

英语写作教学研究：

同伴反馈对英语学习者
写作能力的影响



王松 / 著

EFFECTS OF PEER RESPONSE
ON CHINESE EFL UNIVERSITY
STUDENTS' WRITING

贵州大学出版社

Guizhou University Press

2012年度贵州大学人文社科出版基金项目

**EFFECTS OF PEER RESPONSE
ON CHINESE EFL UNIVERSITY
STUDENTS' WRITING**

**英语写作教学研究：
同伴反馈对英语学习者写作能力的影响**

贵州大学出版社

Guizhou University Press

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

英语写作教学研究：同伴反馈对英语学习者写作能力的影响 / 王松著. — 贵阳：贵州大学出版社，
2014. 9

ISBN 978-7-81126-722-8

I. ①英… II. ①王… III. ①英语—写作—教学研究
IV. ①H315

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2014)第200111号

**EFFECTS OF PEER RESPONSE ON CHINESE EFL
UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' WRITING**

英语写作教学研究：同伴反馈对英语学习者写作能力的影响

著 者：王 松

责任编辑：廖 波

出 版：贵州大学出版社

印 刷：贵阳快捷彩印有限公司

开 本：889毫米×1194毫米 1/32

印 张：8.5

字 数：300千字

版 次：2014年9月 第1版

印 次：2014年9月 第1次印刷

书 号：ISBN 978-7-81126-722-8

定 价：28.00元

版权所有 侵权必究

本书若出现印装质量问题，请与出版社联系调换

电话：0851-5981027

Abstract

Although a considerable number of studies on L2 students' compositions have shown that peer response has a profound and positive effect on the students' revision, few investigations have examined the results of electronic peer response in comparison with face-to-face peer response. The present study aimed to examine types of comments Chinese EFL university students made, functions that these comments served, roles that students' relevant cultural behaviors played in providing comments, how the students used the comments in revising their writing, and the final writing quality after revision.

40 Chinese EFL third year university students participated in the study. After a 2-hour training session on how to assess an argumentative essay, they were divided into two groups for an additional 2-hour training session on peer response techniques, one being trained on how to give face-to-face peer feedback, the other on electronic peer response. The students in both groups wrote three argumentative essays, each followed by two revisions after receiving peer comments. Comments made and those actually used by the two groups were categorized, counted and analyzed, and the students' essays were rated by five trained raters.

The findings revealed that the students' preference in providing

comments was different in both groups because of their apprehension in different communicative environments. More comments were produced by the face-to-face peer response group, resulting in more comments used in revisions. However, although fewer comments were made by the electronic peer response group, a higher percentage of the comments made were used in revisions. In other words, the electronic peer response group's comments were more revision-oriented. The use of face-to-face peer response significantly encouraged the students to outperform in the aspects of vocabulary and content, while the use of electronic peer response helped the students greatly improve their revisions at the levels of content and organization. In terms of final writing quality after the experiment, however, there was no significant difference in the two groups.

Key words

Electronic peer response / Face-to-face peer response / Revision / EFL writing

Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to a number of people who have helped me in various ways throughout the preparation of this thesis. I would like to take this opportunity to thank each one.

My deepest gratitude goes first and foremost to my supervisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Siriluck Usaha, for her expert consultation in my designing of this research and her illuminating comments, which made the completion of this thesis possible. My consciousness of a debt to her can only be acknowledged here gratefully and inadequately.

I should also thank the members of my committee. Without their timely academic advice, this thesis could not have reached its present form.

I am also grateful to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jeremy Ward, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kanit Khaimook, Assoc. Prof. Songporn Tajaroenusuk, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Channarong Intaraprasert, Asst. Prof. Dr. Pannathon Sangarun, and Dr. Sirinthorn Seepho, who greatly expanded my academic and statistical knowledge when I studied at Suranaree University of Technology.

Special thanks go to Dr. John Eyles in New Zealand. His instruction and support on Moodle encouraged me to go on when I met difficulties in my research design and implementation.

I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to all my Ph. D. classmates, Duan Linli, Zhou Lin, Wang Fei, and An Mei for their warm friendship and consistent encouragement in my life and work in the past four years.

The staff and 60 participants at Guizhou University were more than cooperative throughout the data collection portion of my research. They provided me with quantities of valuable information. Their cooperation and assistance were highly appreciated.

Last but not the least, I owe my gratitude to my beloved family who have always been assisting, encouraging and caring for me all of my life without a word of complaint. They are my largest motivation on my way to the completion of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	3
1.2 The Statement of the Problem	4
1.3 The Preliminary Study and Purposes of the Present Study	14
1.3.1 The Preliminary Study	14
1.3.2 The Purposes of the Present Study.....	20
1.4 Research Questions	20
1.5 The Significance of the Study.....	21
1.6 Definition of Terms.....	23
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	25
2.1 Introduction	27
2.2 Nature of Writing.....	27
2.3 Writing Process: The Theories	29
2.3.1 Characteristics of the Writing Process	30
2.3.2 Approaches to Writing Process	31
2.3.3 Three Models of Writing Process.....	33

