

IMPACT OF PEER REVISION ON SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING

Graduate School of Education
of
Bilkent University

by

BURCU ÖZTÜRK

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

July 2006

BILKENT UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

July 3, 2006

The examining committee appointed by the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences
for the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Burcu Öztürk

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis Title: Impact of Peer Revision on Second Language Writing

Thesis Advisor : Dr. Johannes Eckerth
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Committee Members : Dr. Charlotte Basham
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Prof. Dr. Aydan Ersöz
Gazi University, Faculty of Education

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Second Language.

(Dr. Johannes Eckerth)
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Second Language.

(Dr. Charlotte Basham)
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Second Language.

(Prof. Dr. Aydan Ersöz)
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Second Language.

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

(Visiting Prof. Dr. Margaret Sands)
Director

ABSTRACT

IMPACT OF PEER REVISION ON SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING

Öztürk, Burcu

M.A., Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Dr. Johannes Eckerth

Co-Supervisor: Dr. Charlotte Basham

July 2006

This study investigates the characteristics and effectiveness of peer revision on second language writing as an aid to teacher feedback. It compares peer revision with the individual revision, helping analyze the former in a more controlled way in terms of its general usefulness. The study was conducted at Middle East Technical University.

The data was collected through peer revision processes, in which peers reviewed each other's writing, and through think-aloud protocols, which involve students reviewing their own writing. The participants were 10 advanced level students enrolled in a composition class. Qualitative and quantitative data analysis techniques were employed in the analysis and the type of interaction among the peers was identified. First and

second drafts written before and after the peer revision and before and after the individual revision were compared. The processes of peer and individual revision were also compared. Additionally, the researcher proposed changes in essays and compared them with peer-proposed changes and individual changes. The texts were compared with respect to nine categories: vocabulary, grammar, spelling, punctuation, morphology, syntax, preposition, correlation of ideas, and organization.

The results indicate that peer revision is a worthwhile activity regardless of whether it leads to highly successful revisions. Texts showed notable differences in eight categories. When students were included in peer revision, they made more changes than they did in individual revisions. The data showed that peers do have the competence to provide useful comments on each other's writing, and that peer revision can lead to language learning.

Keywords: Peer revision, Individual revision.

ÖZET

ÖĞRENCİLERİN BİRBİRLERİNİN KOMPOZİSYONLARINI GÖZDEN GEÇİRMESİNİN (PEER REVISION) YABANCI DİLDE YAZMAYA ETKİSİ

Öztürk, Burcu

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Johannes Eckerth

Ortak Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Charlotte Basham

Temmuz 2006

Bu çalışma, öğretmenin geribildirimine bir destek olarak, öğrencilerin birbirlerinin kompozisyonlarını gözden geçirmesinin (peer revision) özelliklerini ve yabancı dilde yazmaya etkisini araştırmıştır. Öğrencilerin birbirlerinin kompozisyonlarını gözden geçirmeleri, bireysel gözden geçirmeyle (individual revision) karşılaştırılmış ve bu öğrencilerin birbirlerinin kompozisyonlarını gözden geçirmelerinin genel yararını daha kontrollü bir şekilde çözümlenmeye olanak sağlamıştır. Çalışma, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesinde gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Veriler öğrencilerin birbirlerinin kompozisyonlarını gözden geçirme süreci ve sesli düşünme protokolleri (TAPs) yoluyla toplanmıştır. Çalışmaya katılan örnek grup, kompozisyon dersine kayıtlı ileri dil seviyesindeki 10 öğrencidir. Veriler kalitatif ve kantitatif olarak incelenmiştir. İncelemede, öğrencilerin diyalogları sırasında başvurdukları yollar belirlenmiştir. Öğrencilerin birbirlerinin kompozisyonlarını gözden geçirme süreci ile bireysel gözden geçirme sürecinden önce ve sonra yazılan ilk ve ikinci taslak kompozisyonlar karşılaştırılmıştır. Öğrencilerin birbirlerinin kompozisyonlarını gözden geçirmeleri ile bireysel gözden geçirmeleri süreç olarak da karşılaştırılmıştır. Araştırmacı kompozisyonlarda kendi yaptığı değişiklikleri, ortak olarak yapılan (peer revision) değişikliklerle ve bireysel değişikliklerle de karşılaştırmıştır. Kompozisyonlar dokuz başlık altında incelenmiştir: kelime kullanımı, dil bilgisi, imla, ekler (kelime oluşumu), cümle yapısı, ilgeçler, noktalama, fikirlerin birbirine uyumu ve kompozisyon düzeni.

Sonuçlar göstermiştir ki, öğrencilerin birbirlerinin kompozisyonlarını gözden geçirmesi, ikinci taslak kompozisyonlarda başarılı değişiklikler olup olmaması göze alınmaksızın olumlu bir aktivitedir. Öğrenciler kompozisyonlarında sekiz konuda büyük değişiklikler yapmışlardır. Öğrencilerin birbirlerinin kompozisyonlarını gözden geçirme sürecine dahil olan katılımcılar, bireysel gözden geçirme sürecine göre ikinci taslak kompozisyonlarında daha fazla değişiklik yapmışlardır. Verilere göre, öğrencilerin kompozisyonları konusunda birbirlerine yararlı yorum sağlama yeteneği olabilir ve bu süreç sonunda, öğrenciler dil konusunda yeni şeyler öğrenebilirler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğrencilerin birbirlerinin kompozisyonlarını gözden geçirmesi, Bireysel gözden geçirme

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background of the study.....	2
Statement of the problem.....	6
Research questions.....	7
Significance of the study.....	8
Conclusion.....	8
Definitions of key terms.....	9
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
Introduction.....	10
Teacher feedback.....	11
Learner-learner interaction.....	17
Peer revision.....	21
Think-aloud Protocols.....	33
Conclusion.....	36
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	37

Overview of the study.....	37
Participants.....	38
Instruments.....	39
Procedure.....	44
Data analysis.....	48
Conclusion.....	50
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS.....	51
Overview of the study.....	51
Data analysis.....	53
Peer interaction.....	54
Essay comparison.....	70
Individual revision vs. Peer revision.....	88
Conclusion.....	95
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....	97
Overview of the study.....	97
Discussion of findings.....	98
Pedagogical implications.....	104
Limitations of the study.....	106
Implications for further research.....	106
Summary and Conclusion.....	107
REFERENCE LIST.....	109
APPENDIX A.....	117

APPENDIX B.....	118
APPENDIX C.....	126
APPENDIX D.....	127

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
TABLE 2.1	
Revisions of All Types in Two Composition Cycles.....	72
TABLE 2.2	
Composition Comparison- 1st and 2nd drafts in Self-Revision.....	82
TABLE 2.3	
Product Comparison- Revisions after Peer Revision and Individual Revision..	86
TABLE 2.4	
Comparison of Changes from Researcher Review and Peer Review.....	87
TABLE 2.5	
Comparison of Changes from Researcher Review and Individual Review.....	88

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Accustomed teacher feedback has been the main method practised over the years to improve writing skills of second language (L2) learners. However, several researchers, including Kroll (2001) have noted that teacher feedback is a time-consuming and sometimes unrealistic task for English teachers. Finding an alternative way to support teacher feedback to improve the text quality of L2 students' papers has become one of the main concerns of researchers and writing teachers since late nineteen eighties. Several studies have been conducted to find new strategies to complement teacher feedback. The purpose of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of peer revision as a support to teacher feedback. Benefits of peer feedback for revision has been extensively discussed in the literature and gained some ground as an aid to teacher feedback on students' text production.

While some studies supported the efficacy of peer revision to improve writing skills of L2 students, a few disagreed with the idea. In his studies Zhang (1995) claims that peer revision is an effective way of improving native language (L1) writing, but not effective in L2 writing. Jacobs et al. (1998) also reveal that their findings validate

Zhang's (1995) findings of non effectiveness of peer revision feedback. However, the study conducted by Villamil and Guerrero (1998) suggests that peer revision can help L2 learners and that peer revision should be seen as an important complementary source of feedback in ESL classroom. Parallel to findings of Villamil and Guerrero's study, Tsui and Ng (2000) also state that peer revision plays an important part in L2 writing.

The purpose of this study is to find out the characteristics and effectiveness of peer revision as an aid to teacher feedback among L2 learners in Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Turkey. The data were collected through a peer revision process. Ten student pairs exchanged their essays which had been composed individually at home and then mutually commented on their written texts in class. These exchanges were recorded and analyzed. Think-aloud protocols were also collected from four students commenting on their own papers by verbalizing their thought processes. This procedure helped to compare first and second drafts and peer commentaries as well as to compare the peer revision process and the individual revision process.

Background of the Study

Among the other language skills (reading, listening and speaking), writing is considered to be one of the most difficult one to master (Richards & Renandya, 2002). The difficulty comes from having to generate and organize ideas as well as to transform these ideas into readable text. Richards and Renandya (2002) state that writing skills are highly complex. Second language writers have to pay attention both to planning and organization, which are higher level skills, and also to spelling, punctuation, word choice,

and so on, which are lower level skills in the writing process (Richards & Renandya, 2002).

Responding to students' writing is an important part of the writing process. Seow (2002) underlines that responding to students' writing has a central role to play in the successful implementation of this writing process. He defines responding to student writing as "teacher's quick initial reaction to student's drafts". Responding takes place after the students have produced the first draft and just before they proceed to revision (Seow, 2002). The failure of many writing programmes in schools today may be attributed to the fact that responding takes place in the final stage and that the teacher responds, evaluates, and even edits students' texts at the same time. Responding and editing students' writing in the final stage gives students the impression that nothing further more needs to be done or can be done for their texts (Seow, 2002). For that reason, teachers feedback may create some anxiety in developing the text quality of L2 students and finally in teaching L2 writing. This is because grading is confounded with revising. However, it is important to stimulate learners to understand that there is more to be done for their texts after this stage. Stimulation may be accomplished by applying peer revision. Because of its apparent potential value to both writer and reviser, using peer revision feedback gained considerable support and ground among educators as a supportive aid to teacher feedback. Villamil and Guerrero (1998) state that peer revision could be seen as an important complementary source of feedback in English as a second language classrooms.

There are several definitions of peer revision given by researchers. Kroll (2001) defines peer revision as “simply putting students together in groups and then having each student read and react to the strengths and weaknesses of each other’s papers” (p. 228). Peer revision is defined by Zhu (2001) as a process in which students critique and provide feedback on one another’s writing. Another definition comes from Cazden. Cazden defines peer revision using the metaphor of “discourse as catalyst”. This means that discourse stimulates students’ potential to improve their written texts. She characterizes peer revision as “enabling students to reconceptualize their ideas in the light of their peers’ reactions” (1988, as cited in Mendonça and Johnson).

Peer revision as part of the process of teaching writing (Flower & Hayes, 1981, as cited in Berg, 1999) has gained increasing attention in the field of English as a Second Language (ESL) since the late 1980s. A number of studies have been conducted on peer revision in ESL classrooms (Hafernik, 1983; Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger, 1992; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Moore, 1986; Nelson & Murphy, 1992, 1993; Stanley, 1992; Witbeck, 1997; Zhang, 1995, as cited in Berg, 1999, p. 215). Several of these studies describe students’ roles, recommend strategies for successful peer revision, and/or report on students’ attitudes and affective benefits (Berg, 1999).

The benefits of peer revision in L2 writing have been discussed in the literature. The common claims are that a) peer revision in L2 writing directs learner interest more and that it is informative; b) it enhances learner awareness of what makes writing successful; c) L2 learners’ attitudes towards writing can be enhanced with peer revision; d) L2 learners can learn more about L2 writing; e) with peer revision L2 learners are

encouraged to assume more responsibility for their writing (Allison & Ng, 1992; Arndt, 1993; Chaudron, 1984; Keh, 1990; Lockhart & Ng, 1993, Mittan, 1989, as cited in Tsui & Ng, 2000, p. 148). As opposed to these advantages, there is still a concern about the credibility of peer revision. The most important concern about peer revision tends to be about the capacity of language learners to provide useful comments to other language learners. Learners may not be knowledgeable enough to revise each other's papers (Villamil and Guerrero, 1998). This may hinder successful revision as well as improvement in text quality.

Another concern about the efficacy of peer revision relates to how it is conducted. Peer revision is a process that needs "careful training and structuring"(Stanley, 1992; Villamil and Guerrero, 1996, as cited in Paulus, 1999). In some cases, learners may be in a "prescriptive" mode, that is "demanding what to do"; instead of a "collaborative mode", that is "discussing what to do". Thus, learners appear to need to be trained about the process of peer revision and effective learner-learner interaction during the process (Mangelsdorf and Schlumberger, 1992, as cited in Paulus, 1999; Stanley, 1992)

In conclusion, even though peer revision may be suggested as an effective strategy to improve writing efficacy of L2 learners, this study is not trying to eradicate the importance of teacher feedback that has been successfully applied for L2 learners for many years. Instead, it is to explore the effectiveness of peer revision as an aid to accustomed teacher feedback.

Statement of the Problem

Since the late 1980s, studies have been conducted on the effectiveness of peer revision. However, these studies have yielded conflicting findings. While the majority of these studies argue convincingly that peer revision has an important role to play in English as a Second Language writing classroom, some of them question the impact of it on L2 writing. Thus, there still seems a need to conduct new studies on the impact of peer revision.

Another need for a further study comes from previous studies' main concerns. Peer revision has been discussed widely in terms of its benefits in second language classrooms (Villamil and Guerrero, 1998). Nevertheless, there is little knowledge about how peers revise each others' texts during the peer revision process, what the characteristics of learner-learner interaction are and how students make use of peer feedback to revise their texts (Mendonça and Johnson, 1994).

Additionally, peer revision has been discussed in terms of L2 learners' capacity to revise each other's texts. Even though some studies provide theoretical and empirical support for peer revision, there are still questions about the learners' capacity to help each other solve linguistic problems and revise their texts (Villamil and Guerrero, 1998). At this point, some researchers are suspicious of whether learners are knowledgeable enough to help their peers detect linguistic problems and make suggestions to correct them (Villamil and Guerrero, 1998). The question remains of the capacities of L2 learners to

suggest grammatically informed and discursively useful revisions to other L2 learners' writing.

All of these reasons contribute to the need to conduct further studies on peer revision. In justifying more use of peer revision in the classroom, its effect on L2 writing needs to be further researched (Villamil and Guerrero, 1998).

To partially fill this gap in knowledge about peer revision in literature, this study intends to shed light upon whether peer revision may improve the quality of second language learners' texts. In sum, the aim of this study is two-fold: first, to investigate the quality of feedback in peer revision and how students make comments to each others' writing; and, second, to investigate the impact of peer revision on the quality of students' revised texts.

Research Questions

In order to respond to the above mentioned concerns, the study will address the following research questions:

1. How do peers interact during the peer revision process?
2. In what way do revision suggestions contribute to the improvement of the quality of the revised texts?
3. In what way do students' revision proposals for their peers' texts differ from students' individual revision plans for their own texts?

Significance of the Study

Teacher feedback is a time-consuming task. One of the main concerns in teacher feedback is that teachers may have so many students in one class. Additionally, teaching more than one writing class may leave the teacher with limited time to provide quality feedback to each student (Kroll, 2001).

Peer revision strategies have been reported to be successfully applied in several countries such as Hong Kong (Tsui and Ng, 2000) and Puerto Rico (Villamil and Guerrero, 1998). This study intends to encourage the application of peer revision in the Turkish higher educational system. Therefore, the primary purpose of this study is to find out whether or not peer revision may contribute to the growth of writing skills of L2 students entering Turkish universities where they are taking preparatory English classes.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the overall purpose and background of the study. In this chapter, the topic was introduced, and the background of the study, and the statement of the problem were discussed. Research questions were outlined and the significance of the study was presented.

In chapter two, the literature relevant to the topic will be discussed.

Definitions of the Key Terms

Feedback: Reaction to a process or activity, or the information obtained from such a reaction.

Revising: Making changes in a text on the basis of peer feedback, teacher commentary or individual reflection.

Reviewing: Providing comments on written texts.

Rewriting: Writing texts again according to peer and/or teacher feedback and/or individual writer reviewing.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In the second language literature there are many studies related to types of feedback, how feedback should be done, what learners' reactions are towards a certain types of feedback and what second language teachers' perceptions are of certain types of feedback. Studies, as well, report on how to provide the most useful responses to student writing (Zamel, 1985; Hedgcock and Lefkowitz, 1994; Ferris et al., 1997; Hyland, 1998; Conrad and Goldstein, 1999; Hyland and Hyland, 2001; Lee, 2004; Goldstein, 2004).

Feedback is an important part of second language writing. Feedback has “a potential to support the teaching environment”. It is also seen as “informational” and “advice to facilitate improvements” (Hyland and Hyland, 2001). There are different types of feedback. These are teacher feedback, peer revision and self-editing, which need to be either oral or written.

