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Abstract

Both students and teachers are environmentally challenged. Teachers are not well-heeled to do everything for students including giving feedback to students. Writing is a challenging area in teaching ESL. It was said that giving written feedback to students’ writing is the most time consuming and challenging job (Ferris, 2007). This paper reports on a study designed to investigate and identify the benefits and the challenges of peer review, to investigate the influence of content and form based feedback to students writing. Teachers should be more aware of the right techniques to use in writing class to produce all-rounder future communities.

© 2012 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Centre for Environment-Behaviour Studies (cE-Bs), Faculty of Architecture, Planning & Surveying, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia.

Keywords: Environmentally challenged; future communities; influence; peer evaluation

1. Introduction

Today’s environment challenges students and also teachers. With the advancement of technology, the students’ attitudes, and facilities available, students are more spoilt, passive and turned out to be more exam oriented. Moreover, students are becoming too dependent. Higher education reports that students have passive attitudes, lack of motivation, weak in problem analysis and have lack communication skills (Shahbodin & Abd Talib, 2010). Students only focus and concentrate on what is required for assessment. They also prefer to memorize facts and the procedures. This shows that they are practicing extrinsic desire to learn that is just for the purpose of passing the exam (Yong 2010). Certain students are very reliant on the teachers and regularly ask for extra exercises and consultations. Teachers’ workloads do not
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help this matter to get any better. Therefore, they do not have much time to cater to every student’s needs. This is where peer evaluation comes in handy.

Teachers will have to do almost everything and with the burden of multitasking, teachers are not well off to do everything including giving feedback to students, especially their essays. Writing is a challenging area in teaching ESL. It was said that giving written feedback to students’ writing is the most time consuming and challenging job (Ferris, 2007). Moreover, Ferris et al. (1997) also stated that teachers spend most time giving written feedback to students’ writing which is also the most crucial part of being a teacher. Therefore, through peer evaluation, teachers will have extra time and this extra time can be utilized to focus on teaching techniques rather than grading students’ writing by themselves (Patri, 2002). The time saved can be used to help students refine their writing skills and also focus on other techniques of teaching. Students too will benefit from this, that is to become more independent.

As teachers need to use an approach to attract students’ interest in writing, many teachers agree that the most effective way to gain the attention of students is to talk about writing in class is to discuss the students’ own writing (Gocsik, 2005). It is not effective when students learn in isolation. Therefore, omitting the isolation can help students learn more effectively. Students should be given opportunity to become actively involved with peers to help them learn (Gocsik, 2005). Willem et al. (1993) stated that involvement between peers is very essential (Shahbodin & Abd Talib, 2010). Since time and full attention are the major problems among teachers in teaching writing, alternatives such as peer review might help in easing the problems and heighten the quality of writings.

As writing includes a large portion of editing in drafting, peer review is a prominent attribute in the editing stage of writing a composition. This occurs when opinions, views and point of views are given thus making the peers as critics of the writing. Criticism is something important especially in reflecting on writing. Writers usually struggle with individual expression and social constraint when writing. Therefore, Holt (1999) suggested that peer criticism work best in the collaborative classroom so that they can face those difficulties and deal with it through peer review. Through that, students will have to alter their work and align their writing to the benefit of the reader so that their work become more comprehensible for their audience.

Peer review stimulates students not only to work alone but also to work with the presence of peers. Peers may help in presenting advice and comments that are later formed into revision. This is parallel with Vygotsky’s theory of zone of proximal development which states the area of certain things that can be done by a person alone and certain things that are to be done with others in furthering learning and development (Jacobs, 1989). Peer evaluation as an approach will be effective to help students build and develop their writing skills. Students read their peer’s drafts and make suggestions for revision (Mangelsdorf, 1992). According to Maesin et al. (2009), undergrads students prefer to participate in collaborative activities during English classes. This is because they get to interact with peers, present, defend their ideas and exchange opinions. Thus, it is a prominent importance to add in alternatives such as collaborative activity in teaching writing. It is vital to focus on peer feedback especially in writing (Caulk, 1994; Carson & Nelson, 1994; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Jacobs & Zhang, 1989; Mangelsdorf & Schumberger, 1992; Nelson & Murphey, 1992, 1993) in (Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, Huang, 1998). With all the problems and difficulties teachers face, it is time to find other ways to improve students’ writing which do not only benefit students, but teachers as well.

