferences." TESOL Quarterly 24 (1990): 443-460.
- Griffin, Williams, C. Teaching Writing in All Disciplines. Washington: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- Hedgcock, John, and Lefkowitz, Natalie. "Collaborative Oral/Aural Revision in Foreign Language Writing Instruction." Journal of Second Language Writing 1 (1992): 255-276.
- Hyland, Ken. Second Language Writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Hyland, Fiona. "The Impact of Teacher Written Feedback on Individual Writers." Journal of Second Language Writing 7 (1998): 255-286.
- , "ESL Writers and Feedback: Giving More Autonomy to Students." Language Teaching Research 4 (2000): 33-54.
- Hyland, Ken, & Hyland Fiona. eds. Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006a.
- , "Interpersonal Aspects of Response: Constructing and Interpreting Teacher Written Feedback." Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues. Eds., Ken Hyland, and Fiona Hyland. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006b.

206-224.

- Leki, Ilona. "The Preferences of ESL Students for Error Correction in College-Level Writing Classes." Foreign Language Annals 24 (1991): 203-218.
- Liu, Jun, & Hansen, Jette, G. Peer Response in Second Language Writing Classrooms. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2002.
- Nelson, Gayle, L, & Murphy, John, M. "Peer Response Groups: Do L2 Writers Use Peer Comments in Revising Their Drafts?" TESOL Quarterly 27 (1993):135-141.
- , "Cultural Issues in Peer Response: Revisiting "Culture."" Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues. Eds., Ken Hyland, and Fiona Hyland. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 42-59.
- Olga, S, Villamil, and Marcia, C, M, de Guerrero. "Peer Revision in the L2 Classroom: Socio-Cognitive Activities, Mediating Strategies, and Aspects of Social Behavior." Journal of Second Language Writing 5 (1996): 51-75.
- , "Sociocultural Theory: A Framework for Understanding the Socio-Cognitive Dimensions of Peer Feedback." Eds., Ken Hyland, and Fiona Hyland. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 23-41.
- Reid, Joy. Teaching ESL Writing. Englewood: Prentice Hall, 1993.
- Saito, Hiroko. "Teachers' Practices and Students' Preferences for Feedback on Second Language Writing: A Case Study of Adult ESL Learners." TESL Canada Journal 11 (1994): 46-70.
- Spack, Ruth. "The Rhetorical Construction of Multilingual Students." TESOL Quarterly 31 (1997): 765-774.
- Truscott, John. "The Case against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes." Language Learning 46 (1996): 327-369.
- , "The Case for "The Case against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes: A Response to Ferris." Journal of Second Language Writing 8 (1999): 111-122.
- Vygotsky, Lev. Mind in Society: The Developmental of Higher Psychological Processes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Zamel, Vivian. "Responding to Student Writing." TESOL Quarterly 19 (1985): 79-102.
- Zhang, Shuqiang. "Reexamining the Affective Advantage of Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class." Journal of Second Language Writing 4 (1995): 209-222.

## 要旨

### ピアレスポンスに対する意識転換

#### 書き手がフィードバックを校正にどう組み込むか

藤枝 豊

ライティングに関するフィードバックは、ライティング力向上を手助けする一つの重要な要素であり、効果的な教育手段と考えられている。過去のフィードバック研究は、教師の手書き評価 (teacher written commentary)、教師と学生間の会議 (teacher-student conferencing)、クラスメート同士によるフィードバック分析 (peer response) が多い。これらの研究内容は、直接的、間接的な文法的誤り訂正 (grammatical error corrections)、文法訂正の批評 (criticism of grammar corrections)、文章内容の交渉 (negotiation of text meaning)、そして共同作業中において、文化的要因がどうライティング力向上に影響を及ぼしたのかという調査が多い。しかしながら、フィードバック研究は、学生のライティングの文章レベルに焦点を置きすぎており、学習者が仲間から得たフィードバックについてどう考え、それを校正にどう組み込んだのかという研究はほとんどない。

本研究は、日本人英語学習者によるピアフィードバックに関する意識、及び校正におけるピアフィードバックの反映度を調査した。また、更なる調査として、1年間クラスメートとライティングの意見交換作業を通じ、ピアフィードバックに関する意識変化を分析した。

本調査は英語専攻学生14名を対象に行った。半期4作品のレポート(年間8作品)について、手書きのピアフィードバックを行い(半期4回、年間8回の意見交換活動)、ピアフィードバックについて何をどのように感じ、またそれを作文校正にどう盛り込んだのかについて被験者全員にインタビューを実施した。また後期に、学生の仲間の意見に関する意識変化も調査した。その結果、8名がピアフィードバックに対して肯定的な立場を示し、3名がピアフィードバックの重要性を否定し、残り3名は中立な立場を取った。ピアフィードバックに関する意識変化について、否定的な態度を取った3名全員がピアフィードバックに価値があると述べ、中立の立場を取っていた3名中1名の被験者がピアフィードバックの重要性を示唆する意識変化が見られた。最終的に、12名がピアレスポンスの重要性を認識し、2名は中立な意見を保持した。

ピアレスポンスの意識研究は、様々な要因を考慮する必要があるが、この新しいピアフィードバック調査は、今後、第二言語ライティング研究におけるクラスメートのフィードバック分析の応用研究として期待される。