This study explores the effectiveness of peer revision as a type of feedback on writing. The purpose is to find out whether peer revision might be applied as a complement to teacher feedback in second language classrooms. In spite of the increasing emphasis on the application of peer revision as another type of feedback, teacher feedback is still the central form of feedback (Hyland, 2003). Thus, general role

of feedback in L2 writing, emphasizing especially teacher feedback, will first be discussed as the main type of feedback which has been used over the years. Additionally, as peer revision involves learner-learner interaction, this will be discussed as well. This will follow the discussion of the literature on peer revision. Last, think-aloud protocol will be presented generally as it is used in this study.

Teacher Feedback

Teacher feedback is the main type of feedback applied in the second language classrooms. I review teacher feedback to introduce the dimensions of writing feedback, in general, before proceeding to consider student feedback. Knowing pros and cons of teacher feedback can pre-shadow what aspects of peer feedback might be possible as well as problematical. This section discusses the characteristics of teacher feedback, effectiveness of teacher feedback, students' and teachers' attitudes towards teacher feedback, and presents the arguments about whether it is teachers' or students' job to provide the feedback.

Responding to student writing can be time-consuming and difficult as teachers have the concern to provide quality feedback to each student (Ferris et al., 1997). Sommers (1982, as cited in Zamel, 1985) states that teachers spend at least 20 to 40 minutes to comment on an individual paper. Although there is little empirical evidence, anecdotal evidence suggests that teachers invest a large amount of their instructional as well as out-of-class time to respond to their students' writing (Zamel, 1985). The role of

written feedback has mostly been considered as ‘informational’ and as a means of advice to foster improvement (Hyland and Hyland, 2001).

The first category of this section discusses the efficacy of teacher feedback. Ferris et al. (1997) mention the following as the characteristics of the teacher written feedback:

1. It allows for a level of individualized attention.
2. It allows for one-on-one communication that is rarely possible in the day-to-day operations of a class.
3. It plays an important role in motivating and encouraging students.

Likewise, Leki (1990, p. 58, as cited in Ferris et al, 1997) states that “ writing teachers and students alike do intuit that written responses can have a great effect on student writing and attitude toward writing”.

In their paper, Ferris et al. (1997) examine the practical aims and the linguistic forms of teacher-written commentary. In their study, they examined 1500 teacher comments by one teacher on a sample of 111 essay first drafts by 47 advanced ESL students. They found that the teacher changed her responding strategies over the two semesters and she provided different types of commentary on various genres of writing assignments. The amount of feedback decreased as the term progressed and she responded differently to students of different ability. What is important in their paper regarding the efficacy of teacher feedback is the form of it. Studies conducted on teacher-written commentary suggest that students may have difficulty in responding to teacher feedback (Cohen 1987; Ferris, 1995b; Leki, 1990, as cited in Ferris, 1997). It may be challenging for students to understand the terminology, symbols and even the

handwriting of the teacher. Another research study on teacher commentary style was conducted by Zamel (1985). The results of her study suggest that teachers make similar type of comments, and, the marks and comments are often confusing, arbitrary and inaccessible.

With a view that teacher feedback is both desirable and helpful, Goldstein (2004) also studied teachers' commentary style. Goldstein states that in interviews, teachers express concerns about how to comment so that students can effectively revise their texts. Goldstein (2004) further suggests that teachers need to approach every class with the expectation that students do not already know "the philosophies underlying" their comments. Therefore she suggests that teachers educate their students about their commentary practices and increase their ability to revise with the help of their comments.

Although teacher written feedback has been used for a long time in the second language classroom, the studies contributing to the literature yield conflicting results in terms of its effectiveness (e.g. Ferris, 1997b; Lee, 2004). Teachers expect their feedback to be effective. The fact that teacher feedback may sometimes fail has got to do with students' attitudes towards feedback as well as the individual nature of teacher feedback.

In this section students' attitudes towards teacher feedback are considered. Students' attitudes affect the success of any instruction, including teacher feedback to writing revision. As well as confusions about teacher's commentary style, there are other reasons for unsuccessful response to teacher feedback on the part of students. Some of these reasons are summarized below (from Goldstein, 2004, p.71):

1. Lacking the willingness to critically examine one's point of view (Conrad and Goldstein, 1999),
2. Feeling that the teacher feedback is incorrect (Dessner, 1991; Goldstein and Kohls, 2002),
3. Lacking the time to do the revisions (Conrad and Goldstein, 1999; Goldstein and Kohls, 2002; Pratt, 1999);
4. Lacking the content knowledge to do the revision (Goldstein and Conrad, 1999),
5. Feeling that the feedback is not reasonable (Anglada, 1995),
6. Lacking the motivation to revise (Pratt, 1999),
7. Being resistant to revision suggestions (Enginarlar, 1993; Radecki and Swales, 1988),
8. Feeling distrustful of the teacher's content knowledge (Pratt, 1999),
9. Mismatches between the teacher's responding behaviours and the students' needs and desires (Hyland, 1998).

In sum, teacher feedback may not guarantee successful revision and an improvement in the texts. And all these reasons for unsuccessful revision may be problematical in peer revision as well.

Similarly, Conrad and Goldstein (1999) investigated, in one of their studies, the relationship between the commenting style of the teacher and the success of student revisions. In contrast to the unsuccessful revision, they give a reason for successful revision feedback:

“ESL students revise most successfully after comments that request specific information or give summary grammatical comments” (Ferris, 1997b, as cited in Conrad and Goldstein, 1999, p. 149).

According to this, learners seem to value more specific comments on the part of the teacher. More general comments may not be taken into consideration by the learners.

Likewise, students’ attitude towards teacher feedback has been studied by Lee. In her study, Lee (2004) asked the students to evaluate their own progress in writing after teacher feedback. Almost half of the students (46%) stated that they had made some progress in their writing as opposed to the 9% who claimed to have made only good progress in writing only as far as grammatical accuracy is concerned. The results of this study do not conclusively show that teacher written feedback can always guarantee substantial improvement in student papers. Another point to add to shortcomings in teacher feedback is that over half of the students (67%) said they would probably make the same errors after the teacher had corrected them.

In contrast to students’ reactions and attitudes towards teacher feedback, what teachers themselves think about their own feedback has been another concern for researchers. Lee (2004) asked teachers to evaluate the effectiveness of their error correction practices. The results are almost parallel to the numbers given above by students. Over half of the teachers said that their practices resulted in ‘some’ student progress in writing accuracy. Only 9% of the teachers believed their students were making ‘good’ progress in their writing.

Students' or teachers' responsibility for direction of writing is revision comprises the last issue of this section. Who, specifically, should do the error correction in the second language classroom has also been discussed in the literature. Lee (2004) sought in her study to learn, by surveying teachers, whether it is the teacher's job to locate errors and provide corrections for students. Over half of the teachers (60%) agreed that locating errors and providing corrections was their job. However, when the teachers were asked whether students should learn to locate and correct their errors, 99% of them believed so. Therefore, it is easy to see that teachers have internally competing views. Despite knowing the importance of students' responsibility to locate and correct their own errors, teachers are really doing the job for the students. (Lee, 2004). This point is also discussed by Seow (2002). She asserts that teachers are taking the responsibility of revising or editing instead of students, which makes the students think that nothing remains to be done on a paper any more once teachers' corrections are noted. This situation, of course, prevents the students from taking the responsibility for their own paper.

Teacher commentary, response, and feedback have long been applied; however there are some aspects of these that need to be made clearer for learners to use feedback successfully. The first one regards the fact that the style of the teacher in correcting errors could bring about some misunderstanding among students (Zamel, 1985; Goldstein, 2004) and teachers should educate students about their symbols, jargon or terminology as well as their general style of feedback (Goldstein, 2004). Teachers have to learn new skills as well. A recent study (Goldstein, 2004) showed that teachers also need to be trained for practice in error correction. Ferris (1999, as cited in Goldstein, 2004)

points out: “poorly done error correction will not help student writers and may even mislead them” (p. 4). Thus, for error correction to be more successful and beneficial, teachers need to go through teacher education courses that focus on helping teacher to cope up with the task of error correction (Goldstein, 2004).

For their error correction practice to be most effective, teachers’ awareness should be raised as to not correcting every single student error , which will possibly overwhelm students (Goldstein, 2004). This practice, as discussed above, does not encourage students to work on their papers any more after teacher correction. For teacher feedback to be successful, it is important to teach students to become independent editors. Additionally, making error correction an integral part of the writing classroom will enable students to consider error correction as important to their own writing development (Goldstein, 2004).

Teacher feedback is one type of feedback. Another type of feedback, peer revision, involves interaction between the learners. Therefore, learner-learner interaction is discussed below as this study is investigating the nature of conversation during the peer revision process.

Learner-Learner Interaction

Achieving student-centered instruction has received growing attention in the second language classroom. Student-centered instruction involves students actively in the learning process. Studies have shown that learners themselves are also capable of providing guided support to their peers during second language interactions (Donato, 1994). This “guided support” is the key component for peer revision in that there is

interaction in the peer revision activity which may result in improved written papers.

This assumption is part of the rationale for the more general “interaction hypothesis”. The interaction hypothesis states that “interactional modification makes the input more comprehensible” (Long, 1985). This makes it possible for the interacting people to realize problem areas in communication, whether that communication be in spoken or written form. The theory that underlies this position is that two learners can “negotiate for meaning” as they interact. That is, interaction is said to provide comprehensible and personalized communication on which acquisition of language is built and, as well, to provide learners with partnered feedback on ways to effectively modify language products – spoken as well as written. The core of “interactional modification” is held to be the “negotiation of meaning” between interlocutors. “Negotiation of meaning refers to the observation that when conversational exchanges are incomprehensible, interlocutors ask for clarification, repetition or confirmation of intention. It is argued that for L2 learners such negotiation provides optimal comprehensible input to the learners thereby facilitating second language development.” (Ellis 1994: 277).

The rationale for peer-assisted writing revision follows somewhat the same line, considering a writer’s composition to be the focus of “negotiation of meaning” between the reader and the writer, both trying to improve the way that the text is formed and understood. The same benefits that come from conversational interaction focusing on negotiation of meaning would be expected to be true of a reader and writer’s interaction about revision of the writer’s essay.

Some skeptics have given the opinion that L2 learners are unlikely to give feedback that L2 writers are likely to accept as correct and useful. Similar concerns have been raised about communicative language teaching in regards to the adequacy of L2 learners to engage in “negotiation of meaning” in ways that are collaborative in style and “correct” in form. Several research studies (e.g. Porter, 1986) offer data that “contradicts the notion that other learners are not good conversational partners because they can’t provide accurate input when it is solicited” (Porter, 1986). The Porter study has been supported by other interaction studies which found that L2 partners were reliable and accurate providers of language and topical commentary.

Regarding interactive feedback, negotiation can occur on form as well as meaning. With negotiation of form, learners try to replace a non-target output by a target-like output (Lyster, 1999). Negotiating the form, learners can both talk about the piece of language (e.g. passive voice) and use the target language. Thus, learners can talk about the second language in the second language. While peers review each other’s written texts, negotiation of form can develop the written language as well as develop the spoken language as written language form is discussed orally.

Learner-learner interaction has a socially important place in the second language classroom as well. This importance stems from learning as being a social phenomenon (Lave, 1988, as cited in Donato, 1994). Donato (1994) conducted a study to find out whether social interactions in the classroom result in second language development. He based his study on the notion of “scaffolding”. Scaffolding is derived as a metaphor from building construction when an external scaffold structure to the building is raised to

support builders in their work. The term first appeared in applied linguistics in Hatch's (1978, as cited in Donato, 1994) early research on second language interaction. The Donato study (1994) concluded that learners are capable of giving effective support (scaffolding) for each other during their L2 interactions. It has also been observed that scaffolding may result in linguistic development in both parties in the scaffolding.

The nature and effectiveness of scaffolding, which is the base for Donato study, is defined (Greenfield, 1984; Wood et al., 1976, as cited in Donato, 1994) as a situation where a knowledgeable participant can create supportive conditions in which the novice can participate, and extend his or her current skills and knowledge to higher levels of competence. Wood et al. (1976) underline six features of scaffolded help:

1. recruiting interest in the task,
2. simplifying the task,
3. maintaining pursuit of the goal,
4. marking critical features and discrepancies between what has been produced and the ideal solution.
5. controlling frustration during problem solving, and
6. demonstrating an idealized version of the act to be performed.

The notion of scaffolding mentions “novice” and “expert”. As far as learner-learner interaction is concerned, one of the questions this study addresses is whether other “novices” are capable or can be trained to give such support to fellow novices.

Wood et al. (1976) conclude that scaffolding is a means of developing language by

means of interaction. As peer revision is conducted through face to face interaction, scaffolding may be helpful a helpful lens through which to look at the potential of peer revision to improve learners in terms of their second writing and general language skills.

Another study on learner-learner interaction based on the concept of scaffolding was conducted by Takahashi (1998, as cited in Donato, 2000). He sought to learn if students' utterances improved over time in peer interaction. Takahashi indicated that students progressed in their language learning and through collaboration and became better able to provide mutual assistance during classroom activities.

The above-mentioned studies and their results argue that interaction is a key component for language development. In sum, interaction may enable learners

1. to provide guided support to each other.
2. to develop their second language.
3. to consider themselves as sources of information as "knowledgeable others" like the teachers.

These conclusions argue that "interaction integrated peer revision" has a potential for learners to help each other. The relevant literature in peer revision is discussed below.

Peer Revision

Reid (1994) stated that how to develop students' writing abilities and improve the quality of their texts is the main concern of composition teachers. Responding to students' texts is central to the successful teaching and learning of writing. The idea of

students receiving feedback on their writing from their peers has been developed from L1 classes and has become an important part of types of response in second language classrooms (Kroll, 2001; Hyland, 2003). Peer revision as a type of responding to students' texts has enjoyed solid theoretical and empirical support in studies conducted by Mendonça and Johnson (1994), Villamil and Guerrero (1998) and Berg (1999).

A definition and defense of peer revision comes from Kroll (2001, p. 228):

“Many ESL/EFL teachers embraced the idea of having students read and/or listen to each other's papers for the purpose of providing feedback and input to each other as well as helping each other gain a sense of audience”. Thus, through peer revision, students become a mutual readers for each other in an attempt to technically improve their papers, and peer feedback helps learner writer become more sensitive to audience in the process of writing.

Peer revision may provide a way of developing the students' drafts as well as improving their understanding of effective communication in both conversation and written expression (Hyland, 2003). Potential advantages of peer revision (Tsui and Ng, 2000; Hyland, 2003) to both writer and peer commentator have been considered by Hyland (2003, p. 199). These advantages include:

- a) Active learner participation.
- b) Authentic communicative context: peer revision is implemented in pair work which creates an environment for students to discuss and share ideas.

- c) Nonjudgmental environment: the purpose of peer revision is that students try to discuss and improve each other's papers rather than judge each other's deficiencies.
- d) Alternative and authentic audience: in peer revision, students become active readers of each other's work.
- e) Writers gain understanding of reader needs: as students carry out the role of a reader, they can realize what their readers could anticipate for their own papers.
- f) Reduced apprehension about reading.
- g) Development of critical reading skills: as students read each other's papers while commenting, their reading skills as well as their ability to critique improve.
- h) Reduces teacher's workload: as students work in groups during peer revision, teacher workload is reduced. Peer revision may require training; however, the time training will take will not be as much as the teacher giving quality feedback to every student.

Thus, the collaborative learning included in peer revision gives learners an opportunity for participation, communication, and developing confidence as both reader and writer. In sum, these commentaries have sought to provide pedagogical justification for peer revision (Hyland, 2003; Tsui and Ng, 2000).

Tsui and Ng (2000, p. 148-149) also consider the rationale of peer revision effectiveness. As preface to their own study of the effectiveness and acceptance of peer revision, Tsui and Ng review the literature on peer revision research. They summarize that research as follows:

- a) Peer revision is pitched more at the learner's level of development or interest and is therefore more informative than teacher feedback;
- b) It enhances audience awareness and enables the writer to evolve from an egocentric perspective to a more "other aware stance" in his or her writing;
- c) Learners' attitudes towards writing can be encouraged with the help of supportive peers, and thus their performance for teacher apprehension can be lowered;
- d) Learners can learn more about their own writing and revision by reading each others' drafts critically and responding to these;
- e) Learners are encouraged to assume more responsibility for their writing.

These views suggest that peer revision has potential to inform, teach writing and make learners more experienced in writing as they take on new roles..

Although many studies have been conducted which support the efficacy of peer revision, it is inevitable to mention the conflicting findings of parallel studies as well. While the majority of these studies support, at least in part, the contention that peer revision is an effective way of providing feedback in English as a Second Language writing classrooms, some of them yield results questioning the impact of peer revision on L2 writing.

These positive and negative studies will be discussed in two categories. One category deals with peer revision as a separate form of feedback; the other category focuses on comparison of peer revision, teacher feedback and self-revision.

One of the recent studies in the former category is was conducted by Villamil and Guerrero (1998). In this study, their question is whether measurable positive effects of peer revision support its continuous use in the classroom. Their study seeks to investigate the impact of peer revision on L2 learners' final drafts. They asked how revisions made in peer sessions were incorporated by writers into their final versions and, specifically, how trouble issues were revised in regard to different language aspects (i.e. content,

organization, grammar, vocabulary and, mechanics).