Types of feedback from peer evaluation could also be investigated to gauge improvement in writing. Arguments have been going on about which type of feedback is better, whether to focus on content or form. Fathman and Whalley (1990) and Ferris (1997) concluded that giving form and content feedback at the same time did not deleteriously affect student revision (Ashwell, 2000). Zamel’s (1985) recommendation to give content feedback on early drafts and form feedback on later drafts did produce better results than the other patterns of form and content feedback used. One of these suggestions is that
teachers should attend to content in preliminary drafts before switching to focus on form on later drafts. The supposition is that by doing so the teacher can encourage revision (making large-scale changes to content) on early drafts before helping the student with editing (making small-scale changes to form) on the final draft (Ashwell, 2000). This can also be applied in peer evaluation where the earlier drafts of peer review focusing on content and later drafts on form.

This research will be focusing on the issue discussed above and will be focusing on four main objectives which is students’ perceptions on the benefits of peer evaluation, on perceptions on its’ challenges, how content based feedback from peer evaluation influences students’ writing and lastly how form based feedback from peer evaluation influences the students’ writing.

2. Literature Review

All Peer evaluation is one method that is essential in teaching writing. According to Forsdyke (2005), peer evaluation is the name of a process where the essay of an individual is assessed by another individual. It can also be done in groups. Peer review is also commonly known as peer editing or peer evaluation (Mangelsdorf, 1992). Hodges (2004) stated that peer evaluation takes on one’s writing to be shared by a group of peer readers who offered to give comments, feedback as well as suggestions for improvement. According to Sengupta (1998), the peer evaluation process involves students to write their own compositions that are their first draft. Then, they exchange this first draft with their partner or the person sitting next to them, read each other’s work and give comments and suggestions where necessary. They then return the compositions with the suggestions and comments. Peers then revise the essays and make improvements. The teachers’ role here is just to facilitate where they need to guide the students and help out with difficult words and so on.

Peer evaluation helps students in certain ways especially in improving writing. In a study done by Roskam (1999), 70% of students agreed that they learnt something from peer evaluation. Peer evaluation also gives students opportunity to actually put extra efforts to their writing rather than let them think that one single draft is enough (Levine et al., 2002). Therefore, it is clear that peer evaluation helps improve writing through receiving suggestions from peers thus giving students awareness of their strength and weaknesses in writing, help improves both language and context of students’ writing, add understanding of writing among students thus making students a more critical reader and writer.

Peer evaluation brings a “sense of audience awareness” which means letting the writing be assessed from the audience point of view, not the writer. Students gain authentic audience when conducting peer evaluation thus this helps them improve their writings. This was according to Mittan (1989) in (Mangelsdorf, 1992); (Gocsik, 2005); (Tsui & Ng, 2000); (Jacob & Curtis, 1998); (Levine et al 2002). Hodges (2005) also agrees on the same matter stating that peer evaluation can help widen the audience for writers as peer review involves interaction among students. Peer evaluation also encourages writing as a process of communication to an authentic audience (Mangelsdorf, 1992). Students feel happy and feel that writing is more meaningful as there are “real” people reading their writing. When students feel there is an audience to read their writing, they tend to improve their writing and know their focus and purpose of their writing (Porto, 2001; Lockhart, 1994 in Lockhart and Ng, 1996). Basically, peer evaluation guides to build and expand students’ sense of audience (Urzda, 1987 in Lockhart and Ng, 1996). Authentic audience has managed to stimulate students in improving their writing.

Peer evaluation has been proven to help reduce teacher’s workload. According to Patri (2002) and Hodges (2005), if peer evaluation can be done by students effectively, then teachers can reduce their workload and can focus more on their teaching techniques. This way, teachers can teach more effectively as one of their workload has been reduced. They can finally focus and spend more time on teaching techniques for better and interesting teaching and learning process in writing. Teachers will be able to
spend more time focusing on teaching techniques rather than grading students’ writing all by themselves. The time saved can be used to help students refine their writing. Generally, peer evaluation helps teachers to focus on more helpful instructions and also to cut down teachers’ marking duties to minimum level.

