

## The Effects of Peer Review Interactions on Korean College Students' Writing

Eunsook Kwon  
(Keimyung University)

Kwon, Eunsook. "The Effects of Peer Review Interactions on Korean College Students' Writing." *Studies in English Language & Literature* 45.1 (2019): 261-296. The present study investigated the types of peer reviews and revisions by Korean EFL college students on their writing, and described students' perception towards peer review. It comprised of a sample of twelve college students joined in this peer review and revision process through surveys and in-depth interviews. The results demonstrate that the participants' peer review paid more attention to addition and positive praise, and their revisions focused on corrections, additions, and no revision. Based on the holistic and analytic scoring results, it indicates that the peer review activity did not reach the expected increase in writing quality. However, participants increased in C-test scores and vocabulary, and employed many writing strategies from their peers. After the peer review process, the participants recognized that the peer review interaction helped them improve their learning: how to share ideas, organize their writing, compare different thoughts of peers, read each other's writings, and find out their own strengths and weaknesses. The results showed that the participants became more positive towards writing in English because they became less anxious in writing as they repeatedly engaged in the peer review process. (Keimyung University)

**Key Words:** types of peer review, types of revision, essay writing, writing quality, students' perception

### I. Introduction

Based on the 2015 Revised Korean National Curriculum (2015), the learning paid

attention to key competencies for students to nurture a creative and integrative learner. These competencies include self-management, creative thinking skills, knowledge-information processing skills, communication skills, aesthetic-emotional competency, and civic competency. Individuals need various competencies to face the complex challenges of life, so they need to use tools and engage the use of language interactively as well as interact in heterogeneous groups, act autonomously, and think and act reflectively (OECD, 2013).

In accordance with competencies, peer review can help give more insight into writing and revision procedure. Writing pedagogy has shifted to the learner-centered and process approach. As a mode of collaborative learning, peer review has received increasing attention and has been widely adopted in the second language (L2) writing; it is convertible with writing phases, numerous drafting, and extensive revision feature markedly in a process approach for writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Language learners can work together to give feedback on each other's writings through active involvement with one another's progress over numerous drafts.

Over the past few decades, many writing instructors have been trying to incorporate peer review activities in writing instructions in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context and have been convinced of their positive effects on motivation, attitude, and even on writing quality (Allaei & Connor, 1990; Mittan, 1989). Language learners are required to be joined in interactive activities to have an opportunity to negotiate meaning and learn from peers to promote their L2 development. Lui and Hansen (2002) mentioned its benefits, such as improving the writing quality, providing learners to test their knowledge, learning from their peers, and negotiating meaning, along with the development of L2 skills. On the other hand, Liu (1998) considered constraints of peer review activities in L2 composition: uncertainty concerning peers' comments, lack of learners' investment, superficial comments due to time constraints, and inappropriate interactions in commenting on peers' drafts.

In addition to the benefits and the constraints of peer review, both L2 writing teachers and students are concerned about peer review activities' effectiveness. To take a closer look at the effectiveness, this study attempts to describe how Korean college students give peer reviews and make revisions on their writings and how their revisions influence their writings by verifying with quantitative and qualitative data on peer review in Korean EFL context. It also observed how Korean college students perceive the peer review experiences. These are the research questions of the study:

- 1) What types of peer reviews and revisions are made by Korean college students during the peer review process?
- 2) How do Korean college students perceive the peer review experiences?
- 3) What are the effects of peer review interactions on Korean college students' essay writing?

## **II. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Effects of Peer Review in L2 Writing**

Peer review activities have been supported by process writing, collaborative learning, Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), and interaction theory. The benefits and the constraints of peer review are summarized in cognitive, social, linguistic, practical categories (Lui & Hansen, 2002). In cognitive stance, students take an effective role in their learning while joining in the peer review activities, and they can "reconceptualize students' ideas in light of their peers' reactions" (Mendoca & Johnson, 1994, p. 746). Commenting to peers' writing construct the critical skills to revise and examine one's own writing (Leki, 1990). In addition, the peer review comments and suggestions allow students to show what they know

about writing and reflect that information in their revisions (Mendoca & Johnson, 1994). In social stance, peer review activities help students obtain their confidence and reduce anxiety by seeing their peers' strengths and weaknesses in writing (Leki, 1990). Peer review activities enhance students' communicative skills to express and negotiate their ideas (Mendoca & Johnson, 1994). Also, students have come to experience that by establishing collegial ties with other students while sharing their concerns during the peer review process they may open up for their friendship and collaboration (Hirvela, 1999).

