

# SWEET BURDENS: PERCEPTIONS OF FOREIGN-LANGUAGE MAJORS ABOUT PEER REVIEWS\*

CHIN-LUNG WEI\*\*

## Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to investigate Taiwanese EFL undergraduates' reflections on peer-review tasks. An intact class with 29 foreign-language majors of a college Sophomore English Composition course was selected as the subjects. After one-semester's implementation of the peer-review technique, questionnaire and reflection papers were used to collect data. Descriptive statistics and content analysis methods were used to analyze the data.

It was found that most students indicated that the peer-review tasks helped improve writing. They also suggested that peer reviews were beneficial for improving interpersonal relationships, communicative competence, oral/aural abilities, and independent thinking. Their attitudes towards peer reviews were generally positive. The problems that emerged in the students' comments were the suspicions of peers' capabilities, the lack of active participation, and students' beliefs in authority. Finally, the present study recommends further research on more non-foreign-language majors and testing the effects of peer reviews on different drafts of an article.

**Key words:** Peer Reviews, English Writing, TESOL

\* This is the first phase report of a project granted by National Science Council. I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the Council.

\*\* Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Taichung Evening School, National Chung-Hsing University.

## 1. The Problem

Although most students in Taiwan spend more than six years studying English, according to Shih, few of them are able to master the language (313-17). Judging from the results of Joint Entrance Examination for Colleges, people can easily discover that most students' English writing scores are not high. Taiwan's students are generally not confident of their English writing competence. Actually, the instruction of English writing has received more attention in senior high schools since English composition was included into the Joint Entrance Examination for colleges in 1981. However, the teaching and learning of writing English were always considered a nightmare by both instructors and learners. Many factors can be attributed to the problem though, the crucial causes are considered to be the large class size and shortage of teacher training. Average class size of over forty or fifty and teachers' lack proficiency in composition have made teaching of writing superficial and ineffective. Many instructional strategies have been introduced and adopted to facilitate EFL writing instruction though, the grammar translation method and teacher-centered philosophy still dominate most EFL classes in Taiwanese schools. Grammar explanation and sentence analysis are the most-seen activities during writing practices. In addition, under a centralized educational system and competitive learning environment, teachers of English are traditionally regarded as the authority of the subject and should be trusted. Students are conditioned to be more obedient and passive. They tend to be more isolated and defensive learners. A typical English writing class in Taiwan is generally a monotonous routine: First, the teacher assigns a topic for the whole class and the students individually write their own articles at home or in the class; then, the teacher correct or grade students' drafts, focusing mainly on grammar/sentence patterns; finally, after browsing the grade or comments on the returned paper, the students file it or throw it in the garbage can.

Peer review had been suggested as a useful and valuable instructional activity for enhancing students' communication and composition abilities in English. According to Mittan, "the peer review process a useful method to focus on students' existing communicative powers and to show them how to extend those abilities in their writing" (208). In Mangelsdorf's study, she discovers that "peer reviews can

be helpful to students during the drafting process" (274). Mendonca and Johnson also conclude that "peer reviews are a valuable form of feedback in L2 writing instruction" (767). In an informal study, Kao indicates that 78% of the subjects considered peer review a helpful process for their writing (49-64). It is reasonable to believe that peer review could be an appropriate instructional strategy for Taiwanese EFL writing classes. Nevertheless, there was a poverty of comprehensive information about how Taiwanese EFL learners perceived peer reviews. It is worthwhile to conduct more profound research to explore Taiwanese students' perceptions about this instructional technique. Without this knowledge, it is difficult to make instructional recommendations on a rational basis. Therefore, research is needed to investigate more Taiwanese EFL students' reflections on peer-review tasks.

## 2. The Focus

The peer review process in the present study means that "students read drafts of their fellow students' essays in order to make suggestions for revision" (Mangelsdorf 274). To fulfill the purpose mentioned previously, the present study addressed the following questions:

- 1) What are the strengths and limitations of the peer review process perceived by Taiwanese college EFL students?
- 2) What are Taiwanese college EFL learners' attitudes towards the peer review process?