Students need to communicate with their peers when doing peer evaluation. Thus, peer evaluation lends a hand to amplify students’ communication skill. Johnson (1994) in Lockhart and Ng (1996) stated that peer evaluation enhances the communication ability of students as they need to interact with each other during peer evaluation. Peers comment and give suggestions and this helps students to gain and develop their social skills (Cheng and Warren, 1996 in Roskams, 1999). According to Levine et. al. (2002), peer evaluation is similar to viewing writing as a social construction of meaning. This means, while conducting peer evaluation, it does not only improve writing, it also improves communication at the same time.

Through peer evaluation, students may increase their way of thinking in a variety of ways. Critical and order thinking may be improved due to evaluation done among peers (Todd & Hudson, 2007). Furthermore, this way, they are more active than passive. They are no longer going to sit still and wait for teachers to return their essays after being marked. They are to communicate with peers in order to make peer review sessions successful. Pelaez (2002) stated in his study that active involvement by students will improve learning. When doing peer evaluation, a sense of responsibility appears as they reflect their own way of learning in the process Saito & Fujita (2009) thus gaining social support (Jacob & Curtis, 1998). They feel more responsible now to revise their work and their writing.

However, there are still some drawbacks for peer review. What comes from students are not necessarily correct and precise. Gardner (2006) stated that many teachers grieved over the use of peer evaluation because they said that students had difficulty to respond effectively to one another’s writing. It was found from studies that students have difficulty in criticizing their own friends. They hate to criticize their friends and are afraid that their friends will not be comfortable with them. They also tend to over mark that is called “friendship marking”. They criticize their enemies and they praise their friends and thus in effect tend to be bias. Woolhouse (1999) in Patri (2002) stated that students have difficulty in making sincere and truthful judgements. Woolhouse also stated that peers do not make honest judgements. They do not want to hurt their friends’ feelings. Oldfield and Macalpine (1995) in Patri (2002) mentioned that peers feel emotionally prejudiced against giving low grades to their classmates. They tend to help their friends by giving high marks. Students may be either over critical or general or reluctant to evaluate at all (Lehtinen & Yates, 2008). There are different levels of students and their responses may vary. During peer evaluation, students are said to overestimate and underestimate their peers. This was supported by Boud and Tyree (1979) in Patri (2002) who stated that peers tend to underestimate and overestimate their friends. Low achievers tend to overestimate high achievers and high achievers tend to underestimate low achievers.

Feedback should influence writing and this varies according to the types of feedback. Content feedback might have its influences on students’ writings. Content based feedback is said to be better than form feedback (Sheppard, 1992) in (Guenette, 2007). Content based feedback is also said to be beneficial for the affective development from primary grades to university level (Peyton & Reed, 1990) though it does not focus on language form and structures (Fazio, 2001). Many others have their own views in believing that a combination of both content and form is the best. However, the specific stages along with what and where to apply both are crucial as well. On another aspect and view, content feedback is said to be just as effective if not more as feedback on form (Guenette, 2007). Hipple (1985) in his research found that students who received content based feedback improved linguistically while Crocker (1982) found that there are improvement in students’ grammar and spelling (Fazio, 2001). The effectiveness of both content based feedback and the form based feedback are being debated and many have stated that both are equally important and both have its own specialty.
3. Methodology

3.1. Research subjects

10 students from AUSMAT programme from INTEC, UiTM Shah Alam were chosen to be the respondents and samples. These respondents needed to go through two round of peer review sessions and read the draft thoroughly as proposed by (Conner & Asenavage, 1994) as well as they were let to self select their peer (Paulus, 1999). Some theories by some writers are replicated in this research. Ashwell (2000), Ferris (2001) and Zamel (1985) all agreed that content should be the focus of early drafts in writing, especially process writing. Only then, grammar should be the focus. Moreover, Melina Porto (2001), in her cooperative writing response group theory and self evaluation, stated that step one should be content oriented, and then self assessment. Second step should be grammar oriented peer review. The researcher alters them in some ways. In this research, the first step is content oriented peer review. Forms and checklist are needed in each of the steps (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005). Second step is self revision based from the feedback given by peers which is content based before the students have to come out with the second draft. Next stage is then form oriented peer review and then another self revision based from the feedback before the final draft. After this, they are to answer the questionnaire before the comments and revision analysis took place by the researcher. In order to accomplish all the goals of the research, which are to look at the benefits, challenges of peer review, the influences of different types of feedback to students writing, all procedures and instruments need to be used accordingly.