The sample group of 14 intermediate Spanish ESL students was enrolled in a course aimed at developing the writing abilities of the students. In the study these students were exposed to two different text types, narration and persuasion. Students worked in pairs to revise each other's papers and then rewrite them according to peer suggestions. In their study, Villamil and Guerrero (1998) found the following (p. 508):

1. The majority of revisions made during the peer revision were incorporated by the learners into their final drafts.
2. Students focused mainly on grammar and content while revising in the narrative mode and on grammar in the persuasive mode.
3. Grammar was the most revised aspect whereas organization was the least revised one.
4. Most final drafts increased in length, with a higher increase in the narrative mode than in the persuasive mode.

In the light of these findings, Villamil and Guerrero state that peer assistance has a considerable effect on revising because the majority of the trouble issues were revised during peer interaction and were incorporated into learners' final drafts. If the participant do not benefit from peer assistance, the revisions in the final draft would not be so high. As a conclusion, Villamil and Guerrero argue convincingly that peer revision can help L2 intermediate learners realize their potential for effective revision. They conclude that peer revision should be seen as a complementary source of feedback in the ESL writing classroom.

Another study that yielded results in favor of peer revision is the one conducted by Mendonça and Johnson (1994). Mendonça and Johnson stated that little is known about the nature of the face to face interaction between peers, and they wanted to find out

how students use peer feedback to revise their texts. Their study aimed at describing the negotiations taking place during ESL students' peer revision and the ways these negotiations shaped students' revision activities. Through their study, Mendonça and Johnson sought how students interacted during peer revision, how students made use of their peers' comments in their revision activities, and what the perceptions of students are about the usefulness of peer revision.

Their subjects were graduate students enrolled in a writing class. They audiorecorded peer review negotiations, compared the first and final drafts and conducted postinterviews. Mendonça and Johnson characterized peer interaction in their study as: “students asked questions, offered explanations, gave suggestions, restated what their peer had written or said, and corrected grammar mistakes” (p. 745). As a result of their study, Mendonça and Johnson claim that the suggestions and explanations offered during the peer revision allowed students to show what they knew about writing and to use that information in their revisions. Also, students' questions seemed to have helped writers see what learners found unclear in their essays. Mendonça and Johnson hold that peer revision enhances students' communication ability by encouraging students to express and negotiate their ideas. They summarize that, overall, students found peer revision very useful. Finally, Mendonça and Johnson conclude that teachers should provide L2 students with opportunities to talk about their essays with their peers, as peer reviews seem to allow students to explore and negotiate their ideas as well as to develop a sense of audience, which means peers represent potential readers for each other's texts. In sum,

this study supports the claim that peer revision is a valuable form of feedback in L2 writing instruction.

Making the peer revision process more effective is also studied in literature. Some studies try to find out whether training students has a positive effect on students' attitudes as well as making the peer revision process more understandable and useful to students. Stanley (1992) emphasizes the importance of training students to make the peer revision process more effective. He found that training students on peer evaluation helped improve implementation of peer revision in three ways (p. 747):

1. With pre-training on peer revision, L2 students are engaged in the revision task more.
2. As a result of coaching, L2 learners get into more effective communication about their peers.
3. Training for peer revision enables L2 learners to make clearer suggestions for revisions.

Therefore, in Stanley's opinion, student training in the process of peer revision is important in that it makes the process fruitful more in terms of more engagement, better communication and clearer comments.

While Stanley's study suggests training for peer revision, Freedman (1987, as cited in Mendonça and Johnson, 1994) questions the control of the teacher over the peer revision process. Freedman found that when teacher assigned more peer editing sheets, students allocated more time for editing sheets instead of allocating time to interaction with their peers. Thus, students turned out to be engaged in teacher demands more rather than the interaction itself. Concerning the teacher control over peer interaction, DiPardo and Freedman (1988) state that what teachers expect for their students' written texts can influence the interactions between peers. They state that the extent of teacher control over

the peer interactions may affect the nature of these peer interactions as well as students' revising activities.

The above-mentioned studies and conclusions suggest that peer revision is an effective type of feedback. However, there are also studies questioning the impact of peer revision. These studies mostly compare peer revision with teacher feedback. The study by Tsui and Ng (2000) consider the roles of teacher comments and peer comments in revision writing. They conducted their study with 27 students in a secondary school in Hong Kong that uses English as a medium of instruction. In this study they sought whether peer and teacher comments facilitate revision, whether teacher comments facilitate more revisions than peer comments, and the roles of peer and teacher comments in stimulating students to make revisions in their writing.

They conducted questionnaires and interviews as well as comparing original and revised drafts. Tsui and Ng found that while some learners made use of high percentages of both teacher and peer comments, some used higher percentages of teacher comments and others used very low percentages of peer comments. In fact, teacher comments were favored by most students and encouraged more revisions. In the study, they discuss the value of teacher comments. The students' idea about teacher comments is that (p. 166):

1. Teacher is considered more experienced and more authoritative.
2. Teacher comments are considered to be of better quality.
3. Teacher comments are more specific.
4. Teachers are able to explain what the problems are.
5. Teachers are able to make concrete suggestions for revision.

In the study, only those who made use of very low percentages of peer comments dismissed peer comments as not useful. Interviews with the students about their views of peer revision yielded their positive attitudes towards the peer revision process and four roles of peer comments were identified (p. 147):

“Peer comments enhance a sense of audience. They raise learners’ awareness of their own writing strengths and weaknesses. Peer interaction encourages collaborative learning. Responding in peer feedback fosters greater sense of text ownership”.

These results are linked to the results from Tsui and Ng study cited previously. As other studies suggest (Villamil and Guerrero, 1996), peer revision is considered a useful adjunct to teacher feedback. Thus, it is possible to combine teacher feedback and peer revision as both yielded positive results in Tsui and Ng study.

Zhang (1995) also compared students’ preference for peer feedback vs teacher feedback. His subject was eighty-one ESL learners. Conducting a questionnaire to get students’ perceptions, Zhang found that peer revision was not a preferred type of feedback for this ESL group of subjects.

Peer revision may not be a preferred type of feedback because of lack of confidence in each other’s L2 competence and capacity to be good judges of writing. However, as suggested above, training learners may prove useful to prevent this shortcoming.

The comparison of teacher feedback and peer revision was studied by Hedgcock and Lefkowitz as well. They focus on the writing classroom and the types and use of

feedback. In one of their studies (1992, as cited in Villamil and Guerrero, 1998) they dealt primarily with how students make use of peer revision. As a result, one group of students who received teacher feedback paid attention to grammatical accuracy more, while the other, students engaged in peer revision, made more changes in the content and the organization.

Thus, peer revision may not guarantee that writing develops in all aspects. What improves in writing may be affected by the type and the source of feedback.

Regarding the comparison of teacher feedback and peer revision, it is important to stress the finding that while students compared peer revision to teacher feedback negatively, they were largely in favor of both kinds of feedback (e.g. Tsui and Ng, 2000). This raises the question of the value of peer comments and whether they have a role to play in L2 writing. Jacobs et al. (1998) argue that studies that force students to make a choice between peer comments and teacher comments are misguided because peer and teacher comments should not be mutually exclusive. Their questionnaire survey of 121 L2 undergraduates found that 93 percent of students preferred to have peer feedback as one type of feedback on their writing. This suggests that when students were not forced to make a choice, they welcomed both peer and teacher comments. Similarly, Caulk (1994), in a comparison of L2 written peer responses, teacher comments, and students' self-analysis of their own papers, found that 89 percent of students were able to give advice considered valid by the teacher and 60 percent made appropriate suggestions not mentioned by the teacher. They also made more specific and localized comments than the

teacher. The study suggests that peer comments may well complement the role that teacher comments play in revision.

Today's trend in the ESL writing classroom for peer revision could be a result of the changing perception of L2 writing classroom. Tsui and Ng (2000) state that the writing classroom is no longer controlled by the absolute power of the teacher. Likewise, Silva (1990, p. 15, as cited in Tsui and Ng, 2000) claims that "the writing classroom is a positive, encouraging, and collaborative workshop environment within which students...can work through their composing processes". Thus, in Tsui and Ng's opinion what characterizes L2 writing classroom today is that (2000, p. 168):

"The writing teacher is no longer engaged in assessing his/her learners' writing, but in negotiating meaning and collaborating with learners to clarify and voice their thinking, emotions, and argumentation as well as helping them to develop strategies for generating ideas, revising and, editing".

The studies discussed above bring out the idea of preparation of students for the peer revision process. For teachers who would like to try peer revision in their classes, it is necessary to prepare students for this process. This preparation motivates students for more engagement in the revision task, more effective communication with each other and clearer suggestions for revision. In support of Stanley's argument of "training for peer revision", Tsui and Ng (2000, p. 168) make two suggestions to teachers who use peer feedback in ELT writing classroom:

1. The use of written comments as the only means of providing feedback to peers may not be sufficient and could also be too demanding for L2 learners.

Opportunities should be provided for learners to discuss the revisions orally.

This suggestion supports the argument discussed in the abovementioned study of Mendonça and Johnson that students' expressing and negotiating ideas also enhances students' general communicative power, also.

2. Since some L2 learners are skeptical about getting feedback from their peers, the teacher should stress that:

-responding to peers' writings is a learning process for all participants.

-peer revision will raise peer awareness about their own written texts.

-peers will be more aware of what constitutes good and poor writing, effective and ineffective writing.

-peer revision will make writers' texts more reader-friendly.

These assumptions are important in terms of both characterizing peer revision and learning to use it. The second above-mentioned suggestion for teachers outlines how the peer revision process contributes to the L2 writing classroom in terms of developing the overall writing ability of the students, improving the quality of L2 learners' written texts as well as informing them about the process itself and its benefits.

The nature of peer revision provides the opportunity to discuss revisions orally. Oral discussion is the basis for this study. The purpose of this study is to learn whether this oral discussion may result in increase in the quality of the text as well as the process of discussing and revising texts. In the third chapter, the methodology designed to gather

data is described thoroughly. Think-aloud protocols (TAPs) are used in this study to collect data on individual revision, thus, TAPs are discussed generally below. The benefits of TAPs in the present study are discussed in detail in the methodology chapter.

Think-Aloud Protocol (TAP)

Investigating the effectiveness of peer revision, this study compared the peer revision process and the individual revision process as well. Individual revision process was implemented through TAPs. Students were asked to review their own papers by thinking aloud and later rewrite their papers. TAPs helped to provide a more controlled way of comparison both in terms of processes, which is between the peer revision process and the individual revision process; and in terms of product, that is between the papers rewritten after the peer revision process and the ones rewritten after the individual revision process. The benefits of using TAPs in this study are discussed in the third chapter. In the present chapter, TAP is discussed generally.

There are advantages of implementing the TAPs: (Ericsson and Simon, 1980; retrieved from <http://www.niar.wichita.edu>):

- "1) Think-aloud" protocol has an advantage over simple observation as evaluator may gain valuable insights into what the participant is thinking on the spot."
- 2) There would be less discrepancy in the verbal response of the participant and what he or she actually thinks, as the participant does not need to recall from long-term memory events that have taken place earlier."

As well as the advantages of implementing TAPs, there may be limitations of it:

“1) Verbal protocol methods including "Think-Aloud Protocol" are designed to tap into certain types of thinking but not all.” This means that it is difficult to see the exactly what stimulates the task doer to think so”.

2) Pure "Think-Aloud Protocol" may not help evaluator gather sufficient information to diagnose a problem without the use of probing.”

3) Think-Aloud" may modify the way participants perform their task as participants may feel uneasy hearing their own voices throughout the whole process.”

4) In view of the limitations, "Think-Aloud Protocol" has evolved over the years and probing is now commonly used to gather more information from participants although probing may influence the reliability of the verbal protocol. Ericsson and Simon (1984, <http://www.niar.edu>) recommend that additional information should be collected in the form of retrospective reports after the task to avoid any interruptions of task flow. "Think-Aloud Protocol" is often used with other methodologies to gather more in depth response from participants.”

Retrospective reports are collected not to interrupt the process. If the task doer is asked questions doing the task, this may break the concentration and affect the process.

In the implementation of the think-aloud protocol, there are specific guidelines to follow for the evaluator to be successful (retrieved from <http://www.niar.wichita.edu>) :

“1) First, a "Think-Aloud Protocol" can only be useful if you begin by determining a purpose. Specifies the task (this can be more than one) the participant need to accomplish during the session. Make sure participant understand what is to be done before proceeding.

2) Make it clear to the participant that it is not the participant but the learning system, which is being evaluated.”

This means that the participant may feel uneasy think that he/she is the one who is evaluated. However, the observer should tell participants that what is evaluated and observed is the “verbalization of thoughts” and “what is going on in the mind.”

“3) Ask the participant to "think-aloud" while attempting the task so that you can understand what he or she is thinking about. Often it is useful to give an example of what you mean by this.

4) Then proceed with the task.

5) While the task is being attempted, it is important to let the participant talk and to listen very attentively to what is being said.

Intervene only in cases of extreme duress (e.g. if the participant is completely stuck and has given up) or if you need to remind the participant to think-aloud.

6) After the participant has accomplished the specified task (or has given up), you should take a few moments to ask the participant to summarize his or her difficulties with the task and to give you any additional comments.”

In the present study, it was made sure that the participants understood the task before proceeding. They were told that they needed to “think aloud” not talk. After the performance, they were all asked what they felt and whether they found the task difficult.

Gass and Mackey (2000) asserts that think-aloud protocol is important in the context of second language research because what often occurs is that the reasoning behind learners’ written or spoken data is inferred by examining only the production data. In second language research it is problematic to understand the source of second language productions because there are multiple explanations for the observed production (Gass and Mackey, 2000). This means that there may be several reasons for the task performer to produce certain words. However, think-aloud protocol may help to infer the mental process during these speech productions.

Verbal reports including TAP, talk aloud protocol (“where the information is already linguistically encoded and can be directly stated”, Brown and Rodgers, 2002, p. 55) and retrospective studies, have been used in some of the areas related to writing like outlining a composition, writing text to cues, peer editing, and their results were found

fruitful (Brown and Rodgers, 2002).

Despite extensive use of TAPs in writing research (e.g. Brice, 1995; Cohen and Cavalcanti, 1987; Cohen and Cavalcanti, 1990; Jones and Tetroe, 1987; Lay, 1982; Raimes, 1985, Skibniewski, 1990; Swain and Lapkin, 1995; Vignola, 1995; Villamil and Guerrero, 1998, as cited in Gass and Mackey, 2000), no research studies using TAPs were found in examination of peer revision of student writing.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the theories and related studies dedicated to peer writing revision. First, forms of teacher feedback were discussed as a principal kind of feedback. Then, learner-learner interaction was discussed in the context of classroom interaction during the process of revision. Additionally, relevant studies on peer revision were discussed. Last, TAP was introduced generally. The next chapter will be focusing on the methodology of this study including discussion of the sample group included in the study, instruments used to collect the data, data collection procedure, and data analysis.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Overview of the study

The overall aim of this study is to determine the effectiveness and characteristics of peer revision as an aid to teacher feedback. This study refers to effectiveness as the potential of peer revision to improve the quality of writing. There have been many studies conducted on peer revision. Several key studies were reviewed in the previous chapter.

There are justifications for further studies for several reasons:

1. There are conflicting results among previous studies. While some of the studies previously conducted constitute empirical confirmation that peer revision plays an important role in the second language class, other studies still question the effectiveness of peer revision.

2. Little information exists on what types of negotiation occur between peers. Peer revision has been suggested as a beneficial process in the second language classroom in some studies; however, most of these studies do not investigate how students interact in reviewing each others' written texts. This study intends to shed light upon what kind of interactive negotiation occurs between peers during the peer revision process.

3. Skepticism about learners' capacity to help other learners. Although peer revision has enjoyed some reputation in terms of its benefits in the ELT domain, there is still

some concern whether learners' can make useful comments to each other. This skepticism comes from the fact that students are learners themselves, and may not be knowledgeable enough to review each other's texts.

These reasons suggest that there is still need for conducting new studies on peer revision. To be able to fill these gaps in the literature, this study will address the following research questions:

1. How do peers interact during peer revision?
2. In what way do revision suggestions contribute to the improvement of the quality of the revised texts?
3. In what way do students' revision proposals for their peers' texts differ from students' individual revision plans for their own texts?

This chapter on methodology gives information about the sample group used in the study, the instruments that were adopted to gather the data, the procedure used to collect the data, and finally the data analysis, describing what was done with the data collected.

Participants

An interventional study was designed for 10 English as Second Language learners enrolled in an Advanced Composition class at Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. They were in the Department of English Language Teaching. The backgrounds of the participants were the same; they are graduates of teacher training high schools. Thus, their level of English was relatively advanced. All the participants in the study

were by chance female students. They were selected randomly from an intact class in session at the time of the study. Individual students were asked randomly whether they were willing to cooperate. All were. There were 22 students in the class. All students participated; however, the interactions of 10 students were recorded as there were not enough tape recorders.