## 3. Delimitations

The scope of the present study was delimited to the following:

- 1) One aspect of the EFL composition instructional techniques was studied--the peer review process.
- 2) The inquiry was confined to college EFL students majoring in foreign languages and literature.
- 3) Restricted to the feasibility and practicability of the present study, the inquiry was limited to selecting students from one intact English composition class as the

subjects.

- 4) The findings of the present study were restricted to the replies of those respondents who returned the questionnaires and the reflection papers.
- 5) The respondents were limited to the choices available on the questionnaires, although there was one open-ended question.
- 6) The present study was descriptive rather than evaluative; therefore, no evaluative criteria were established.

## 4. Methodology

Questionnaire and written reflection papers were used to collect data for the present study. The subjects, instrument, instructional design, and data analysis are described in the following:

### 4.1. The Subjects

The subjects for the present study were the 29 students of an intact sophomore English composition class. No random sampling was conducted. These subjects were students of Department of Foreign Languages and Literature at a university evening school in the central part of Taiwan. Although their major was foreign languages, English was traditionally designed as the primary foreign language for the curriculum and English was officially considered as a foreign language. Both freshmen and sophomores in the Department are required to take English composition courses. They need to pass the Freshman English Composition course before they take Sophomore English Composition.

### 4.2. The Instrument

In order to obtain more specific and objective data, a questionnaire with 27 statements and one open-ended question was generated by the researcher on the basis of Mangelsdorf's study. Prior to being circulated, the questionnaire was submitted to the same participants for pilot testing. Based on their suggestions, a revised version of questionnaire was created for the present study (See Appendix A). After one-semester's peer review processes, the subjects were requested to carefully read

the questionnaire and decided whether they agreed with, disagreed with, or weren't sure about each statement based on their one-semester's experiences with peer-review tasks. The open-ended question asked students to write down their comments on peer reviews. In addition, an assignment was also made at the end of the semester to have the students write a reflection paper on the peer-review tasks in an unstructured, comprehensive, and open-ended way to obtain more profound data.

#### 4.3. The Instructional Design

The Sophomore English Composition offered by the Department is a two-credit course. Class was scheduled to meet two successive hours each week. For the present study, the peer-review technique was applied to the course for one semester. In order to produce marked effects, the whole semester was arranged in several cycles of three weeks for the peer review activities. Within each cycle of the three weeks, the students worked on the very same topic they picked. Each essay needed to be written and revised three times through peer-review processes in three class meetings. The original and revised drafts were turned in for grading each week. In total, except for holidays and examinations, five cycles/essays were proceeded during the semester. The instructional procedures were divided into demonstration and three draftings:

##### 4.3.1. Demonstration

Since the subjects were not familiar with and not used to the peer-review processes for English writing, a demonstration was given at the first meeting of the course. The instructor first distributed a sample essay, a peer-review sheet (See Appendix B), and a sheet of checking guidelines (See Appendix C) to each student and explained how to make the most use of the review sheet and the guidelines to facilitate the review tasks. He also introduced the general components of a piece of writing--content, form, grammar, style, and mechanics--to strengthen the students' knowledge of English composition. Then, the whole class practiced together. The instructor, acting as the chairperson, guided the students to go over errors in the sample essay and suggestions made by the students. The students were then divided

into several study groups with five to six members in each to experience the peer review processes following the instructor's demonstration.

#### 4.3.2. The First Drafting

During the first meeting of a cycle, a brainstorming activity was first performed. Students organized their own study groups with five to six members in each. They could express their ideas openly and request suggestions from their group members, but they needed to decide their own topic and outline. As long as they felt they were ready to compose, they started to write the first draft by themselves. They were free to consult any tool books or asked for help from classmates or instructor. After they finished the first drafts, they picked a reviewer from the study group and exchanged their drafts for reviewing. Every student was a reviewer for someone else. No two or more students shared the same reviewer. They were requested to do the review tasks and fill in the peer-review sheet after class before next meeting.