3.2. Research instrument

The data gathering instruments that were used in this research were peer review sessions using forms and checklist as guidance (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005), questionnaire adapted from McMurry (2004), Todd & Hudson (2007) and Kwok (2008), and students’ feedback analysis (Analytic Model for Categorization of Comments by Wilson, 2002) as well as the revision analysis (Faigley & Witte (1981). All the feedback and data gathered were scrutinized to provide some insight into the issue of peer review, its benefits and challenges as well as the types of feedback and revision which are both in content and form.

4. Results and Findings

4.1. Benefits of peer evaluation

In Table 1, it is found that the highest benefit stated by the students was that they felt less pressure and more relax when having peer review. This was supported by 70% of respondents who strongly agreed and 30% who agreed. The same goes to 40% who strongly agreed and 60% who agreed that it was very easy to use the advice from their classmates to revise their essays. This was followed by 90% of the samples agreeing that their peer who peer reviewed their essays are nice. 30% strongly agreed and 60% agreed and a total of 90% basically agreed that the advices they received are very useful. 10% of respondents strongly agreed and another 80% of respondents agreed that the evaluation and comments given are fair. 60% of the samples agreed that by peer review, they have the chance to do more practice and discussion. However, another 60% disagreed that the comments given are sufficient. Therefore, the benefits of peer review gained from this research are that students feel less pressured and more relaxed when doing peer review, the advice given by peers are easy to use to revise essay, their peers are nice, received useful
advice, comments given are fair and through peer review, students are able to do more discussion and practices.

Table 1. Benefits peer review questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A (Agree)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D (Disagree)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD (Strongly Disagree)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think that the evaluation and comments given are fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the comments given are useful for making improvement.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that the comments given are sufficient.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have more chance to practise and discuss.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt less pressure and more relaxed.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My classmates who review my essays are very nice.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advices I have received from my classmates are very useful.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was very easy to use the advice from my classmates to revise my essays.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Challenges of peer evaluation

From Table 2, it can be concluded that majority of the samples have less negative things to say about peer review. This was proven by firstly, 40% of the respondents strongly disagreed and 50% disagreed that peer underestimate them in their writing. Secondly, 40% of respondents strongly disagreed and 50% disagreed that they tend to underestimate their friends’ writing. This was followed by 30% of the samples strongly disagreed and 60% disagreed that the quality of comments given was low. Moreover, 10% of the respondents strongly disagreed and 80% of them disagreed that the comments given were bias. Another 10% of the samples strongly disagreed and 70% of respondents disagreed that their comments to peers was bias. However, the only big amount of challenges agreed by the students was the comments that were given by them to their peers were bias, but only by 40% as compared to 60% who disagreed. The challenges of peer review gained from this study are firstly, the comments were not sufficient which was gained from the benefit section which turned into negative. The rest of the points stated to be the challenges of peer review were not agreed by the respondents. The only point worth highlighting is that respondents were less confident about them giving comments to peers and were confident about their peers giving comments to them.
Table 2. Challenges peer review questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA (Strongly Agree)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A (Agree)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D (Disagree)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD (Strongly Disagree)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of comments given by my peers is low.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of comments I give to my peers are low.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My comments to my peers are bias.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments given to me are bias.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers tend to overestimate me in my writing.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers tend to underestimate me in my writing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to overestimate my peers in their writing.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to underestimate my peers in their writing.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Content based feedback influences on students’ writing