Instruments

The data were collected through text comparisons, audio recordings of peer revision processes, and think-aloud protocols. A revision checklist (Appendix A) was distributed to the participants to constitute a framework during the revision processes both in peer revision and the individual revision (think-aloud protocol). The use of checklist ensured parallel and reasonably comparable data. The checklist was adopted from Seow (2002) by combining two different revision checklists. The researcher added some items as well. The focus of the checklist was on the form of writing. It consisted of questions on the categories that this study used to examine (vocabulary, grammar, spelling, punctuation, morphology, syntax, correlation of ideas, prepositions, and organization). Since one of the intentions of this study is to create topics that the reviewer and writer could engage in discussion about and since these categories are lively topics in student-student interaction as formal aspects which the students feel confident about, they were included in the study. Some of these questions in the checklist were “what” questions rather than yes or no to motivate the students to talk. Tape recorders were also used to record the revision processes.

The following lists describe the chronological steps in briefing participants, collecting and analyzing data:

Steps that the 10 readers and the writers went through for the peer revision process: (repeated twice at different times with a new writing assignment)

- Teacher gives a writing assignment, argumentative essay (in class)
- Learner 1(L1) picks a topic (in class/ at home)
- L1 writes an essay (at home)
- Researcher provides guidelines and explain the process (in class)
- Learner 2 (L2) reads L1's essay (in class)
- L2 responds L1's assignment by taking notes on the essay and the checklist (in class)
- L1-L2 interact to revise L1's writing (in class, tape recorded)
- L1 rewrites the assignment (at home)
- L1 gives the first draft and the second draft of the assignment and the checklist to the researcher later.

Steps that 4 writers went through for the individual revision process:

- Teacher gives a new writing assignment, argumentative essay (in class)
- Learner (L) picks a topic (in class/ at home)
- L writes an essay (at home)
- Researcher provides guidelines and explain the process
- L comments on her own assignment by thinking aloud (tape recorded)

- L rewrites the assignment (at home)
- L gives the first draft and the second draft of the assignment and the checklist to the researcher later.

The steps that the researcher went through to analyze the data:

- Transcribed recorded peer revision process
- Compared the first drafts written before the peer revision and final drafts written after the peer revision,
- Compared first drafts written before the think-aloud and final drafts written after the think-aloud,
- Compared the final drafts written after the peer revision and the ones written after the think-aloud,
- Compared the peer interaction process and think-aloud protocol process.

Below, the methodology of studying peer interaction will be discussed. This will be followed by a discussion of using think-aloud protocols and their analysis.

The methodology for studying the peer revision process was adopted from the literature (e.g. Villamil and Guerrero, 1998; Paulus, 1999; Berg, 1999; Connor and Asenavage, 1994; Mendonça and Johnson, 1994). The process of peer revision involves students reading each other's papers and then making comments on these to each other. After this discussion, writers rewrite their papers individually according to their reactions to the peer comments. Audio recording of the peer revision process makes the study more

controlled in that it is relatively easy to listen to the comments on the tape and then find the revised part of the paper while comparing the first and final drafts. Studying this process requires the peer discussion to be audio taped and the first and the final drafts to be compared.

To familiarize them with the process, students were given instructions and guidelines before the implementation of peer revision process. The researcher explained the process, the steps of peer revision, and the points to be commented on. The process was then simulated. This took about ten minutes. The essays were written at home; thus students came to class prepared with essays. The type of essay was argumentative in both the first peer revision stage and the second one. Argumentative essays were the focus for this advanced composition class for about three weeks before the study. In this respect, the study was designed to fit the regular composition curriculum. Students had choice of topic. The subjects that the students wrote about in their essays showed variety. There were topics such as “euthanasia” and “the death penalty”.

One of the intentions of this study was to compare the peer revision process with an individual revision processes. Therefore, the researcher decided to implement think-aloud protocols (TAPs). Gass and Mackey (2000) define a think-aloud as “the vocalization of silent speech”. Silent speech refers to “the thoughts” of the task performers. What a certain participant thinks during a task is thus made more concrete. It is stated that in the TAP, “individuals convert silent speech into a form that can be vocalized” (p. 11). The think-aloud protocols were implemented in this research for two

reasons. First; they provided the researcher a chance to compare the process of revising both in terms of peer revision and individual revision. Hearing users' thoughts, feelings, and rationale as recorded might yield information about their individual thinking experiences. Having information about an individual's thinking experience might be useful in terms of comparing it with the thinking experience of others. The TAPs could provide data to whether the peer revision has a broader potential for use in Turkish English prep classes. Second; it was thought that the TAPs could provide data regarding the mental processes of a learner/writer during the task of revising. Again, having evidence of these mental processes in a transcribed document would give the researcher a controlled way of analyzing and evaluating the individual self-revision and the peer revision process in terms of the general usefulness of peer revision. Additionally, instead of asking participants what they feel doing individual revision, getting participants to think-aloud for individual revision provided a more controlled way of gathering the data. Additionally, as Ericsson and Simon point out (1980), just asking participants what they recall after individual revision would be less insightful than think-alouds collected before doing final revisions.

In this study, each participant in the TAPs was asked about her feelings during the task after she completed the task. Their answers helped to focus the researcher on key elements in the verbal protocols.

Procedure

In this research, there were three stages in the gathering of the data. The first and second stages were implemented as peer revision processes and the third stage the administration of think-aloud protocols during self-revision of an essay. It took three weeks to gather the data: first week: first stage of peer revision; second week: second stage of peer revision; third week: TAPs during self-revision gathered.

There were three substages to be implemented in each of the three stages of the peer revision processes. The very first stage was an out-of-class activity. The regular teacher of the classroom asked each of the students to write a paper individually. The type of the text had been determined as argumentative essay in the class syllabus. Therefore it was not changed. The text type used in all the three cycles was ensured to be the same. In order for the students to take this seriously, teacher assigned this essay writing as homework and informed the students that this paper was going to be graded. In order not to stimulate students beforehand in thinking about what they could mention in the revision of their peers, students were not informed about having this used paper later in the peer revision process.

The second substage comprised the peer revision process in the form of learner-learner interaction completed in the classroom. Students brought to the classroom the papers they had completed at home and were randomly divided into groups of two. The researcher presumed that few students had background experience in commenting on others' writing. To familiarize the participants more with the peer revision process, they

were given instructions about the process of peer revision, the steps they were supposed to follow, what they were supposed to comment on. The process was simulated as well, exemplifying some reviewer/writer dialogues. During the oral instruction, students were given a revision checklist (Appendix A). Everything on the checklist was explained and the questions of the students were answered. Students were asked to guide their peer revision processes using these guidelines and the checklist. They were all asked to implement the process in English. After discussing the checklist, students were given instructions about how to work the tape recorders in order to ensure the successful implementation of the process. After the oral instructions, each student was asked to read his/her peer's paper and then discuss with her the form (grammar, spelling, vocabulary, morphology, syntax, correlation of ideas, organization) of his/her peer's writing in a negotiation process. This negotiation process was audiotaped.

The third substage was completed out of classroom after the peer revision process. Each student was asked to rewrite her own paper individually according to the discussion they have had with his/her peer in the second stage. They submitted the first draft and revised papers to the researcher later.

These three substages (first stage) were implemented twice for practical and methodological reasons. From a practical point it was safer for the researcher to have primary and secondary results, in that if students had some difficulties in the first revision process, these could be overcome in the second. From a methodological point of view, implementing these stages twice would be helpful in the observation of changes in learners'

language learning behavior and, particularly any changes in the interactive skills of the learners and their possible growth in using these interactions in negotiation of meanings with their partners.

The third stage consisted of TAPs conducted with the four volunteer students, implemented out of the classroom. These four students were asked by the regular teacher to write a new paper (again an argumentative essay) to be completed at home. Again, students were not informed about the future use of their papers. The researcher met the four students at scheduled times. They were asked to engage in think-aloud protocols in examination of their papers, which lasted about 15 minutes. They were given oral instructions about the implementation of a think-aloud protocol and told what they were supposed to do during the TAP, and what they were supposed to comment on. They were given a checklist to guide them on what to focus during the protocol. The same checklist used in the peer revision process was given to four students after it is written again in the second person singular. The protocol process was audio recorded. After the protocol, each of these four students chatted with the researcher and was asked to rewrite her paper recognizing the think-aloud protocol ideas she had generated. They gave the first and revised drafts as well as the checklists to the researcher later.

The research design is schematized as follows:

1ST STAGE: PEER REVISION, 10 students

- Writing assignment (argumentative essay) to be completed at home.
- Peer revision in the classroom in groups of two to discuss the form of writing (grammar, spelling, vocabulary, morphology, syntax, correlation of ideas, organization) (audiotaped)
- Students rewriting of their texts individually according to the peer suggestions

2ND STAGE: PEER REVISION, 10 students

- Writing assignment (argumentative essay) to be completed at home.
- Peer revision in the classroom in groups of two to discuss the form of writing (grammar, spelling, vocabulary, morphology, syntax, correlation of ideas, organization) (audiotaped)
- Students rewriting of their texts individually according to the peer suggestions

3RD STAGE: INDIVIDUAL REVISION, 4 students

- Writing assignment (argumentative essay) to be completed at home
 - Individual revision through TAPs concerning form of writing (audiotaped)
 - Rewriting of their texts individually according to the think-aloud protocol
-

Data analysis

The analysis of the data started by transcribing the audio-recorded peer revision activities. The audio recorded peer revision activity, taking place in the second stage in the first and second cycles, was transcribed and analyzed. The quality of peer revision was assessed through analysis of the audio recordings of these peer revisions. There is one categorized result in this step:

-Identifying the ways peers interact during peer revision

This process provided the data to answer the first research question this study investigated: How do peers interact during the peer revision process?

The second stage in the analysis was the comparison of the first and second drafts of the papers. Each student's individual paper completed at home and the one revised after the peer discussion and the think-aloud were compared to see in what way the texts had changed in terms of grammar, spelling, vocabulary, morphology, syntax, correlation of ideas, punctuation, preposition, and organization (discussed in the next chapter). According to these same categories, students' final drafts written after the peer revision and the one written after the think-aloud process were also analyzed and compared. Additionally, to be able to see what a more knowledgeable would have done in the essays, the researcher made changes in two essays (one discussed in peer revision and one reviewed individually) and compared them with the peer-proposed changes and the individual changes. Thus, there are five groups of data and results in this part of analysis:

1. Comparing the compositions written before and after the peer revision processes
2. Comparing the compositions written before and after the think-aloud processes
3. Comparing the amount and kind of text revisions done in pair as opposed to those done individually
4. Comparing researcher review and peer review
5. Comparing researcher review and individual review

This comparison provided the data to answer the second and third research questions: In what way do revision suggestions contribute to the improvement of the quality of the revised texts? In what way do students' revision proposals for their peers' texts differ from students' individual revision plans for their own texts?

The third stage in the analysis involved transcription of the think-aloud processes. Four students' audio recording of think-aloud protocols were transcribed and analyzed. This analysis of the think-aloud process was compared with the peer revision process. This comparison refers again to the third research question: In what way do students' revision proposals for their peers' texts differ from students' individual revision plans for their own texts?

In this stage, the data comes from:

-Comparing the think-aloud process and the peer revision process.

As mentioned, this study was designed to compare the first and final drafts of peer revision as well as to compare the peer revision process and the think-aloud process. Thus, this study is outcome oriented in terms of comparing the papers as well as being process-oriented in terms of comparing the peer revision process and the think-aloud process.

Conclusion

This chapter outlined an overview of the study, described the participants, and indicated the instruments used in gathering the data. Finally, the procedure section describes how the data were gathered and the steps involved in how the data were analyzed.

In chapter four, the analysis of the data will be discussed. The examples will be given from the data and the results will be outlined and then summarized.

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS

Overview of the study

The aim of this study is to find out whether peer revision might be used as an supportive strategy to complement teacher feedback on students' written texts in second language classrooms. The intention of the study is to identify the characteristics and determine the effectiveness of the peer revision process.

Peer revision has been studied widely in the second language literature. However, there are reasons to conduct a new study on peer revision. First of all, and as outlined in chapter two, although there have been studies conducted on the effectiveness of peer revision on second language writing, some of these studies question the impact of peer revision on second language writing, while others provide empirical evidence that it is an effective method. Thus, there are conflicting results among the studies which need further resolution. Second, although the studies conducted on peer revision have had the empirical evidence to suggest peer revision is an important part of writing in second language classrooms, these studies have failed to demonstrate in what way or how peers revise each other's texts. This issue also calls for closer examination. Third, there is still concern among second language researchers and teachers about the capability of peers to help each other by providing comments on each other's written texts. This is to say that

these researchers and teachers suspect that L2 students themselves are still in the process of learning, thus it may be probable that they might suggest non-target like text changes during the peer revision process. Forth, there are not many studies comparing peer revision on texts with self-revisions, which is the third research question of this study.

All these reasons contributed to the need for conducting this study. There were three questions that this study sought answers for:

1. How do peers interact during the peer revision process?
2. In what way do revision suggestions contribute to the improvement of the quality of the revised texts?
3. In what way do students' revision proposals for their peers' texts differ from students' individual revision plans for their own texts?

This chapter deals with the analysis of the data gathered. The data were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. The data were gathered from 10 participants enrolled in an advanced writing class. The researcher implemented two stages of peer revision with 10 students and, further follow-up think-aloud protocols with 4 students. Two stages of peer revision were conducted in the classroom. Students wrote their essays individually at home and they came to class prepared with these essays. They were given guidelines and instructions about the peer revision process and were distributed a checklist so that they were guided about what to comment on. After the explanations, students were put into groups of two, so that there were five groups. They were asked to exchange and read each

other's papers. After they were finished with reading, they were asked to review and comment on each others' papers according to the checklist. The process was audiotaped. After the comments, each student in the group got back her paper and rewrote it individually according to her peer's comments. After the two stages of peer revision, four volunteer students were chosen to do think-aloud protocols. In the think-aloud protocols, students were asked to review their own papers according to the same checklist used in the peer revision. After the revision, they rewrote their papers individually according to their own proposed revisions in the think-aloud protocol. The audio recorded peer revision activities and think-aloud protocols as well as the written texts of students were used in the analysis.

Data analysis

There are three parts in the data analysis:

Part 1:

Peer interaction

Identifying the ways peers interact during peer revision

(Refers to the first research question)

Part 2:

- a) Comparing the compositions written before and after the peer revisions with respect to the compositional issues (vocabulary, grammar, spelling, punctuation, morphology, syntax, correlation of ideas, prepositions, and organization)
- b) Comparing the compositions written before and after the think-aloud, self-revision process with respect to the above mentioned compositional issues
- c) Comparing the number and kind of text revisions done in pair as opposed to done individually (Refers to the second and third research question)
- d) Comparing researcher review and peer review
- e) Comparing researcher review and individual review

Part 3:

Comparing the process of think-aloud self revision and the process of the peer revision (Refers to the third research question).

Peer interaction

Identifying the ways peers interact during peer revision

This part of the data analysis sets out to answer the first research question of this study. The aim of this first part is to identify what kinds of revisions are proposed by peer reviewers. The audio-recorded portion of peer revision talk was transcribed. The whole interaction was originally carried out in English, thus no translation was needed during the transcription.

The categories for part 1 were adopted from the literature, and the researcher modified and made additions to these adopted categories as well. In this analysis a framework built by Mendonça and Johnson (1994) was used as a basis. It would be useful to mention this study again as the categories are derived from it.

The first research question in the study of Mendonça and Johnson (1994), (What types of negotiations do L2 students engage in during peer revision?) explores the types of negotiation between peers. This is the same question this study is examining,, thus their categories for describing the negotiation constitutes a basis for this first part of analysis.

The following categories were derived from above mentioned Mendonça and Johnson study. Request for explanation, Explanation and Suggestion were adopted from their study. Explanation of a mechanical point and error correction were added by the researcher as the data yielded this kind of examples.

After adapting the Mendonça and Johnson study, the researcher identified the types of negotiations occurring during the peer revision process according to the following categories:

1. Request for explanation: Reviewers try to get further explanation of what writers have said or what is not clear to them in the essays. This request can be either an explicit question or a statement saying that something is not clear (from Mendonça and Johnson, 1994, p. 769).

2. Explanation

Of an unclear point: Writers explain the meaning of a term or idea that is not clear to reviewers (from Mendonça and Johnson, 1994, p. 769).

Of opinion: Reviewers or writers explain why they think a given term or idea is not clear and should be or should not be used in the essays (from Mendonça and Johnson, 1994, p. 769).

Of content: Writers explain the subject of their essay to reviewers (from Mendonça and Johnson, 1994, p. 769).

Of a mechanical point: Writers or reviewers explain a grammatical issue, why a certain pattern should be used or should not be used.

3. Suggestion: Reviewers or wilters suggest ways to change the words, content, and organization of essays (from Mendonça and Johnson, 1994, p. 769).

4. Error correction: In the present study, the word “error” was used to refer to wrong language structures. However, regarding spelling, “mistake” is used with no aim of differentiating between “error” and “mistake” but this is the usual usage. Reviewers directly correct wrong grammatical structures or language items in the essays.

Here are the examples from the data (APPENDIX D, transcription conventions).