#### 4.3.3. The Second Drafting

During the second meeting of a cycle, the students exchanged peer-review sheets with the reviewer they picked in the first meeting, discussed with their peers about their first drafts, and requested opinions for revision. After the discussion, they turned in a photocopy of the first draft along with the peer-review sheet written by the reviewer for grading and began to write the second draft based on the first one and their peer's suggestions. They selected a different reviewer to exchange their second drafts for the second peer review tasks. Similarly, they needed to finish the second peer review tasks at home before next meeting.

#### 4.3.4. The Final Drafting

During the third meeting of a cycle, the students did the same tasks executed in the second meeting, but with a different reviewer they had chosen. Based on the second draft and new reviewer's comments, they could finish the final drafts either during the class period or at home. They were required to turn in their final drafts at the beginning of the next cycle.

Although students were allowed to use the English and native languages as the media of discussion, English was strongly encouraged. During the peer review processes, the instructor occasionally walked around the classroom to observe and evaluate students' performance and to provide help whenever it was needed. Learners' grades were based on all the drafts they composed and the overall performance of the peer review tasks. Each draft was checked and graded following the scoring guide recommended by Lin and others (597). The peer-review performances were assessed on the bases of the comments filled in the peer-review sheet, suggestions written on their peers' drafts, and the tasks they performed in the class meetings.

#### 4.4. Data Collection and Analysis

After one-semester's peer-review tasks, students were requested to fill out a questionnaire anonymously and write a reflection paper on the course. The instruction for writing the paper was: "Please look back to see what you have been through in Sophomore English Composition course and write an essay on it."

The analysis of these data was processed in two procedures. Firstly, the data for the 27 objective statements were quantified with descriptive statistics by using the SAS computer software and presented in the form of tables. Secondly, the answers for the open-ended question and the written reflections were analyzed by using content analysis method. The analyses were focused primarily on both the positive effects and the problems students perceived about the peer review tasks.

### 5. Results

Data collection terminated at the end of the Fall semester in 1994. The results and implications are presented in two sections: responses to the questionnaire and elicited written reflections.

#### 5.1. Responses to the Questionnaire

Data drawn from the responses to the 27-statement questionnaire were collected, recorded, and quantified with descriptive statistics. The results are presented in

tables to facilitate reading and understanding. Percentages are rounded to whole numbers in the tables. The percentages are followed by frequencies (in parentheses) for each table. The format for the presentation of data follows a sequence of content, organization/style, grammar/mechanics, and comments.

### 5.1.1. Content

Students' responses to the components relevant to the content of compositions are presented in Table 1. Eighty percent or more of the students agreed that peer-review tasks helped clarify ideas (80%), give different views on topic (86%), and develop ideas (86%). Seventy percent or more of the respondents agreed that peer-review tasks helped with focus (72%), giving new ideas (70%), improving thesis (70%), and deleting unnecessary statements (79%). About sixty percent (59%) of the students agreed that peer-review tasks helped in keeping audience interest. On average, 75% of the students agreed that peer-review tasks helped improving content and 24% disagreed. The results suggest that most students assured that peer-review tasks were useful for improving the substance of the writing and the ideas expressed.

