Implementing Peer Feedback and Teacher Feedback Activities into EFL College Writing Class

Yuhwa Lee & Younghae Lee

Lecturer & Graduate Student, Keimyung University

u-hwa3720@hanmail.net

Abstract

Both teacher feedback and peer feedback have been important pedagogical activities in second language writing classroom. This study is to examine L2 writers' perceptions of the experience in both teacher feedback and peer feedback. For this study, 60 college students participated. Two survey questionnaires after peer and teacher feedback were used to compare and examine the students' perceptions about both feedback process. Writing samples through peer and teacher feedback were collected to evaluate students' revisions and improvements from both their first drafts marked by peer feedback and teacher feedback and their revised drafts. The results show that students were enjoyable for both peer and teacher feedback experience and they admitted to revise their first drafts as much as they can. Because of the lack and uncertainty in terms of vocabulary, grammar, structure, and expression ability in the process of peer feedback, students prefer receiving the teacher's feedback. Therefore, the revision rate from the teacher's feedback was higher.

1. Introduction

There has been constant interest in the effects of feedback on second language (L2) writing development (Ferris, 2003 & Goldstein. 2005). In the wide range of educational settings, the feedback practice on the students' written assignments has been provided with. Positive feedback on the content of learners' writing can help not only to increase the amount of writing but also to improve their attitude of writing. In ways of providing feedback on the writing process, these two sources – teacher feedback and peer feedback – are used. Until recently, research on L2 writing feedback

practices had focused predominantly on teacher-centered written feedback in order to enhance students' writing development. However, peer feedback also has a lot of advantages that the use of peer feedback can reduce the teacher's load as well as can be very valuable in helping writers develop a sense of audience. Therefore, peer feedback interactions generate to enhance the students' sense of audience that typically feels more authentic than when students write and receive feedback exclusively from teachers (Mandelsdorf, 1992 & Rollinson, 2005).

As the writing pedagogy has shifted from the traditional product approach to the learner-centered and process approach. Badger and White (2005) mentioned that process writing is when learners "discover and reformulate their ideas as they attempt to approximate meaning" because they go through "interconnected production and regulatory activities, including planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising" (pp. 153-155). Therefore, process approach to writing is extremely essential to produce the multiple drafts during revising. For the effective revision of the drafts, both teacher feedback and peer feedback are significant. This is why writing is not simply a solitary activity but a collaborative activity in which exchanging comments and opinions with both teacher and peers plays an important role in revising drafts.

By comparing with these two positive approaches called teacher feedback and peer feedback, this study tries to explore L2 writers' perspectives of feedback practices and their implications for L2 writing development.

2. Method

For this study, 60 freshmen college students who attend an engineering college in G city participated. Two groups of participants were majoring in computer science and they participated in the liberal art mandatory course called 'Reading and Writing Class' in the fall semester in 2019. Each group consisted of 30 students who have similar English level. During the course, they were asked to write two different writing assignment. After finishing the first writing, they switched their first draft with classmate whom an instructor matched with, and then they had to provide the peer feedback by using the checklist. This checklist is designed to guide the students how to give feedback. The other writing assignment was processed through the teacher feedback. At the end of the semester, two survey questionnaires after peer and teacher feedback were used to compare and examine the students' perceptions concerning both feedback process. Writing samples through peer and teacher feedback were collected to evaluate students' revisions and improvements from both their first drafts marked by peer feedback and teacher feedback and their revised drafts. Throughout the study, data

analysis drew on both quantitative and qualitative methods and consisted of the iterative opinions which gave the key themes by coding the data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000).

3. Findings

The findings for this study reveal that students were enjoyable for both peer and teacher feedback experience and they admitted to revise their first drafts as much as they can. Because of the lack and uncertainty in terms of vocabulary, grammar, structure, and expression ability in the process of peer feedback, students prefer receiving the teacher's feedback. Therefore, the revision rate from the teacher's feedback was higher. The detail results from survey including 5-scale Likert and open-ended questions will be described in the conference.

List of References

[1] Badger, R., and White, G. 2000. A Process Genre Approach to Teaching Writing. *ELT Journal, 54*(2), 153-160.

[2] Denzin, N,K., and Lincoln, Y. S. 2000. *The Handbook of Qualitative Research (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

[3] Ferris, D. R. 2004. *Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawence Erlbaum Associates.

[4] Goldstein, L. M. 2005. *Teacher Written Commentary in Second Language Writing Classrooms.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

[5] Mangelsdorf, K. 1992. Peer Reviews in the ESL Composition Classrooms: What Do the Students Think? *ELT Journal 46*(3), 274-293.

[6] Rollinson, P. 2005. Using Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 23-30.