The categories are first interpreted and then exemplified:

1. Request for explanation (RE):

Request for explanation was in the form of question that the reviewers used in peer interaction. While requesting explanation, reviewers stated that they did not

understand, or they asked for clarification of a point that they could not understand. Or they requested explanation clearly by saying “Can you explain it to me?” Another form for request for explanation was asking questions directly from the essay.

In the example below, the reviewer asks what the writer meant by using “so called” and the writer explains it:

Transcript 1; peer revision

Reviewer: here again, *maybe it is vocabulary which I could not understand.*
(RE) *maybe you can explain to me. So called benefits. Have you referred to the political and social reasons here **(RE)**...by saying “so called”?*

Writer: no...”so called” is a word that we use for the things we do not believe actually...here I say “so called benefits”...I think that there are no benefits actually...but other people think that there are benefits

Reviewer: ok...now it is more clear for me.

In some cases, reviewers avoided directly making a comment on their peers’ papers. Before making a comment they asked these common questions:

-Can you explain it?

-I couldn’t understand.

This may be for two reasons:

-First of all, students may lack confidence, thus they would like to request an explanation from their partner to have further information.

-Second, they just ask questions to generate conversation.

The same commenting style formulated above is used in the second and the third examples below.

In the example below the writer tries to define “specifically”, as the reader states she doesn’t understand it:

Transcript 2; peer revision

Reviewer: here I am reading the sentence...there must be reliable scientific researchers on this issue specifically... *I do not understand “specifically” in this sentence (RE)*

Writer: by “specific” I meant actually...it is very easy but...

Reviewer: specifically on this issue you mean?

Writer: yes.

The following is another example of request for explanation:

Transcript 3; peer revision

Reviewer: *I do not understand a sentence (RE)*...I am reading it again...even the fact that the patient requests it from the doctor patient people who trust doctors in the whole hearted it will be hard for them to sustain their trust...*can you explain it I couldn’t understand it? (RE)*

Writer: ok...in this paragraph I mentioned about the patient doctor trust...the patients’ trust in the doctors...and here I wanted to say that assist a suicide is something that the patient

required...requests suicide from the doctor...in a way...in other words it is on the request of the patient...and then patient people who trust the doctors...they trust the doctors wholehearted...I mean by their hearts...

2. Explanation

Explanation by writers occurred often during the peer revision process. As reviewers were, in some cases, engaged in understanding the subject of the essays, they tried to make explanations to make their contributions as well as to convey their opinions. There were four different kinds of explanation.

A) Explanation of an unclear point (EUP):

Peers explained the parts that were vague or unclear to their reviewing partner.

The data showed peer writers “explained” may mean that:

1. Unclear points are not skipped over by the writers, thus they may be willing to cooperate for revision, and they may be enjoying the process.
2. Unclear points are emphasized by the reviewers for further clarification. The writers may want to be sure that their comments are exact and accurate.

Explanation of an unclear point is exemplified in the data below:

In the extract below peers discuss a paper with the title “The Internet and the Psychology of Children”. The reviewer states that the title is vague and the writer tries to explain it:

Transcript 4; peer revision

Reviewer: when I read this title I understand that you will talk about the internet...but I do not understand which side of internet you will talk about...what I want to say is that a more striking title would be better I think...

Writer: *but I want to... say that the internet and the psychology of children...(EUP)*

Reviewer: *there is a relation...(EUP)*

Writer: *there is a relationship between them...(EUP)*

B) Explanation of opinion (EO)

Another kind of explanation occurred as explanation of an opinion. Here, peers talked about their personal ideas regarding a certain point or a part in the essay. The reviewers sometimes made personal comments like ‘I did not like this’. But these ideas are open for discussion. Explanation of opinion occurs because in some cases, reviewers may not give an accurate comment. They may feel that there is a problem, but they cannot name it. Therefore, they may fill in the gap by saying ‘I did not like this’.

Here are examples from the data:

In the data below, the reviewer states that ‘in fact’ is not an appropriate conjunction to use, as there two opposite ideas saying she dislikes it:

Transcript 5; peer revision

Reviewer: you say in fact the internet has also bad sides such as gambling, violence or pornography etc...but in the first sentence you talk

about something positive...because you said internet providing people with lots of useful things...but in the following sentence you will talk about a negative thing...so... as a conjunction we should use something giving... the meaning of contradiction...so *“in fact” is not appropriate for...(EO)*

Writer: But I want to say this there is a good side of internet but in fact in the essence of internet internet has also bad sides...because most people know internet as a good thing as we all know...and I want to support this

Reviewer: I see but...when I read the two sentence when I read the “in fact” *I did not like the transition...(EO)*

In the example below, the reviewer says that there is no need to use “himself or herself” as there is no emphasis on gender, however; the writer defends herself, saying that if there is a need to use “himself”, “himself and herself” should be used:

Transcript 6; peer revision

Reviewer: ethanasia is performed when the patient himself or herself I think there is no need too much “himself or herself”...if you use these words you need to mention...about the difference... about gender... *there is no need (EO)*

Writer: I think I used...”himself herself” not...for emphasizing gender... but...to emphasize that they...decide on their own ...but when I use

only “himself”...as I read in an...article in formal writings...we should use...both “himself or herself” (EO)

C) Explanation of content (EC)

Explanation of content was observed often in the peer revision. Here, peer writers tried to explain their point by referring to the topic they wrote about. They tried to answer their peer reviewer’s question or defended themselves by explaining what they actually tried to say in their essay. The data showed that content is an important issue in revising for peers. This maybe because peers may need to know the topic better to be able to revise more usefully.

In the example below, the reviewer suggests using “prefer” or “demand” rather than “ask for”. The writer says that by using ‘ask for’, she actually wanted to emphasize that the patient himself begs for euthanasia:

Transcript 7; peer revision

Reviewer: you can use “demand” or “prefer” rather than “ask for” ...
here...they “prefer” dying not “ask for”

Writer: *I tried to show that... it is their desire and long for...it and they...or beg for it (EC)*

Here again the reviewer suggests the use of “death” instead of “dying”; however, the writer stands by that word, saying she actually wanted to stress the process of dying:

Transcript 8; peer revision

Reviewer: and ...you may use “death”...instead of “dying” maybe

Writer: *it is the duration of the dying... but not the... result of...when we talk about result we can say death... but the duration is dying (EC)*

The example above is a good instance of negotiation of meaning. The reviewer stresses “the result-death” while the writer stresses “the process-dying”. It is interesting to see that learners were engaged in discussing the verb “to die” both as a process and a result. Both the writer and the reviewer cooperates to improve the meaning of the this word to fit in the context.

D) Explanation of a mechanical point (EMP)

Explanation of mechanical points occurred as peer reviewers and writers presented knowledge about the language. In these cases, peers felt the need to explain mechanical points such as grammar and punctuation. The data showed that mechanical points such as grammar are important for peers. These points are not skipped. This may be because students usually regard grammar as the most important part of the language and value particularly the mechanical parts of language. Here are examples from the data:

The reviewer below states that the in “the netherlands” should not be written with a capitalized letter, because that should only be the case when starting a new sentence:

Transcript 9; peer revision

Reviewer: there are some punctuation mistakes here...as you see this article “the”...for “the netherlands”...*you shouldn't capitalize it...because I know it is like this (EMP)*

Writer: as far as I know it is written like this...but I will check it

Reviewer: *but it is only at the beginning of the sentence (EMP)*

Writer: As far as I know the country's name is written like this...*so for example when we write "the turkey" we write it with not a capitalized letter but with "the netherlands" (EMP)*

Reviewer: You cannot use it with capitalized t

This transcript shows that peers may not always revise in the correct way. They may suggest untarget like items. Thus, they have to have the right knowledge to suggest or correct points that will be accepted by the writer. If the writer doesn't have the correct knowledge either, the revision may not be successful.

Although the reviewer suggests a non target item in the above interaction, this example is very good to emphasize the interactive aspect of peer revision. It shows that the task is taken seriously by both the writer and the reviewer. There is no silence or direct acceptance but there is negotiation with more than one exchange. Thus, the task is perceived as a collaborative revision.

3. Suggestion (SUG)

Suggestion was one of the mostly used revising tools during the peer revision process. Peers suggested alternative ways to make the writing clearer or for the point to be more striking. Suggestions are not a matter of right or wrong, but the reviewers offer new ideas to the writers. Peers make suggestions to each other because they have the capacity to suggest alternatives for better writing. However, the data showed that these may not always be accepted by the writer. Thus, suggestion, as is seen in the examples below, may not result in revision.

The example below example constitutes a suggestion for saying something in a different way:

Transcript 10; peer revision

Reviewer: again as suggestion I say this...you say we live in a technology world...*I think you can change it as “we live in a world of technology” (SUG)*

Writer: hmmm

The reviewer suggests using “end up” instead of “become”:

Transcript 11; peer revision

Reviewer: ... and their minds become very sadist...*let’s not write it like that (SUG)*....and it is likely that...again possibility...*it is likely that they will end up as sadist (SUG)*

Writer: ok

Reviewers and writers took the task seriously, and were engaged in collaborative revision. “let’s not write it like that” is a collaboration proposed by the reviewer. These students were classmates for more than a year accustomed to do pair collaborative task. This example reveals that the notion of peer revision is a continuing task of collaborating.

Another suggestion is made to say “to check email accounts” rather than “to check my emails”:

Transcript 12; peer revision

Reviewer: in the second developmental paragraph...to check my emails...I did not like that..."*to check my email accounts*" is better word I think...*better phrase for a formal writing (SUG)*

Writer: I will look at this

Reviewer: I am sure about this

In this example, the reviewer suggests using "related with" rather than "related to":

Transcript 13; peer revision

Reviewer: To search for something related to my homework...I think we should express this in other way but I couldn't find any right words or right structure...I do not know but there is something wrong with here...*maybe "search for something related with my homework" is better (SUG)*

Writer: ...

4. Error correction (EC)

Errors refer to the wrong language structures. Errors were handled widely in the peer revision process. While learning a foreign language, students are sensitive to language structures. They try to learn the correct forms of the language when using it. Thus they carry their strengths in this issue. Reviewers corrected errors directly. And most of the time, the writers kept silent or immediately accepted when an error in their writing was corrected. So, it is not a very successful way of revision in terms of

interaction. There were no denials expressed by the writers. The data showed that peers both acquired new knowledge during error correction. Looking at the papers after the transcriptions, it was observed that students corrected the errors that their peer revised. Thus, error correction may be a good revising technique. Error correction also showed that peer revision may result in language learning, as students state that “yes you are right” or “I did not know that”. “Yes, you are right” as writer’s reaction to reviewer’s suggestion may mean two different things. First, it may be in a cognitive level as writer has mentally replaced a non target-like L2 hypothesis by a target-like one. This results in learning, as the writer has restructured her interlanguage. Second, it may be in a discursive level as writer pretends to accept reviewer’s suggestion to keep the interaction going smoothly. In this second case there is no learning as there is no restructuring of interlanguage. First case is exemplified in the 14th transcript.

Error corrections are exemplified below:

The reviewer below corrects a singular word (characteristics) which should be plural:

Transcript 14; peer revision

Reviewer: here I think you said learner style depends on individual characteristic...instead of characteristic you can say the plural form...characteristics... (EC) because you do not focus on only one characteristic but many characteristics...

Writer: yes you are right

In the example above, reviewer's suggestion is correct. Thus, an uncorrected item is replaced by a target-like one. Parallel to the discussion above, the writer has internalized her interlanguage as she applied reviewer's suggestion in her second draft. Thus, the peer revision resulted in language learning.

The reviewer states that it is not correct to use a "slash" in a formal essay and suggests to use "or" instead of it:

Transcript 15; peer revision

Reviewer: You used a slash in the essay...I used a slash in my previous essay and my instructor said that in a formal essay you cannot use a slash...(EC) and *you should use I think "or"...*instead of a slash

Writer: hmm...thank you for that suggestion...I did not know

The reviewer states that there has to be a comma after "in that case":

Transcript 16; peer revision

Reviewer: here I think a punctuation mistake...in that case and you go on your sentence...it is destructing bla bla...*but I think you should put a comma after "in that case" (EC)*

Writer: yes you are right

In sum, the data shows the following as the positive aspects of peer revision:

1. It may result in language learning when the writer incorporates reviewer's correct suggestion into her second draft to replace her incorrect language item (Examples in Error Correction category, EC). When the reviewers make a commentary, writers may

add a new language item in their language inventory, restructuring their interlanguage and use it in their second draft.

2. Peers try to open discussion for the points they do not understand, they emphasize and ask about the points they do not understand; they do not avoid or skip them. Some questions may arise because of lack of confidence in understanding. However, they wanted to be sure that they understood first, which is good in terms of making useful commentary (Examples in Request for Explanation, RE).

3. Explanations and questions have a clarifying effect, which creates fruitful interaction, which may mean that students are quite willing to cooperate (examples in Explanation, EUP, EO, EC, EMP and Request for Explanation, RE). Additionally, although the focus of the task was mostly on grammar, peers really did engage in trying to understand each other's writing. This may mean that they took the task seriously.

4. Peers ask, explain, suggest and correct during peer revision (all categories, EUP, EO, EC-Explanation of Content, EMP, RE, SUG, EC-Error Correction)

5. Peers may be capable of providing useful comments to each other (All categories, EUP, EO, EC-Explanation of Content, EMP, RE, SUG, EC-Error Correction).

6. Readers and writers negotiated the meaning during peer revision (Transcript 8). They negotiated the meaning trying to improve the way that the text is formed and understood. (negotiation of form is exemplified and discussed in PART 2, transcript 19).

However there are some drawbacks to peer revision as the data indicate:

1. Peers need to have the right knowledge to revise, otherwise the interaction may lead to non-target like items (Transcript 9; in explanation of mechanical points).

2. Suggestions and Error Correction may not guarantee fruitful discussion and they are the least successful way of revision in terms of interaction, as students immediately accept suggestions or keep silent.

3. Reviewers asked questions about the subject of the essays and writers explained. Thus, topic is important for the peers; they feel the need of learning more about the subject of the essay. They need to have the topical knowledge to be able to revise. Otherwise they may be mistaken in their revisions (examples in Explanation of Content, EC)

Essay comparison

In this part of the analysis, the essays are compared according to vocabulary, grammar, spelling, punctuation, morphology, syntax, correlation of ideas, prepositions, and organization. The texts written before the peer revision process and the ones produced after the peer revision process were compared. Then, the texts written before the think-aloud self-revision and the ones rewritten after the think-aloud self-revision were also compared. The amount and kind of revisions realized on papers after peer revision and the one realized after the think-aloud, self-revision was also compared. Additionally, changes made by the researcher on two essays (one reviewed by peers and

one reviewed individually) were compared by peer-proposed changes and individual changes.

a) Comparing the compositions written before and after the peer revision

As there were 10 students participating the study, and the peer revision activity took place twice, 20 first and final drafts were compared (two stages altogether). The text written before the peer revision is referred to as the first draft, the one produced after the peer revision referred to as the second draft.

There are nine categories to compare in the drafts with the categories for comparison selected by the researcher. The drafts were compared in terms of grammar, spelling, vocabulary, morphology, syntax, punctuation, preposition, organization and correlation of ideas. These categories were considered to be compositional issues included in the writing.

Grammar relates to tenses, subject-verb agreement, use of modals and so on. Spelling is how a certain word is written. Vocabulary is examined as to the choice of words for the context and meaning. Morphology includes the suffixes and prefixes and how words are formed. Syntax refers to the sentence formation, such as passive, active or “if” clauses. Punctuation includes the use of commas, semi colons, question marks, and so on. Prepositions mean the use of phrase markers such as “in”, “on”, “at”. Organization includes the introduction, development and conclusion of the essay. Last, under correlation of the ideas, use of conjunctions are examined.

220 revisions were made in 20 papers (two stages together). Table 2.1. below shows the number, the type and the percentage of revisions (changes) in all 20 texts:

Table 2.1. Revisions of All Types in Two Composition Cycles

Type of changes	The number of changes made	The percentage of types of changes (Total = 100%)
Vocabulary	74	33.6%
Grammar	49	22.2%
Punctuation	37	16.8%
Spelling	27	12.2%
Preposition	12	5.4%
Morphology	10	4.5%
Syntax	9	4.09%
Correlation of ideas	2	0.9%
Organization	0	0%
TOTAL	220	100%

In two writing stages, the texts were revised in eight categories out of nine. The changes were observed as seen above in vocabulary (33.6%), grammar (22.2%), punctuation (16.8%), spelling (12.2%), preposition (5.4%), morphology (4.5%), syntax (4.09%) and correlation of ideas (0.9%). Organization did not show any changes at all. The most revised parts turned out to be vocabulary and grammar. The data show that students negotiate mostly on vocabulary and grammar. Students usually consider grammar and vocabulary as important to language learning. Thus, peers may carry their attention and strengths in these two categories. The data also showed that there was no improvement in organization at all. This may be because students simply did not want to revise or they found it difficult to revise in this dimension.

The data is exemplified below. How the revision was handled during the peer revision is also exhibited:

Vocabulary:

Different kinds of words, such as verbs, adverbs, adjectives, nouns and conjunctions were treated under the vocabulary heading. A word is either changed, added or omitted.