Table 1 Percentages of responses to the content categories (N=29)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
Helps clarify ideas	80% (23)	17% (5)	3% (1)
Helps give different views on topic	86% (25)	14% (4)	---
Helps develop ideas	86% (25)	14% (4)	---
Helps give new ideas	70% (20)	30% (9)	---
Helps with focus	72% (21)	28% (8)	---
Helps in keeping audience interest	59% (17)	41% (12)	---
Helps improve thesis	70% (20)	30% (9)	---
Helps delete unnecessary statements	79% (23)	21% (6)	---

### 5.1.2. Organization/Style

Students' responses to the components relevant to the form and the style of compositions are presented in Table 2. About eighty percent (79%) of the students

agreed that peer-review tasks helped improve organization and 21% disagreed. Around sixty percent (59%) of the respondents agreed that peer-review tasks helped improve title and 41% disagreed. About forty percent (41%) of the students agreed that peer-review tasks helped improve transitions and 59% disagreed. Thirty percent of the respondents agreed that peer-review tasks helped improve style and seventy disagreed. On the whole, more than 60% of the students agreed that peer-review tasks helped improve the form and title of compositions. However, more than half of the students disagreed that peer-review tasks helped improve the transitions and style. The results suggest that most students supported that peer-review tasks were useful for improving the title and organization of a composition, but not so helpful for improving transitions and style. This may imply that the transitions and the style of a composition were the most difficult components for most students to comment on and deal with in peer review processes.

Table 2 Percentages of responses to the organization/style categories (N=29)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
Helps improve organization	79% (23)	21% (6)	---
Helps improve title	59% (17)	41% (12)	---
Helps improve transitions	41% (12)	59% (17)	---
Helps improve style	30% (9)	70% (20)	---

### 5.1.3. Grammar/Mechanics

Students' responses to the components relevant to the grammar and the mechanics of compositions are presented in Table 3. More than eighty percent (83%) of the students agreed that peer-review tasks helped with grammar and improving mistakes and 17% disagreed. About eighty percent (79%) of the students agreed that peer-review tasks helped improve spelling and 21% disagreed. On the whole, more than about 80% of the students agreed that peer-review tasks helped improving the employment of grammatical forms and mechanics. The results suggest that most students approved that peer-review tasks were useful for enhancing the usage of syntactic patterns and the use of the graphic convention of English in their writing.

This may imply that grammatical and mechanic errors were the easiest for students to identify and handle.

Table 3 Percentages of responses to the grammar/mechanics categories (N=29)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
Helps with grammar	83% (24)	17% (5)	---
Helps improve mistakes	83% (24)	17% (5)	---
Helps improve spelling	79% (23)	21% (6)	---

#### 5.1.4. Comments

The results of students' comments on peer-review tasks are presented in Table 4. More than ninety percent of the students agreed that peers' drafts were readable (93%) and that they liked to be criticized (97%). More than seventy percent of the students agreed that peers' criticism could be trusted (73%), that they liked criticizing peers (79%), peer-review tasks helped writer be more critical (83%), and that peer-review tasks made it easy to relate to another student's comments (76%). More than half of the respondents agreed that they were confident of being a reviewer (55%), that time was enough in class (66%), that peer's drafts served as models (66%), and that reviewers told them to change positions (57%). More than seventy percent of the students (72%) disagreed that peers' critics were apathetic. Less than half of the subjects (38%) agreed that peers' written comments were specific. On the whole, more than half of the students' remarks on peer reviews were positive. The only complaint about peer reviews was that the comments on the review sheets written by the peers were not specific. The results suggest that most students' attitudes toward peer-review tasks were positive. Most of the respondents expected that their peers' comments could be more specific.



National Chung Hsing University

Table 4 Percentages of responses to the comment categories (N=29)

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
Student criticism can be trusted	73% (21)	21% (6)	6% (2)
Student critics are apathetic	28% (8)	72% (21)	---
Written comments are specific	38% (11)	59% (17)	---
Time is enough in class	66% (19)	34% (10)	---
Drafts are readable	93% (27)	7% (2)	---
Confident of being a reviewer	55% (16)	45% (13)	---
Likes criticizing peers	79% (23)	21% (6)	---
Likes being criticized	97% (28)	3% (1)	---
Helps writer be more critical	83% (24)	17% (5)	---
Peers' drafts serve as models	66% (19)	28% (8)	6% (2)
Makes it easy to relate to another student's comments	76% (22)	24% (7)	---
Reviewers tell me to change my position	59% (17)	41% (12)	---