2.4	Revision.....	41
2.5	Peer Response	42
2.5.1	Definition of Peer Response.....	42
2.5.2	Forms of Peer Response Activity.....	42
2.5.3	Face-to-face Peer Response and Second Language Writing.....	44
2.5.4	Merits and Demerits of Face-to-face Peer Response	45
2.5.5	The Studies on Traditional Face-to-face Peer Response	47
2.5.6	Implications for the Present Study.....	61
2.6	Electronic (Computer-Mediated Communication) Peer Response.....	63
2.6.1	What is Computer-Mediated Communication?.....	64
2.6.2	Computer-Mediated Peer Response	65
2.6.3	The Empirical Studies on Computer-Mediated Peer Response	68
2.6.4	Implications for the Present Study.....	78
2.7	Summary	81

CHAPTER 3 PILOT STUDY	83
3.1 Research Questions	86
3.2 Participants	86
3.3 Instruments	87
3.4 Procedures	88
3.5 Procedures for Reliable Scoring	92
3.6 Data Analysis	94
3.6.1 Quantitative Analysis	94
3.6.2 Qualitative Analysis	99
3.7 Implications for the Main Study	105
CHAPTER 4 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY ..	107
4.1 Nature of Research	109
4.2 Research Methods	111
4.3 Research Design	113
4.3.1 Population and Participants	113
4.3.2 The Pedagogical Context	117

4.3.3 Procedure.....	119
4.3.4 Assessment	128
4.3.5 The Post-test.....	134
4.3.6 Oral Interview	134
4.3.7 Written Questionnaire	136
4.3.8 Data Collection.....	137
4.3.9 Data Analysis	137
4.4 Summary.....	141
CHAPTER 5 RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	143
5.1 Student Participants	145
5.2 Research Findings	145
5.2.1 Research Question 1.....	145
5.2.2 Research Question 2.....	155
5.2.3 Research Question 3.....	170
5.2.4 Research Question 4.....	183
5.2.5 Research Question 5.....	197
5.3 Summary	200

CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	201
6.1 Conclusions	203
6.1.1 Answers to Research Question 1	204
6.1.2 Answers to Research Question 2	205
6.1.3 Answers to Research Question 3	206
6.1.4 Answers to Research Question 4	207
6.1.5 Answers to Research Question 5	208
6.2 Limitations	208
6.3 Implications	209
 REFERENCES	 212
 APPENDIX	 225

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Writing task procedures for the FPR and EPR groups ...	91
Table 3.2 The frequency of types of peer comments on the students' written work	95
Table 3.3 The functions the comments served.....	96
Table 3.4 The difference of students' essay scores between the FPR and the FPR groups	97
Table 3.5 Correlations among raters.....	97
Table 4.1 The results of two tests in the FPR and the EPR groups	115
Table 4.2 The comparison between the FPR and the EPR groups	116

Table 4.3 The mean score of each small group in the FPR and the EPR groups	122
Table 4.4 Writing Task Procedures for the FPR and the EPR groups	127
Table 4.5 The raters' scoring correlations.....	132
Table 4.6 The Format of Data Collection	137
Table 5.1 Descriptions and examples of the types of comments..	146
Table 5.2 A comparison of provided peer comments between the FPR and the EPR groups in three writing tasks.....	148
Table 5.3 A comparison of provided peer comments between the FPR and the EPR groups in the first writing task ...	149
Table 5.4 A comparison of provided peer comments between the FPR and the EPR groups in the second writing task	150

Table 5.5 A comparison of provided peer comments between the FPR and the EPR groups in the third writing task..	151
Table 5.6 Categories for functions, descriptions and examples ...	152
Table 5.7 A comparison of functions that peer comments served between the FPR and the EPR groups	153
Table 5.8 A comparison of functions that peer comments served in the FPR group in three writing tasks	154
Table 5.9 A comparison of functions that peer comments served in the EPR group in three writing tasks.....	155
Table 5.10 A comparison of numbers of used peer comments between the FPR and the EPR groups in three writing tasks	171
Table 5.11 A comparison of numbers of provided and used peer comments in the FPR group in three writing tasks.....	173

Table 5.12 A comparison of numbers of provided and used peer comments in the EPR group in three writing tasks	173
Table 5.13 A comparison of provided peer comments and used peer comments in the FPR and the EPR groups.....	184
Table 5.14 A comparison of numbers of provided, revision-oriented and used peer comments in the FPR and the EPR groups	184
Table 5.15 A comparison of functions changed in revisions between the FPR and the EPR groups.....	185
Table 5.16 A comparison of first drafts and final drafts in the FPR and the EPR groups in the first writing task.....	187
Table 5.17 A comparison of first drafts and final drafts in the FPR and the EPR groups in the second writing task.....	188
Table 5.18 A comparison of first drafts and final drafts in the FPR and the EPR groups in the third writing task	189

Table 5.19 A comparison of the revision quality between the FPR and the EPR groups in the three writing tasks.....	190
Table 5.20 The result of the pre-test in the FPR and EPR groups.....	197
Table 5.21 The modified result of the pre-test in the FPR and EPR groups.....	198
Table 5.22 A comparison of the pre-test and the post-test in the FPR and the EPR groups	199
Table 5.23 A comparison of the final drafts between the FPR and the EPR groups	200