In this example, the writer talks about her own experience in her essay, so the reviewer suggests using “experience” rather than “giving myself as an example” :

Transcript 17; peer revision

Reviewer: is there any printing mistakes here I did not understand...

Writer: yes...as an example...to this debate about the programs on television ...and there is comma there must be comma (laugh)...I can give myself as an example

Reviewer: instead of myself you can use my own experience

Writer: yes

Reviewer: because you are not the example but your experience is an example

Writer: I can give my own experience...you see

First draft

As an example to this debate about the programs on television I can give myself as an example

Second draft

As an example to this debate about the programs on television, I can give my own experience.

In the next example , use of “supports” is suggested rather than “thinks”

Transcript 18; peer revision

Reviewer: you may use support or hold up rather than thinks or another verb

Writer: maybe

First draft

Yet, some *thinks* that the pain of the patients suffering from terminal illnesses can be eliminated by the help of pain relieving pills.

Second draft

Yet, some *hold up* that the pain of the patients suffering from terminal illnesses can be eliminated by the help of pain relieving pills.

Grammar:

The grammar revisions include the revisions of tenses and other grammatical points.

In the example below, the writer did not use a relative clause, but the reviewer revises the sentence and explains the use of relative clause. Following that a tense mistake is corrected as well:

Transcript 19; peer revision

Reviewer: which is a right THAT CANNOT BE DEPRIVED OF

Writer: I do not know exactly but I think we can delete THAT in situations...like that...when it is a...

Reviewer: if you use...without “cannot” you can use I know...but...if there is “cannot”...you must put “that” or another relative clause

Writer: ok...I see

Reviewer: and rather than “makes” “make”...(laugh)

Writer: ...

This extract is an instance in which the writer and the reviewer are negotiating the form. The reviewer is explaining the use of relative clause saying the writer should use “that” as there is a verb after it. Here, learners are engaged in a discussion in which they are talking about the target language. The writer is learning something about the structure of relative clause. The negotiation is in the target language; thus learners are talking about the target language in the target language. This develops both the language knowledge and presumably speaking as well as the negotiation is in the target language.

First draft

Lastly, in some cases the patient herself or himself decides on euthanasia, *which is a right cannot be deprived of* since the patients *have to makes decisions* on their lives.

Second draft (Following revision suggestion discussed previously)

Lastly, in some cases the patient herself or himself decides on euthanasia, *which is a right that cannot be deprived of* since the patients *have to make decisions* on their lives.

Punctuation

During the peer interaction, the use of capital letters and the use of commas were the main concerns.

In the example below, the reviewer suggests the use of a comma:

Transcript 20; peer revision

Reviewer: I think there is a need for comma here...as she doesn't even enjoy even the course of her life consciously...comma...there is no meaning of life for her to go on

Writer: yes

First draft

Thus, as she does not enjoy even the course of her life consciously there is no meaning of life for her to go on.

Second draft

Thus, as she does not enjoy even the course of her life consciously, there is no meaning of life for her to go on.

Spelling

The reviewer corrects directly a spelling mistake:

Transcript 21; peer revision

Reviewer: there is a spelling mistake here..."changing"

Writer: ...

First draft

...And also *chnging* the colors of Turkey's uniform will be economically harmful as supporters of Turkish national team have bought many accessories whose colors are red and white....

Second draft

...Moreover *changing* the colors of Turkey's uniform will be economically harmful as supporters of Turkish national team have bought many accessories whose colors are red and white....

Preposition

Prepositions like *to*, *for* and *at* were handled under the category of preposition revisions.

In this example, it is possible to see an explanation of opinion and suggesting 'for' instead of 'to':

Transcript 22; peer revision

Reviewer: schools and classrooms should be preparation to real life...I think the preposition "for" is more suitable here

Writer: ...ok I agree with you

First draft

Schools and classrooms should be preparation *to* real life.

Second draft

Schools and classrooms should be preparation *for* real life.

Morphology

Wrong word formation which were revised were treated as morphology revisions. These were derivations like "education-educational" or singular and plural forms like "some illness-some illnesses".

The reviewer below corrects a singular word which should actually be plural:

Transcript 23; peer revision

Reviewer: again vocabulary mistake...not mistake actually...as a suggestion I say...you said that...hence, it is again an irrational reason in order to claim that assisted suicide should be legal because medicines cannot cure some terminal illness...here you used singular form of “illness”...eh...but you can say “some terminal illnesses”...by ...using its plural form...it would be better I think

Writer: ...

First draft

Hence, it is again an irrational reason in order to claim that assisted suicide should be legal because medicines cannot cure some terminal *illness*.

Second draft

Hence, it is again an irrational reason in order to claim that assisted suicide should be legal because medicines cannot cure some terminal *illnesses*.

Syntax

Revising sentence structures were considered as syntactic revisions. An example of this is changing a passive sentence into active, shown below. In this discussion, it is possible to observe request for explanation, and explanation for content, explanation of a mechanical point as well as suggestions.

Transcript 24; peer revision

Reviewer: I did not see any relationship between these two sentences you used **(RE)**... if it is thought the programs are harmful and bad for

the society, the decision about whether they will watch or not is of their choice, too.

Writer: at the beginning of the sentence I say...if people chose what they will watch...and if they think these programs are harmful and bad...the decision if of them too...I tried to emphasized these and these...and I used “too” because of this...they choose what they will watch...and if this is harmful their choice...(EC)

Reviewer: can we use there “while” or (SUG)... in one hand these programs are thought to be harmful and bad...in other hand they are choosing these programs...we use “if” for conditions (EMP) but I do not see any conditions there...

Writer: I tried to show both of them are their own choice...I used “if” because of this but...if you cannot understand I can change it

Reviewer: yes...better...clear

First draft

If it is thought the programs are harmful and bad for the society, the decision about whether they will watch or not is of their choice, too.

Second draft

If the people think that these entertainment programs are harmful and bad for the society, they do not watch, which is also their choice.

Correlation of ideas

The correlation of positive and negative ideas is considered in this section.

The reviewer below states that there are opposite ideas in one sentence, so the writer should use a conjunction showing this contradiction:

Transcript 25; peer revision

Reviewer: what must change are not television programs and the families must be careful about their children...and there is a contradiction between these two sentences...and you can use contradictive...eh...an “adverbial” or something showing the contrast of the sentence

Writer: ...

First draft

That is, what must change are not the television programs *and* the families must be careful about their children.

Second draft

That is, what must change are not the television programs *but* the families.

Organization

Organization was handled in some cases as “the essay is very well organized” or “I like the organization”, however no revision took place in terms of organization.

The example below is the best example that could be presented; however, the discussion did not result in any change in the organization:

Transcript 26; peer revision

Reviewer: I think the organization for this kind of...eh...argumentative essay...first a paragraph about background...then a paragraph...only for thesis statement

Writer: I do not know but...

Reviewer: it is written there...so I think you can separate these two sentences from each other...eh...add something to the thesis statement to making it a paragraph

Writer: ...

In sum, peer revision (with respect to the re-writing observed in eight categories, Table 2.1 above) appears in positive light:

1. The form of writing usually changes through peer revision. It appears a good method for writing teachers because peer interaction results in changes in the texts.

2. Peers may be capable of providing comments to each other. They value, most of the time, each other's comments, and they revise accordingly. The notable changes are evidence of this. Also the interaction where the revision is discussed is given above as a support to second drafts.

3. Vocabulary and grammar are the categories that the peers commented on mostly. These were the most important problem category to the peers. Moreover, these issues are easy to recognize and easy to discuss by students.

4. Reviewers and writers negotiated the form (Transcript 18). The data reveal that peers can talk about the target language in the target language, which results in language development as well as an improvement in the speaking ability.

b) Comparing the compositions written before and after the think-aloud self-revision process

Four volunteer students were asked to revise their papers individually and rewrite them again individually. The Table 2.2. below shows the type, number of the revisions and the percentages of each type in the total number of the revisions in 4 papers after self-revision.

Table 2.2. Composition Comparisons- 1st Draft and 2nd Drafts in Self-revision

Type of revisions	Number of revisions made	Percentage of types of revisions (Total=100%)
Vocabulary	12	57%
Punctuation	7	33%
Preposition	1	5%
Spelling	1	5%
TOTAL	21	100%

According to the comparison of first and second drafts, there were 21 revisions made in all the 4 papers after the think-aloud, self-revision process. These revisions occurred in terms of vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and prepositions. However, no revisions were observed in terms of grammar, morphology, syntax, correlation of ideas and organization. This means that less than half of the categories (4 out of 9) showed change as a result of self-revision, as opposed to changes in 8 categories in peer revision.

That the texts rewritten after the think-aloud changed less than the ones produced after the peer revision may be because it may be difficult for the students to locate their own errors. There are two learners working in peer revision, thus this cooperation makes it easier to see the details and to work on the papers to improve them.

Vocabulary

Vocabulary was the most revised part after the think-aloud self-revision process. More than half of the revisions occurred to in terms of vocabulary. Vocabulary was again the most revised part after the peer revision.

The example below shows a vocabulary change. The learner corrects a vocabulary choice. She states that she should use the verb form of success, and then she changes it in the second draft.

Transcript 27; think-aloud

“...it is a vocabulary mistake I used “success” in the form of word instead I should use “succeed”...”

First draft

It sounds rational to have education in English *to success this*; however it does not only depend on English education to keep up with the globalization.

Second draft

It sounds rational to have education in English *to succeed this*; however it does not only depend on English education to keep up with the globalization.

Punctuation

Punctuation is the second most revised item after the think-aloud process. It was the third item among the revisions after the peer revision. In the example below, there is an error correction. The learner says she forgot it, and then she revises that part in the second draft:

Transcript 28; think-aloud

“...again I have forgotten to put a comma before conjunction_“so”

First draft

It is impossible for students to know all the vocabulary in a foreign *language so* when students come across with an unknown word, it may be an obstacle for him to grasp the meaning.

Second draft

It is impossible for students to know all the vocabulary in a foreign *language, so* when students come across with an unknown word, it may be an obstacle for him to grasp the meaning.

Prepositions

Like spelling, preposition revision occurred only once. In the extract below, the learner corrects herself, stating the need of a preposition, and it is so revised in the second draft:

Transcript 29; think-aloud

“...the case of Roy Roberts executed in Missouri 1999. maybe I should have put an *in* in front of 1999...”

First draft

The case of Roy Roberts, executed in Missouri, *1999* is one of the recent bothersome issues discussed in this report.

Second draft

The case of Roy Roberts, executed in Missouri, *in 1999* is one of the recent bothersome issues discussed in this report.

Spelling

Spelling revision occurred only once. Spelling was the third most revised item after the think-aloud process, identical with preposition revision. The example below shows the correction of the spelling mistake:

Transcript 30; think-aloud

“...I found a spelling mistake. It would be easier for the. I should separate the t sound here...”

First draft

...however, if it were in Turkish, the difficulty would decrease, and it would be easier *fort he* student to understand.

Second draft

...however, if it were in Turkish, the difficulty would decrease, and it would be easier *for the* student to understand.

In sum, there are changes in four categories. Vocabulary, punctuation, preposition and spelling showed changes from the individual revision. Vocabulary changed in individual revision more than the other categories. However, there is no revision or

reconsideration in other five categories at all. In the peer revision there were changes in eight categories out of nine.

c) Comparing the amount and kind of text revisions done in pairs as opposed to that done individually

The table 2.3 below compares 4 students' revisions after the peer revision and the ones they did after their individual revision (think-aloud process). Vocabulary was the most revised part both in the peer revision process and in the individual revision process. Peer revision yields more changes in 5 categories: spelling, morphology, grammar, preposition and syntax.

Table 2.3. Product Comparison- Revisions after Peer Revision and Individual Revision

Type of revision	Peer revision	Individual revision	Difference
Vocabulary	43%	57%	-14%
Spelling	17%	5%	+12%
Morphology	13%	0%	+13%
Grammar	11%	0%	+11%
Preposition	9%	5%	+4%
Syntax	6%	0%	+6%
Punctuation	2%	33%	-31%
Correlation of ideas	0%	0%	0%
Organization	0%	0%	0%
TOTAL	100%	100%	

In sum, there is a notable difference between the individual revision and the peer revision as far as the revised drafts are concerned.

d) Comparing researcher review and peer review

The aim of this study is not to compare teacher and student changes, as this study is investigating the effectiveness of peer revision as an aid to teacher feedback. However,

the researcher herself proposed changes as an example for what a more knowledgeable would have done and whether the amount of student proposals was homogenous or comparable across the categories. The researcher proposed changes on one peer reviewed essay and the changes made by the researcher and the ones resulting from the peer reviewing were compared.

Table 2.4 Comparison of Changes from Researcher Review and Peer Review

Type of revisions	Number of changes by the researcher	Number of changes by the participant	The difference
Vocabulary	21	12	+9
Preposition	12	5	+7
Syntax	7	0	+7
Correlation of ideas	6	4	+2
Spelling	4	4	0
Grammar	3	3	0
Punctuation	3	1	+2
Morphology	1	1	0
Organization	0	0	0
TOTAL	57	26	+31

The Table 2.4. compares the changes made by the researcher and the ones made by the peers on one randomly chosen paper. The researcher made 57 changes in the essay as opposed to 26 peer changes. The researcher made more changes in most of the categories, and it is impossible to say that all changes proposed by peers are the part of the changes the researcher proposed. Thus, there is overlap between the researcher-proposed changes and the peer-proposed ones. However, it could be said that the peers were more or less successful to propose changes and the essays changed accordingly.

e) Comparing researcher review and individual review

The same comparison above was made with the individual changes as well. The researcher proposed changes in an individually reviewed essay. Changes proposed by the researcher and the ones resulting from individual review were compared.

2.5. Comparison of Changes from Researcher Review and Individual Review

Types of changes	The number of changes by the researcher	The number changes by the participant	The difference
Vocabulary	9	5	+4
Punctuation	2	1	+1
Syntax	3	0	+3
Prepositions	3	0	+3
Organization	1	0	+1
TOTAL	18	6	+12

The Table 2.5. compares the changes the researcher made and the ones made by the writer in one randomly chosen essay. The researcher made 18 changes in the paper as opposed to 6 changes resulting from individual review. The table goes parallel to the Table 2.4 in that writers were more or less successful to propose revisions and to incorporate these proposals into their essays.

Comparing the process of think-aloud self-revision and the process of peer revision

In this study, 4 students were asked to think-aloud about their papers; they were told to revise their own papers by thinking aloud. The entire processes by all four students were carried out in English, so there was no need for translation. The aim of including the think-aloud protocol in this study was to be able to compare the process of

individual revision with the process of peer revision. The main difference between the think-aloud and the peer revision comes from the fact that while the input in the peer revision is the reviewer, the input in the individual revision is the writer herself.

Peer revision processes implemented in this study continued long enough (a class hour) for the partners to communicate multiple suggestions for improving each others' papers. However, think-aloud protocols were rather short (about 15 minutes). After the think-aloud process, informal talk between the learners and the researcher suggested that learners had had difficulty in seeing their mistakes or ways to improve their papers. One learner said: "I am being subjective towards my paper, I cannot see my mistakes, it seems like everything is correct."

The peer revision process and the think-aloud process were compared according to the following, which were invented by the researcher:

1. Self defense/Arguing
2. Self-Evaluation
3. Finding Alternatives
4. Discovering Errors
5. Doubtful Attitude Toward the Revision Proposed

Below, the categories are exemplified and interpreted.

1. Self defense/Arguing

The transcriptions of the think-aloud protocols indicated a constant and limited response during individual revisions. Writers commented on their papers just like "I did

this, I could do this”. But they did not give any reasons about “why this is better than that” or “why I should do it”. However, the peer revision activity resulted in argument on certain points, defending herself or giving reasons for a change in the text (examples part I). Here is one section from a think-aloud process. There is really no involvement, it is quite monotonous. This may be because of appearing to talk to yourself instead of having person to person interaction. The writer is here is the only source in revising, thus there may be no feeling of need to explain WHYs or defending an idea. Thus, there is no fruitful process to generate alternative ideas. However, negotiation can result in more engagement in the task as there are two learners exchanging ideas. At this point it is important to underline the cultural background of the learners, as well. Turkish students usually take the teachers into consideration; most of the time they regard the teacher as the only authority in giving feedback. Individual revision may be affected by this culture aspect.

Transcript 31; think-aloud

“...when I look at the first paragraph I see that I used and and I should use comma before the and. While writing I missed that point. When I look at the second paragraph I used to follow the developments in the worldwide I think I can change this as in order to follow the developments in the worldwide I said language of internet but I can use internet language instead of language of internet...”

The transcription above suggests that the learner writer in the individual revision may lack the necessary incentive to generate more ideas. The learner doesn't ask questions to herself, doesn't argue on a point. Thus, individual revision may not be a fruitful process

for revision. The data indicate that limitation of input may affect the revision and that two learners working on one paper in learner-learner interaction may generate more ideas than one may in the individual revision. Interaction has a potential of bearing instances in which there is exchange of language knowledge and ideas; thus learners engaged in interaction have more potential to experience different kinds of information together. It would be interesting to see if writers generated more ideas in self-revision if the process was delayed for, say, a month after writing. The writers might then be able to approach the written piece with some distance and a sense of looking at a “new” piece of writing.