## 5.2. Elicited Written Reflections

Written reflections and replies to the open-ended question of the questionnaire were either positive or negative. On the whole, most of the students indicated that the peer-review experience led to both improving writing and increasing creativity and critical thinking. Their attitudes toward peer reviews were positive. These data generally correspond with the results found from the responses to the 27 statements on the questionnaire. One student suggested that peer-review tasks improved her English writing "both in quantity and quality". Although, in the beginning, some students were not used to the peer-review tasks and felt nervous and burdensome, they changed their mind-sets little by little. In the end, one student reflected that the peer-review tasks were "sweet burdens". English writing became a high rewarding task because of the abundant feedback from peers. Further, English composition was no longer a nightmare to some students. Their writing apprehension was lessened. Some began to like English composition more. Tool books, such as dictionaries and grammar texts, were consulted more frequently and more efficiently. Moreover, some students indicated that peer-review tasks were good for improving interpersonal relationships, English oral and aural abilities, and

communicative competence. Some believed that cooperation was an important factor for effective learning. Peer-review tasks were also considered beneficial for independent thinking, self-esteem, and self-education.

Three problems that emerged in the students' comments were the suspicions of peers' capabilities, the lack of active participation, and students' beliefs in authority. These are actually the issues resulted from the traditional, teacher-centered teaching culture in Taiwan. These issues can lead to an important but painful learning experience for the students who are not aware of the adverse effects of old learning habits.

## 6. Conclusion and Recommendation

Most subjects for the present study positively reflected the effects of the peer reviews on their English draftings. This finding appears to be consistent with the research literature. Most of the participants felt more comfortable and easier to deal with the components of grammar, mechanics, content, and organization in an article. The peer review process represents one of many possible techniques for the teaching of English writing. It is practical and helpful because it is flexible and relatively lively, while embodying a philosophy of English writing instruction that affirms the creativity, critical thinking, and communicative competence of the learners. Peer reviews are designed to give the control of learning back to the students, so that they become actively involved in choosing what and how to write and share. It is earnestly recommended that EFL teachers in Taiwan can make the best use of this technique to empower students' writing ability.

There are some problems with peer reviews for Taiwanese EFL undergraduates. Transitions and style were reflected as the difficulties in peer reviews. Most students also anticipated more specific comments and suggestions from their reviewers. Other problems primarily surround issues of traditional learning styles or habits--passive learning, isolated learning, defensive learning, and authority trusting. However, to change students' stereotyped mind-sets is a long-term job. Judging from the significant changes of most subjects, the present study suggests that students' attitudes are gradually molded in the long run. Teachers should be

persistent with this effective technique from the beginning to the very end. In order to make the best effects of peer reviews, teachers are recommended to be more open, fortitude, and patient while implementing. Peer reviews are definitely a novelty to students who are used to teacher-centered and authority-trusted culture. Suspicions and complaints about the change can surely be heard every now and then, especially at the beginning of the implementation. Some students distrusted and rejected peer's comments. Some students were used to teacher-directed activities. Some misunderstood that the instructor was trying to be lazy during the class meetings. Therefore, instructors must be insistent on the innovation, patient with helping student, and willing to accept any constructive opinions such as re-organizing study group every month and giving more time for whole class discussion. Teacher-student conference can be a helpful way to dispel possible objections or misunderstandings.

As the delimitations mentioned above, the subjects were confined to college foreign-language majors. The small sample size and the participation of only advanced EFL learners constrain the extent to which the findings of the present study can be generalized. Further studies are recommended to select a broader sample of subjects from EFL learners other than English majors, such as adults, high school students, or college non-English majors. Moreover, although most subjects for the present study reflected that peer reviews were helpful for their English composition, it is worthwhile to conduct an empirical study to test whether there is a significant difference between two drafts through peer-review tasks.