Table 3. Content oriented questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA (Strongly Agree)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A (Agree)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D (Disagree)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD (Strongly Disagree)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My reviews of my peers’ papers were beneficial for identifying errors in content and ideas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My reviews of my peers’ papers were beneficial for identifying errors in organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments provided by my peer papers were beneficial to me for identifying errors in content and ideas.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments provided by my peer papers were beneficial to me for identifying errors in organization.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 illustrates that a number of 60% of respondents strongly agreed and another 30% of respondents agreed that comments given by peers were beneficial for identifying errors in organization. 30% of the samples out of 10 students strongly agreed that comments by peers help them to identify errors in content and ideas while another 40% of the samples agreed. 10% of respondents strongly agreed and 80% of them agreed for both review to peers beneficial for peers’ content and ideas, and own review beneficial for peers’ organization. Looking at the percentages, it can be concluded that students are always more confident with what peers give rather than what they give to peers. It can be concluded that students are very confident that peers’ comments benefit most in improving grammar, the students’
comments to peers are helpful in improving grammar and content and lastly, peers’ comments benefit in improving the content of the essay.

Table 4. Types of comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Comments</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4, there are two types of comments which are the content and form based comments. The total of comments on content based is 73 which consumed 41%. Content are less likely to be commented on during peer review as compared to form based feedback which consumed 59%.

4.4. Form based feedback influences on students’ writing

Table 5. Form oriented questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA (Strongly Agree)</th>
<th>A (Agree)</th>
<th>D (Disagree)</th>
<th>SD (Strongly Disagree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My reviews of my peers’ papers were beneficial for identifying errors in spelling.</td>
<td>5 50%</td>
<td>5 50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My reviews of my peers’ papers were beneficial for identifying errors in grammar.</td>
<td>4 40%</td>
<td>5 50%</td>
<td>1 10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments provided by my peer papers were beneficial to me for identifying errors in spelling.</td>
<td>3 30%</td>
<td>5 50%</td>
<td>1 10%</td>
<td>1 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments provided by my peer papers were beneficial to me for identifying errors in grammar.</td>
<td>3 30%</td>
<td>5 50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 5, it was found that all of the samples agreed that their reviews of peers’ paper helped in identifying errors in spelling. 50% strongly agreed while another 50% agreed. 40% of the students strongly agreed and 50% agreed that their reviews of the peers’ essay were beneficial in identifying grammar errors. 30% strongly agreed and 50% agreed that comments by peers were beneficial for identifying errors in spelling and the same goes also for grammar. Basically, students felt that their own comments to peers will help improve spelling and then grammar. This was followed by peers’ comment were beneficial to improve spelling and then grammar. Here, students are more confident with what they comment on rather than their peers’ comments.

5. Conclusion

Students feel less pressure and feel more relax when conducting peer review. Advices given by peers are very easy to be used to revise essay as well as very useful. Through peer review, more practices and discussion are made among friends. Despite their peers being nice to them, the evaluation and comments
given are fair. However, more than half of the respondents agreed that the comments given were insufficient. This has now become the biggest disadvantage of peer review in this research. The respondents disagreed that peers underestimated and overestimated the writings, bias and give low quality comments.

When comparing the two types of comments, it can be found that more comments are given for form rather than content. For content based feedback, it was found that students feel what they comment to their peers and what peers comment on them benefit in terms of grammar and also content of the writings. However, when asked about peers comments, the respondents seem more confident with peers’ comments rather than with their own comments to peers. It can be concluded that the respondents were confident with what their friends commented on their writings but they were not confident with what they did and commented on. Another conclusion can be made which is the students are more of a good evaluator but not a good self-evaluator. For form based feedback, it was found that it benefits in terms of spelling and grammar. However, students are more confident with what they commented to their peers rather than what their peers commented on them. This is totally the opposite of content based feedback.

As this research has it’s limitation which is the small sample of 10 students, it is recommended for future research to be done with larger sample. It is also very interesting to suggest for further studies to investigate on the differences of comments as well as revisions from peer evaluation with the addition of proficiency levels. Different writing ability students should be separated and studies could be done according to levels. This is to ensure more detail results and can be applied to real teaching process. As the results will be specific to certain levels only, teacher now can figure out the correct way to deal with respective level of students and now are enlighten with what to do and what not to do when teaching as well as when conducting peer review. Through all prove to show improvements, the findings revealed that form based is preferred by students. From this study, teachers should be more aware of the right techniques to use in writing class in order to inculcate better all-rounder students for future communities.
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