2. Self-Evaluation

During the individual revision writers tried to express some sort of self-evaluation. In this study, evaluation referred to writers’ addressing her major strengths and weaknesses in their writing. They evaluated their performance and what their errors were; although this was limited. This means they could see one aspect of their writing. In the peer revision the writers did not tend to evaluate themselves, either. This may be because of the fact that they knew that this role was carried out by the partner’s review. In the example below the writer evaluates her writing performance, stating that her major mistake is in punctuation. This self-evaluation occurred at the end of one individual’s revision:

Transcript 32; think-aloud

“...my biggest mistake is conjunctions and not putting a comma before them...”

This example occurred in the middle of the revision:

Transcript 33; think-aloud

“...I found again the same mistake. I couldn’t escape from this mistake...”

The data showed that individual revision is somewhat effective in the learner’s evaluating her performance. In peer revision, writers did not evaluate their performance, since this was carried out by the reviewers.

3. Finding Alternatives

In the individual revision, learners tended to find slight alternatives to improve the text. This was similar to the peer revision process; where peers made improvement suggestions to each other. However, the individual revision yielded little data on suggestion. They couldn’t or wouldn’t see many parts to be improved. However, peer revision was a rich process, as there were two learners discussing a point.

Here is an example of a self-revision reconsideration of a essay choice:

Transcript 34; think-aloud

“...I used additionally here but it doesn’t sound logical. We can use in addition moreover or furthermore...”

4. Discovering Errors

There are two things to be emphasized in this category. One is error correction. Learners corrected their errors when they saw them. Error correction did not occur as much as it did in the peer revision. However, there are instances in the individual revision that cannot be ignored. Here is one example:

Transcript 35; think-aloud

“...it is a vocabulary mistake I used success in the form of word instead I should use succeed...”

The second remark here is that learners expressed their inability to see or find their own errors. They could manage to correct their errors as much as they could see them. This emerged in the informal talk after the think-aloud processes. Learners said they could not see or discover their errors because everything seemed correct. “Could not see” is the key phrase here.

However, peer revision yielded plenty of talk regarding most aspects this study investigated (vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, spelling, preposition, morphology, syntax, correlation of ideas, organization). It may be easy for writer to see her errors during an interaction with another person. If one cannot see, the other one may see it. It was obvious looking at the transcriptions that it is difficult to see your own errors (writers called “error” as “mistake”), and writers express this:

Transcript 36; think-aloud

“...and my second paragraph here I couldn’t find any mistakes...”

Transcript 37; think-aloud

“...I cannot find a mistake in the last paragraph...”

The data showed that in the individual revision some parts may be missed because it may be difficult for one to see her own error.

5. Doubtful Attitude Towards Revision Proposed

This category is important in that being sure of oneself may differ in individual revision and the peer revision. There were instances in the think-aloud process that the learners were not sure of their revisions. They felt the need of asking somebody or checking it from a dictionary. Peer revision was an enriched process in that the writer has got another learner to consult with, to discuss, to ask or to try to get an answer. In the think-aloud the learners were suspicious of their own possible revisions:

Transcript 38; think-aloud

“...there are some probable mistakes in my essay I think so but I am not sure I should check it. I should ask somebody...”

Transcript 39; think-aloud

“...I think I should put another word but I can't find anyone. I also ask for it somebody...”

The data showed that learners may not have much confidence in themselves while revising individually. In the examples above, they felt the need of consulting or asking.

In sum, individual revision and peer revision differ in that:

1. Individual revision, as conducted here, may not be a very enriched process, as the generation of ideas is limited; however, learner-learner interaction in peer revision is a fruitful situation in which ideas are shared, negotiated, and discussed.

2. Individual revision may help the writer to evaluate her writing performance, as the writer herself is the one who deals with her own text. In peer revision, evaluation is carried out by the reviewers. Writers did not evaluate themselves in the peer revision.

3. In the individual revision it may be difficult to generate alternatives as the writer is alone. However, in peer revision, suggestion turned out to be one of the several ways that peers used to review their peers' paper.

4. In the individual revision it may be easy to miss errors, as the writer gets used to one's own text making it difficult to see errors.

5. In individual revision, writers may not feel confident about their revisions, as they are alone. However, peer revision may be more satisfactory for the writers, as there is another learner to ask, to consult and to negotiate with, which creates a more interesting and more productive atmosphere.

Conclusion

This study investigated whether peer revision might be applied as a complementary source of feedback as support to teacher's feedback. In this chapter, the ways that peers interact during peer revision were identified. Texts written before and after the peer revision processes and the ones produced before and after the individual revision processes were compared according to vocabulary, grammar, spelling, punctuation, morphology, syntax, correlation of ideas, organization and preposition. Four students' texts rewritten after peer revision and ones rewritten after the think-aloud, self-revision were compared. Lastly, the process of peer revision and the process of think-aloud self-revision were compared.

In the next chapter, the findings of the study will be reviewed and analyzed. Pedagogical implications and implications for further research will be offered and the limitations of the study discussed.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Overview of the study

The purpose of this study was to find out the characteristics and effectiveness of peer revision on students' written texts as an aid to teacher's feedback. The intention of the study was to find out whether peer revision might be used as a supportive strategy parallel to teacher's feedback on second language writing. It aimed to answer the following research questions:

1. How do peers interact during the peer revision process?
2. In what way do revision suggestions contribute to the improvement of the quality of the revised texts?
3. In what way do students' revision proposals for their peers' texts differ from students' individual revision plans for their own texts?

In this chapter the findings will be discussed. Additionally, pedagogical implications, implications for further research and the limitations of the study will be presented.

Discussion of the Findings

The findings of the study were categorized as follows:

1. Effects of peer revision on the writing product
2. Effects of peer revision on the writing process
3. Effects of peer revision on learner-learner interaction
4. Effects of peer revision on language learning

Effects of peer revision on the writing product

The data showed that peers value each other's comments on their writing, and they revise accordingly. This was also stated as a result in the study of Villamil and Guerrero (1996) and a point that will also be raised in the discussion on writing process. As peers take each other's comments into consideration, they tend to incorporate them in their texts and they revise accordingly. These changes were viewed by peers and researcher as an improvement in the written product.

This study aimed at investigating the effectiveness of peer revision by taking the compositional issues into consideration. The results related to suggest an improvement in the form of written texts of students. This, as outlined above, might serve as a good tool for teachers to improve students' writing as far as the compositional issues are concerned. Tsui and Ng (2000, p. 148-149) state this in their study:

“Learners can learn more about writing and revision by reading each others’ drafts critically and their awareness of what makes writing successful and effective can be enhanced.”

In terms of the revisions incorporated in the texts after the peer revision, the data showed that vocabulary and grammar were the most revised categories as opposed to organization, which did not yield any changes in the papers. The Villamil and Guerrero (1996) study is another study in which organization did not show a significant improvement as a result of peer review.

This study suggests that notable change in the form of writing makes it possible to propose peer revision as an important writing activity in the second language classroom. Villamil and Guerrero (1996), Mendonça and Johnson (1994) and Berg (1999) studies also found that peer revision is an important type of feedback and recommended its place in the second language writing instruction.

The data showed that the same students who were engaged in both in peer revision and individual revision made more changes through peer revision. Thus, peer revision might provide a fruitful atmosphere for language learners to improve the compositional issues, as there is more capacity to identify mistakes, to generate new ideas and to encourage changes in peer revision than in self-revision.

Effects of peer revision on the writing process

It is possible to say that peer revision might be quite useful in terms of enriching the writing process. The data showed that students share, interact and discuss during peer

revision. According to Seow (2002), teachers edit and even revise students' written texts; however, this makes an impression on the students that nothing more needs to be done to their papers. The process of improving the paper in peer revision appears to give a sense of essays "in development" with additional revisions always possible. Peer revision might be applied by language teachers, as this study suggests. Peers take each other's comments into consideration while rewriting their papers individually after the peer revision. The notable changes in the papers between drafts (elements in eight categories out of nine changed) support this.

Additionally, the comparison of the think-aloud process of self-revision and the peer revision process revealed that it may be easy to miss some errors while revising individually. Peer revision appears to minimize this difficulty. During peer revision, peers, as outside readers to each other, can produce new ideas, which makes the writing process of revision easier. In sum, peer revision affects the writing process in a more dynamic and effective way.

Effects of peer revision on learner-learner interaction

During the peer revision activity, there was a lot of interaction going on between the reviewers and the writers. Thus, peer revision is a valuable activity regardless of whether it leads to very successful revision. The questions that the peers asked each other during the interaction and the explanations that they made, facilitated the flow of learner-learner interaction. This seems a desirable general activity for the second language classroom as well as a support for the teaching of writing, specifically. This result

constitutes support for Hyland's (2003) findings. Hyland states that peer revision provides a way of developing the students' drafts as well as improving their understanding of what constitutes good writing (Hyland, 2003). Mendonça and Johnson (1994) stress interaction in the peer review as a result of their study. They state that "teachers should provide L2 students with opportunities to talk about their essays with their peers, as peer reviews seem to allow students to explore and negotiate their ideas" (p.766). The result of the present study also parallels recommendations that follow from interactional theories, which suggest that strongly focused learner-learner interaction and negotiation of meaning and form support language acquisition (Long, 1983; Pica, 1994, Long, 1996).

It was observed that reviewers asked questions before making a suggestion. This is very useful in that reviewers want to make sure that the revision suggestions are useful and accurate. However, it may be because some learners have worries about introducing a wrong item, as well. Thus, peer revision may require some training to familiarize learners with the interactive review process more, which might ease some learner concerns in this regard. This result is similar to the one reported by Stanley (1992).

During interaction it was observed that readers evaluated their peer's writing by addressing the major strengths and weakness, as well as reviewed each other's writing (e.g. "you vocabulary choice is very good" or "the organization of the essay is ok"). As far as the evaluation of the students is concerned, peer revision might be a useful supporting activity. The data showed that writers evaluate their own writing in the individual revision, as well. Thus, teachers could direct students to evaluate each other's

papers by addressing the weaknesses and strengths in the papers. A similar recommendation appears in Tsu and Ng (2000).

As far as interaction is concerned, another result of this study was that learners felt more confident in peer revision than in individual revision. This was according to informal talk after the think-aloud protocol. Thus, peer revision may be more satisfactory for the learners as there is another learner to ask, to consult and to negotiate with. This negotiation might have a potential to teach learners to become more confident in their own judgement.

In the literature, there is a concern expressed about the capability of learners to help each other by providing reliable comments on each other's texts (Villamil and Guerrero, 1998). This study suggests that peers may be capable of providing reliable and useful comments to each other. Peers open discussion on points they do not understand, seek clarification and make recommendations for changes (chapter 4, part 1). Peers make revisions based on these discussions; they revise their papers in an attempt to improve them. Mendonça and Johnson (1994) indicate similar results in their study. Their findings support the argument that peer revision enhances students' communicative power by encouraging students to express and negotiate their ideas.

Students were engaged in understanding each other's writing as well, indicating that they took the task seriously. In some cases, reviewer suggested rewriting of a language item by saying "let's not write it like that". This occasion is a good reflection of peers that the task was perceived as a collaborative one.

Nonetheless, the data also suggested that there may be occasional instances when peers may propose non-target like items to one another. This occasion was exemplified and discussed in chapter 4, transcript 9. It is important to note that the peer writer rejected this “incorrect” proposal for change. Negotiation of form in this instance resulted in an appropriate resolution.

Reviewer suggestions in the peer interactions were usually acknowledged, often accepted and sometimes rejected as indicated by silence or counter-argument. Peers also used politeness formulas such as “I will consider it.” (transcript 12). Therefore, suggestion may not generate fruitful interaction. This is the same with “error correction” as well. There aren’t many exchanges in the interaction while correcting an error directly, thus, although both “suggestion” and “error correction” were usually acknowledged, they were the least successful in terms of interaction. Additionally, the data showed that in some cases peers took the topic of the essay into consideration before making a comment. This may mean that peers require some topical knowledge to be able to make their review proposals relevant and appropriate.

Effects of peer revision on language learning

Although the evidence is limited, the results of this study suggest that peer review and revision may result in language learning. Thus, it is possible to say that in peer revision, peers may have the potential both to teach and to learn (chapter 4, suggestion). As the nature of the peer revision is learner-learner interaction, learners in the interaction sometimes learned new things about the language (Donato, 1994). Thus, peer revision

might be a strategy that second language teachers could use to support more general language acquisition as well as to teach writing. Tsui and Ng (2000) report a similar finding in their study in which they identified roles and results of peer revision. In their study, peer revision is underlined as encouraging collaborative learning (p. 147).

In sum of categorized results, this study showed that peer revision may result in revision changes as far as compositional issues are concerned. Students' texts changed in eight categories out of nine that this study investigated. To support this, same students included in peer revision incorporated more changes in their essays than they did in the individual revision.

As an overall result, this study suggests that peer revision of students' written texts provides a useful type of feedback as a complement to teacher feedback in second language writing (Villamil and Guerrero, 1996; Mendonça and Johnson, 1994; Berg, 1999).

Pedagogical Implications

The data showed that peer revision may support language learning. Teachers can apply peer revision in second language writing as well as being aware of this more general goal. It is important that the results of this study showed that peers may have the capacity to effectively revise each other's papers. Teachers can use this approach to get students to address the strengths and weaknesses of each other's writing. As there is learner-learner interaction in peer revision, there is more idea generation in peer revision than in individual revision; therefore, peer revision may have a strong potential to improve conversational skills and well as the forms of writing. However, as the data

showed that topical knowledge is important during peer revision, it would be advisable for teachers to try to help students become familiarized with the essay topics.

The data showed that in some cases students may lack the necessary confidence to provide a comment. Thus, as discussed above, pre-training may be necessary in peer revision.

In peer revision, students talk about the target language in the target language. In getting students to form groups of two and help review each other's papers, teachers can encourage learner-learner interaction, which can support both language development and composition improvement. While the students negotiate the meaning and the form, they acquire new language items. When the language is discussed in the target language, presumably their speaking ability will develop as well. Thus, this finding combines the "product", writing, and the "process", interacting. Both writing product and writing process might benefit from a development with peer revision activity in the classroom.

This study investigated the effectiveness of peer revision as a complementary aid to teacher feedback in second language writing. As the present research studied peer revision as a support to teacher feedback, peer revision was not compared with teacher feedback. The comparison was made between the peer revision and the self-revision. Both are learner-centered revisions. Following the same purpose, the present study yielded mostly favourable results about peer revision as an aid to teacher feedback. It is advisable for teachers to apply and combine peer revision with their own feedback. Students can review each other's essays and then rewrite their papers individually according to this peer assistance. They can submit this second draft to the teacher, which

they revise after the peer discussion. Then, the teacher can provide feedback on the second draft. Thus, both learners and teachers work together on the essays to improve them.

Limitations of the Study

This study was conducted in and limited to Middle East Technical University, Turkey. In another university within Turkey or another country where English is taught as a foreign language, the results could be different. Thus, the generalization of the results is in question.

The participants included in this study were sophomore students enrolled in English Language Teaching department. Thus, participants' level of English was relatively advanced. With different student language levels, such as with beginning and intermediate students, different results might be obtained. Additionally, the backgrounds of the students were more or less the same in this study. With students coming from different kinds of backgrounds, peer revision might have a different impact on writing.

Time was another limitation in the study. Because of time limitation, the sample group included in the study was small. Additionally, time permitted the researcher to conduct only two stages of peer revision. More stages would yield different results.

Implications for Future Research

This study investigated whether peer revision of students' written texts in second language writing might be effectively applied. The results are quite promising in that the data yielded revisions in eight categories out of nine which are based primarily on writing

form. The only category in which no changes were noted, was organization. Future research may focus on how to improve second language writers' organization of their writing.

This study was conducted with a sample group of advanced language level students who were sophomores. Whether peer revision might be effectively applied with other levels of students needs to be researched.

Only two stages of peer revision could be applied in this study. Therefore, only the form of writing was taken into consideration. Improving the more general writing ability of students may require another study, as there would be more stages and a broader focus on improving student writing ability.

Summary and Conclusion

This study investigated the characteristics and effectiveness of peer revision in second language writing. Ten advanced level English as a Foreign Language students participated in the study. The data were collected through peer revision processes and think aloud processes and then analyzed using qualitative as well as quantitative analysis techniques. In the analysis, the ways peers interact during peer revision were identified. There were six comparisons made in the analysis:

1. Comparison of texts written before and after the peer revision
2. Comparison of texts written before and after the think-aloud
3. Comparison of texts rewritten after peer review and ones rewritten after the think-aloud

4. Comparison of researcher review and peer review
5. Comparison of researcher review and individual review
6. Comparison of peer revision process and the think-aloud process

The data revealed that peer revision might be used as an effective and complementary source of feedback in second language writing. The revised form of writing showed a general improvement in eight categories out of nine. Moreover, students engaged in peer revision more thoroughly reviewed and commented on essays than they did in individual revision. The study parallels other studies in the literature on peer revision indicate that students are capable of making appropriate and useful comments on peer writing revision and provides some unique data on self-revision of writing.