National Chung Hsing University

## Works Cited

- Kao, S. M. "Teaching Writing from a Process-Oriented Approach and its Application to the University English Composition Course Design." Papers from the Tenth Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China. Ed. W. P. Li, Y. M. Yin, H. H. Chang, B. I. Lin, and C. Y. Lin. Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co., Ltd., 1992. 49-64. [In Chinese]
- Lin, H. R., Huang, T. S., Lin, C. Y., and Chen, K. T. "English Composition Topic Assignment and Grading." Papers from the Tenth Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China. Ed. W. P. Li, Y. M. Yin, H. H. Chang, B. I. Lin, and C. Y. Lin. Taipei: The Crane Publishing Co., Ltd., 1992. 577-610. [In Chinese]
- Mangelsdorf, K. "Peer Reviews in the ESL Composition Classroom: What do the Students Think?" ELT 46.3 (1992): 274-84.
- Mendonca, C. O. and Johnson, K. E. "Peer Review Negotiations: Revision Activities in ESL Writing Instruction." TESOL Quarterly 28.4 (1994): 745-69.
- Mittan, R. "The Peer Review Process: Harnessing Students' Communicative Power." Richness in Writing: Empowering ESL Students. Ed. Donna M. Johnson and Duane H. Rosen. New York: Longman, 1989. 207-19.
- Shih, Y. H. Overview. EFL Readings for Chinese Teachers. Vol. 1. By Shih. Ed. F. F. Tsao, T. S. Huang, Y. H. Shih, and T. L. Huang. Taipei, Taiwan: The Crane Publishing Co., Ltd., 1980. 313-317.



National Chung Hsing University

### Appendix A Questionnaire

Please read each of the following statements (1-27) carefully.

If you agree, check or circle the "A".

If you disagree, check or circle the "D".

If you are not sure, check or circle the "N".

- A D N 1. Peer-review task helps clarify ideas.  
A D N 2. Peer-review task helps give different views on topic.  
A D N 3. Peer-review task helps develop ideas.  
A D N 4. Peer-review task helps give new ideas.  
A D N 5. Peer-review task helps with focus.  
A D N 6. Peer-review task helps in keeping audience interest.  
A D N 7. Peer-review task helps improve thesis.  
A D N 8. Peer-review task helps delete unnecessary statements.  
A D N 9. Peer-review task helps improve organization.  
A D N 10. Peer-review task helps improve mistakes.  
A D N 11. Peer-review task helps improve spelling.  
A D N 12. Peer-review task helps improve title.  
A D N 13. Peer-review task helps improve transitions.  
A D N 14. Peer-review task helps improve style.  
A D N 15. Peer-review task helps writer be more critical.  
A D N 16. Peers' drafts serve as models in peer-review task.  
A D N 17. Peer-review task makes it easy to relate to another student's  
comments.  
A D N 18. Student criticism can be trusted in peer-review task.  
A D N 19. Student critics are apathetic in peer-review task.  
A D N 20. Written comments are specific in peer-review task.  
A D N 21. Reviewers can help with grammar in peer-review task.  
A D N 22. Reviewers tell me to change my position.  
A D N 23. Time is enough in class for peer-review task.  
A D N 24. Student drafts are readable.  
A D N 25. I am confident of being a reviewer.  
A D N 26. I like criticizing peers.  
A D N 27. I like being criticized by peers.

\*\*\* If any, please write down more comments on peer-review tasks in general  
(either positive or negative).

National Chung Hsing University

Appendix B Peer Review Sheet  
(From Mittan, R.. The Peer Review Process, 1989, p.216)

Draft written by \_\_\_\_\_  
Review written by \_\_\_\_\_

Your purpose in answering these questions is to provide an honest and helpful response to your partner's draft and to suggest ways to make his/her writing better. Before beginning your review, be sure to read the writing carefully. After you have done that, respond to each of the following questions. Be as specific as possible; refer directly to your partner's paper by paragraph number.