In the study, there was a lot of interaction during peer revision activity. The results of this study suggest that interaction is a valuable activity regardless of it leads to successful revision. The study investigated the compositional issues including grammar mainly; however, there were occasions in the reviewer/writer dialogues that the both peers negotiated the meaning and the form. Students were engaged in understanding the content of the essays as well, which means they took the task seriously. In some cases, the task was perceived as a collaborative one as learners suggested writing together by saying “let’s not write it like that”.

An important characteristic of this study is that all data were gathered in the target language, which is English. There was no need to translate the transcriptions; thus, the possibility of a loss in meaning which might occur during translation was eliminated.

REFERENCE LIST

- Allison, D. & Ng, P. (1992). Developing text revision abilities. In M. Lau and M. J. Murphy (Eds.), *Developing Writing: Purposes and Practice* (pp. 106-130). Hong Kong: Institute of Language in Education.
- Anglada, L. (1995). *On-line writing center responses and advanced ESL students' writing: An analysis of comments, students' attitudes and textual revisions*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Texas Tech University.
- Arndt, V. (1993). Response to writing: using feedback to inform the writing process. In M. N. Brock and L. Walters (Eds.), *Teaching Composition Around the Pacific Rim: Politics and Pedagogy* (pp. 90-116). UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Berg, E. C. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8/3, 215-241.
- Brown, J. D. & Rodgers, T. S. (2002). *Doing Second Language Research*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cambridge Dictionary of American English. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Caulk, N. (1994). Comparing teacher and student responses to written work. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28/1, 181-188.
- Chaudron, C. (1984). The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. *RELCL*.
- Cohen, A. (1987). Students processing of feedback on their compositions. In A.L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 57-69). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Connor, U. & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3/3, 257-276.
- Conrad, S. M. & Goldstein, L. M. (1999). ESL student revision after teacher-written comments: text, contexts, and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8/2, 147-179.
- Dessner, L. (1991). *English as a second language college writers' revision responses to teacher-written comments*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Dipardo, A. & Freedman, S. W. (1988). Peer response groups in the writing classroom: Theoretical foundations and new directions. *Review of Educational Research*, 58, 119-149.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In Lantolf, James P. and Appel, Gabriela, *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33-96). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- Donato, R. (2000). Sociocultural contributions to understanding the foreign and second language classroom. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 27-50.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 824pp.
- Enginarlar, H. (1993). Student response to teacher feedback in EFL writing. *System*, 21, 193-204.

- Ericsson K. A. & Simon, H. A. (1980). Verbal reports as data. *Psychological Review*, 87, 215-251. (retrieved on March 31, 2006, from <http://www.niar.wichita.edu/humanfactors/toolbox/TA%20Protocol.htm>)
- Ericsson K. A. & Simon, H. A. (1984). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data*. Cambridge, MA. The MIT Press. (retrieved on March 31, 2006, from <http://www.niar.wichita.edu/humanfactors/toolbox/TA%20Protocol.htm>)
- Ferris, D. (1997b). The influence of teacher commentary on students revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 315-339.
- Ferris, D. (1999). One size does not fit all: Response and revision issues for immigrant students writers. In L. Harklau, K. Losey & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition* (pp. 143-158). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ferris, D. R. (1995b). Teaching ESL composition students to become self-editors. *TESOL Journal*, 4/4, 18-22.
- Ferris, D.R., Pezone, S., Tade, R.C. & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: descriptions and implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6/2, 155-182.
- Flower, L. & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-387.
- Freedman, S. W. (1987). Response to student writing (Research Report No. 23). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Gass, S. M. & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, London.

- Goldstein, L. & Kohls, R. (2002). *Writing, commenting and revising: The relationship between teacher feedback and students revision online*. Paper presented at the American Association of Applied Linguistics Conference, 6-9 April 2002, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Goldstein, L. M. (2004). Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and student revision; teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13/1*, 63-80
- Hafernik, J. J. (1983). The how and why of peer editing in the ESL writing class. Urbana, IL. ERIC Document Reproduction Service #ED 253 064.
- Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition*, (pp. 401-435). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Hedgcock, J. & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3/2*, 141-163.
- Hedgcock, J. & Leftkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1/3*, 255-76.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7/3*, 255-286.
- Hyland, F. & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill. Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10/3*, 185-212.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Jacobs, G. M., Curtis, A., Braine, G. & Huang, S. (1998). Feedback on student writing: taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7/3, 307-317.
- Journal*, 15/2, 1-14.
- Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: a model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal* 44/4, 294-304. Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Kroll, B. (2001). Considerations for teaching ESL/EFL writing course. In M. Celce-Murcia (ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 219-232. New York: Newbury House.
- Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics, and culture in everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13/4, 285-312.
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from margins: Issues in written response. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp.57-68). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lockhart, C. & NG, P. (1993). How useful is peer response? *Perspectives* 5/1, 17-29.
- Long, M. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 177-193.
- Long, M. (1996). *The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition*. In W.C. Ritchie and T.K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*, 413-468. Sand Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Long, M. & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly* 19, 207–227.
- Lyster, R. (1999). La négociation de la forme: la suite...mais pas la fin. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55/3.
- Mangelsdorf, K. & Schlumberger, A. (1992). ESL student response stances in a peer review task. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1, 235-254.
- Mendonça, C. O. & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer revision negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28/4, 745-768.
- Mittan, R. (1989). The peer review process: harnessing students' communicative power. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Rohen (Eds.), *Richness in Writing: Empowering ESL Students* (pp. 207-219). New York: Longman.
- Moore, L. K. (1986). Teaching students how to evaluate writing. *TESOL Newsletter*, 20, 23-24.
- Nelson, G. L. & Murphy, J. M. (1992). An L2 writing group: task and social dimension. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1, 171-192.
- Nelson, G. L. & Murphy, J. M. (1993). Writing groups and the less proficient ESL student. *TESOL Journal*, 2, 23-26.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods* (3rd ed.), Variety in Quality Inquiry (pp.385). California: Sage Publications.
- Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on students writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8/3, 265-289.

- Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: what does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44, 493-527.
- Porter, P. A. (1986). How learners talk to each other: Input and interaction in task-centered discussions. In: Day, Richard R. (Hrsg.), Talking to learn. Conversation in second language acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 200-222.
- Pratt, E. (1999). *A qualitative study of peer and teacher response in an ESL writing classroom in Puerto Rico*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Radecki, P. & Swales, J. (1988). ESL students reaction to written comments on their work. *System*, 16, 355-365.
- Reid, J. (1994). Responding to ESL students' written texts: the myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26/2, 273-292.
- Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (2002). Teaching writing. In Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (ed.), *Methodology in Language Teaching*, 303-305.
- Seow, A. (2002). The writing process and process writing. In Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (ed.), *Methodology in Language Teaching*, 315-320.
- Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to students writing. *College composition and communication*, 33/2, 148-156.
- Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to become effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1, 217-233.

- Takahashi, E. (1998). Language development in social interaction. A longitudinal study of a Japanese FLES program from a Vygotskyan approach. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31/3, 392-406.
- Tsui, A. B. M. & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9/2, 147-170.
- Villamil, O. & Guerrero, M. (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 19/4, 491-514.
- Witbeck, M. C. (1976). Peer correction procedures for intermediate and advanced ESL composition lessons. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10, 321-326.
- Wood, D. Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17, 89-100.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19/1, 79-101.
- Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing classes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4/3, 209-222.
- Zhu, W. (2001). Interaction and feedback in mixed peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10/4, 251-276.

APPENDIX A
PEER REVISION CHECKLIST

WHEN RESPONDING TO YOUR PEER'S DRAFT, ASK THESE QUESTIONS TO YOURSELF:

1. What are the strengths of this composition?
2. What are the greatest weaknesses of this composition?
3. Has he/she used the verbs in correct tenses?
4. Are the verb forms correct?
5. Is there agreement between subject-verb? (Example: the boys WAS hungry.)
6. Has he/she used the correct prepositions? (In, on, at...)
7. Has he/she used all the pronouns correctly?
8. What do you think about the choice of adjectives, adverbs and nouns? Are they appropriate?
9. Has he/she written in complete sentences?
10. Is spelling correct?
11. Are there punctuation errors?
12. What do you think about the organization? Where is organization confusing?
13. Where is the writing unclear or vague?
14. Is the use of prefixes and suffixes correct? (Example: mortal---DISmortal)

APPENDIX B

A SAMPLE PEER REVISION TRANSCRIPT

FIRST PART (peers are talking about a paper on euthanasia)

R: I want to say...about...something...euthanasia is performed when the patient himself or herself I think... there is no need too much “himself or herself”...if you use these words you...need to mention...about the difference...about gender...there is no need

W: I think I used...”himself herself” not... for emphasizing...gender...but...to emphasize that they...decide on their own...but when I use only “himself”...as I read...in an...article in formal writings...we should...use...both “himself or herself”

R: understand but it seems...like gender differences...you may change and then...there is a spelling mistake...”asks for” and you can use “demand” or “prefer” rather than “ask for”...here...they “prefer dying” not “ask for”

W: ... I tried to show that...it is their desire and long for...it...and they...or beg for it

R: “asks for” seems...basic

W: ok...maybe I do not know

R: and...you may use “death”...instead of “dying” maybe

W: it is the duration of the “dying”...but not the...result of when we talk about result we can say “death”...but the duration is “dying”

R: there may be comma here...especially for..."incurable cancer patients"...if you want to start another sentence you may use comma I think..."patients" spelling mistake again...this sentence seems a bit complex because...supporters of the ideas () it should be the patients just supposed to the treatment to be pondered on not to the emotional side...full stop..."as a result"...the care should be worth the cost and effort"...seems...better I think BECAUSE

W: NO no I do not agree with you the...sentence after as is the reason for the sentence...starting with "supporters of the idea"...so I am...what is the complication I did not...get

R: "As the result of the care"...but "should be worth" seems another sentence... "as the result of the care"...full stop it may be correct but "as the result of the care should be worth"

W: NO..."AS THE RESULT OF THE CARE"

R: no you must put comma

W: where?...can I translate it in Turkish...yani bu dusunceyi savunanlar . dusunulmesi gerekenin...treatment oldugunu...iddia ediyorlar burada da "rather than" anlamina gelen...sey yerine yani

R: "not the emotional side"

W: "emotional side" yerine...treatment olmasi gerektigini soyluyorlar..."because" buraya "because" da koyabiliriz..."because the result of the care should be worth the cost and the effort"

R: sorry you must put...because because...it seems a bit complex

W: ok

R: I couldn't catch the meaning at the first time

W: I can put "since"

R: yes it can be...which is a right...that cannot be deprived of I think...if it is like this

W: I think I do not...know exactly...but I think...we can delete "that" in... situations like that when it is a ...

R: if you use...without "cannot" we can use I know but...if there is "cannot"...you must put "that" or another "relative clause"

W: ok

R: it seems like a sentence because

W: ok

R: and rather than "makes" "make"...for a film using "touching"...is suitable or not?

W: I took this part of my article from an...article on this film...and they also used the adjective "touching"...means a..."sensitive"...

R: it seems a bit Turkish...

W: no..."touching"...it is...taken from..."touching"...duygusal

R: yes it may be...yet the accident took the joys of his life...it may be used like this by saying directly leaving him stick in a bed but if we use "by" it seems more meaningful

- W: but when we use “by”...it means as if...the subject of the sentence is a living thing...and it is an aim “by leaving”...but “leaving him”...it may be used “inanimate non living things”
- R: you may use commas to differentiate gay and full of life
- W: I think I said that...”he is a handsome gay who is full of life”...it is the compliment of gay
- R: it is like a () you say...so you must put commas I think...there are too much adjectives and they are in order...
- W: I mean he was a gay full of life but we say “he is a handsome gay” comma...full of life...I think it becomes ungrammatical
- R: I think there is a need for comma here...as she doesn’t enjoy even the course of her life consciously...comma...there is no meaning of life for her to go on...you may ”support” rather than “thinks”...or another verb...and rather than writing them in paranthesis...you may write directly I think...
- W: but our teacher said that...we can use...some information in paranthesis...to enrich our article...it makes it more sophisticated...
- R: it doesn’t seem like an...information...it is a part of...
- W: it is part of but I want to make it ironic...because generally...”they are conscious enough to respond to” ()
- R: that’s all

SECOND PART (peers are talking about a paper on television)

- R: at the beginning of the...article I think there is a mistake about phrasal verb..."look at something"...
- W: yes
- R: it is not about grammar but the organization of this kind of argumentative essay first a paragraph about background then a paragraph about only for thesis statement
- W: I do not know...but
- R: it is written there...so I think you can...separate these two sentences from each other and add something to the thesis statement...making it a paragraph...also...I did not see any relationship between these two sentences you used...if it is thought the programs are harmful and bad for the society the decision about whether they will watch or not is of their choice too
- W: at the beginning of the sentence I say... "if people choose what they will watch...and if they think these programs are harmful and bad...the decision is of them too"...I tried to emphasize these and these...and I used "too" because of this
- R: can we use there "while" or "in one hand"? These programs are thought to be harmful and bad...in other hand...they are choosing these programs...we use "if" for "conditions" but I do not see any "conditions" there...

- W: I tried to show “both of them are own their choice”...I used “if” because of this but if you cannot understand I can change it...
- R: also you mentioned an example about your own experience in metu...in this reason part...but I think it is an experience...you can include in emotional paragraph...
- W: yes but to support my idea I need to give an example here
- R: we should use comma before “but” not after “but”...also you said that to be able to survive in terms of economic side it is a bit Turkish...I think you can use “aspect” in terms of “economic aspect”...again...for “want”...”wanted”...you can use “what is voted”...
- W: I tried to say...”what is wanted”...I used “what is wanted” because...it is about their “wants”...I do not want to...mention about “the votes”...the direct results...the formal things...
- R: ok I know it is their desire but the verb is not appropriate for this sentence...maybe I am wrong but...also...here do we use “feel someone” and “infinitive?” “remote” is a verb here?
- W: no it is an adjective...”feel themselves remote”...
- R: I do not know but feel with an infinitive...you can use “relieve from”...”relieve from the”...also here people are tired not “tiring”
- W: yes that’s true
- R: also is there a spelling mistake here I did not understand...

- W: yes...as an example to this debate on television...and there is comma...there must be comma...I can give myself as an example
- R: instead of “myself” you can use “my own experience”...because you are not the example but your experience is an example
- W: I can give “my own experience”
- R: also you said that I prefer to watch after a zapping period IS entertainment...”becomes entertainment” is Turkish...
- W: I used is it is like a () but I want to mention about an action but...I can't find another verb
- R: I find it strange become but is also is strange...but I think there is another verb we can use there...here you said in trt but for channels we use “on”...you say in addition my father is another example “in addition” and “another” have the same meaning here
- W: yes
- R: you should delete one of them...also...”because of”...after “because” you used a phrase so “because of” should be used there
- W: yes that's true
- R: and I think so that he can get rid of the stress of the whole day...instead “he can be remote”..again you used “remote” here...also...here you have “when”...and that...but I think it is not necessary to use that here because here you say I remember when I was in high school...I think it is extra it

can be omitted here...and also it is past action so you should use past tense...and then...

W: a spelling mistake about “the computer”

R: and also you said that the programs that are put forward...

W: “both they televise and they support this”...I tried to say this by saying “put forward”

R: I think I get the point...so you can use “exhibited” there...also here there is a prepositional mistake here...”on television”...and there is an absence of verb here?

W: yes... I may change write that in a different format I think

R: you said that in today’s world a lot of children are showing some bad habits...I think “showing” is not appropriate here...instead of showing “acting out some bad habits”...and what must change are not the television programs but the families must...there is contradiction between these two sentences...you can use a contractive...a...an adverbial or something showing the contrast of the sentences...I think...what is the use of this...

W: I forgot to write “although” I think...

R: yes “despite”...like a relaxation for people...I say that “they are a way of relaxation”

W: yes that’s true...thank you

R: I thank you

APPENDIX C

A SAMPLE THINK-ALOUD TRANSCRIPTION

A participant is revising her paper individually in think-aloud protocol:

the success of English as a medium of instruction firstly I said...people are accustomed to living I think...if I would say “people are used to”...I think it would be better...and...I say supermarkets or cinemas...and I think I should use comma before “or”...and to start with in Turkey there are many foreign companies such as ...I should add “not only foreign companies but also companies which are shared by turkish people and also foreign people”...at the end of the first page I said this situation can occur only through good universities while I was writing this I suspect that whether I should use “occur” or not...but if I use should be “happened”...yes...yes...I would be better...and the situation requires knowing perfect english not only but also explaining some terms about business life...I think I should change the format of this sentence... instead of some terms I should say “terminological terms” maybe “about business life”...I should...use comma...all in all the role of english as a medium of instruction...yes.. I would say that it is an extra information

APPENDIX D

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

<u>Underlined</u>	read parts from the essay
<i>Italics</i>	the parts which show the part that the coding relates to in the analysis
CAPITAL LETTERS	emphasis on the words during the talk
...	pause
?	a question arised
()	not understandable parts during transcription
“ “	negotiated parts of the language