1. What do you like most about your partner's writing? Choose the most interesting idea and EXPLAIN WHY it captured your attention.
  
2. In your own words, state what you think your partner's focus is. What is your partner trying to explain to readers?
  
3. How helpful and informative will this paper be for readers who want to visit your partner's culture? Which parts need to be developed with more detail so that the readers can understand these kinds of communication?
  
4. Choose the response that you agree with:  
\_\_\_\_\_ Each of your paragraphs discusses only one idea and everything in it is related to that topic.  
\_\_\_\_\_ Some of your paragraphs are confusing because they seem to be about more than one idea. I marked them with an X.  
\_\_\_\_\_ Your writing seems to be all in one paragraph. I can't tell where you start discussing a new idea. Please help!
  
5. On the back of this page, write a short letter to your partner explaining how his or her writing can be improved. BE VERY SPECIFIC and explain why you think these changes will be helpful to the reader. Be sure to sign your letter.

### Appendix C Composition Checklist

#### I. CONTENT/ORGANIZATION

1. Is there an introductory paragraph? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Does the introductory paragraph end with a thesis statement? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Are there at least two supporting paragraphs? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Does each paragraph begin with a topic sentence? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Is the information in each paragraph related to the topic of the paragraph?  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. Does the essay have a conclusion? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Does the conclusion include the main points of the essay? \_\_\_\_\_

#### II. GRAMMAR

1. Do verbs agree with their subjects? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Are the verb forms (past, present, future, etc.) used correctly? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Does every sentence have a subject, verb, and an object (if necessary)?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Are plural nouns pluralized with ‘s’ or ‘es’? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Are articles (a, an, the) used correctly? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Do adjectives come before the nouns they modify? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Are other rules of grammar used correctly? \_\_\_\_\_

#### III. MECHANICS

1. Are all paragraphs indented? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Do all sentences end with periods or question marks? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Do all sentences begin with capitals? \_\_\_\_\_
4. What about other punctuation: commas, quotation marks, apostrophes, etc.? \_\_\_\_\_

5. What about other capitalization: city-names, country-names, etc.? \_\_\_\_\_

6. Are words correctly spelled? \_\_\_\_\_

#### IV. FORM

1. Is the hand-writing clear and easy to read? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Does the essay have margins on all four sides? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Does the writing begin on the third line of the paper? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Is the name, date, etc. in the upper right-hand corner? \_\_\_\_\_

5. Are all mistakes erased (or whited-out) so that no crossed-out words or words written above others appear in the paper? \_\_\_\_\_

6. Does the paper have a generally neat appearance? \_\_\_\_\_



National Chung Hsing University

# 甜美的負擔：外文系學生對同儕評稿的看法\*

韋金龍\*\*

## 摘要

本研究的目的是調查臺灣外文系學生對同儕評稿的態度。29名原建制、外文系二年級英文作文課的學生被選作調查的對象，經過一學期使用同儕評稿進行英文作文教學活動後，以問卷及感想書寫來蒐集資料，再以統計及內容分析法來分析學生的反應資料。

結果發現多數學生認為同儕評稿可以改進英文作文，也覺得同儕評稿對改善人際關係、溝通能力、英語聽講能力、及獨立思考有助益，一般說來，他們對同儕評稿教學活動是持正面的看法；少數學生提出三個可能影響同儕評稿成效的疑慮：同儕的評稿能力、同學漠不關心的態度、及學生過於迷信權威的習慣；本研究建議選取更多非外文系學生作進一步探討研究。

關鍵詞：同儕評稿、英文作文、英語教學

\*本研究報告屬國科會贊助計畫之第一部份，特別向該會致謝。

\*\* 國立中興大學台中夜間部外國語文學系副教授  
National Chung Hsing University