In linguistic stance, students may improve their reading and writing abilities during the collaborative peer review activities. Students can focus on their strengths and resources of their peers while sorting and growing L2 writing knowledge (Hirvela, 1999). In practical stance, peer review activities can take place in a variety of stages of writing procedure and place an emphasis on process in writing (Connor & Asenavage, 1994). Besides, peer review can reduce the writing teacher's workload and can give the teacher important information regarding students' reading and writing skills (Mittan, 1989). Moreover, teachers can assume the role of a peer, so it can be highly time-efficient (Liu, 1998). Peer review can increase the amount of comments (Topping, 1998) and facilitate higher order thinking (Cheng & Warren, 2000). Involving the peer review interactions in the writing process enhances students' responsibility and the sense of ownership (Sivan, 2000). Peer review can also prevent the free-riders in writing process and it can be easy to differentiate individual contributions from group writing products (Johnston & Miles, 2004).

On the other hand, there are concerns about the use of peer review activities in L2 writing. Students feel uncertain whether their peer review comments are accurate (Lui, 1998). Students also focus too much on 'surface concerns' (Leki, 1990), or editing, neglecting larger revising issues (Lui & Hansen, 2002). Students are extremely critical of one another's writings (Nelson & Murphy, 1992) and they feel uncomfortable and uneasy to respond to peers' drafts. They can be defensive when their work is criticized by their peers (Amores, 1997).

Proficiency has received significant attention during peer interaction because of students' varied proficiency levels (Dao & McDonough, 2017). L2 proficiency is suggested as a critical factor in peer feedback (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Allen and Mills (2015) explored the issue of proficiency and the type of peer feedback with varied proficiency participants. Lower proficiency reviewers made fewer explanations when paired with higher proficiency reviewers. Also, Paulus (1999) pointed out that lower proficiency writers make fewer meaning-related revisions. Choi and Iwashita (2016) discovered that learners in mixed-proficiency pairs interact more on language form than the same proficiency pairs.

In Korean EFL context, different aspects of L2 peer review are explored. Kang (2008) investigated different types of feedback types with the teacher and peer review. Students showed that both were beneficial for their writing, but most students preferred the teacher's feedback to the peers'. Kim (2013) explored how Korean EFL writers perceive their writing skills, feedback activity, and different types of feedback. The students favored teacher's feedback to peer's feedback, and feedback given on grammar more than the other aspects of writing. Choi (2013) researched the effects of peer's feedback mixed with teacher's feedback in L2 writing. The results showed that it appeared to be beneficial for improving L2 knowledge and lowering L2 writing anxiety.

Moreover, Kim (2014) explored that six Korean college students in English composition class made more revisions on grammar and expression than ideas and structure and in the second session than in the first. Extension/reduction of idea units which is global and meaning-level changes increased consistently. Also, students' perceptions are more influential over students' L2 proficiency and prior revision experiences. Yoon and Lee (2018) mentioned that 22 college students assigned significantly higher score to their peers' writing. The written comments include micro-level comments and broad statements. The students listed consequential benefits and concerns of the peer feedback activity.

## 2.2 Revision in Writing

A number of studies in L2 writing has suggested the importance of revision in writing (Sommers, 1980). To assist writers to revise the subsequent drafts, teachers take a careful look at determining what kind of feedback and revision has the greatest effect on improving students' writing quality. Some researchers employed numerous different taxonomies (Berg, 1999). For example, Bridwell (1980) and Sommers (1980) analyzed revisions on a linguistic level (words, clauses, sentences), and on a level of operation (addition, deletion, substitution). On the other hand, Faigley and Witte (1981) were interested in examining revisions that either affected meaning (meaning changes or surface changes). The surface change is further divided into the following subcategories: addition, deletion, substitution, permutation, distribution, consolidation, and reordering. The text-based were divided into micro-text-based changes and macro-text-based changes. It shows that experienced writers more frequently made meaning changes, whereas inexperienced writers mostly made surface revisions. It seemed that the revision types of experienced writers would be more likely to result in improved writing than types common to novice writers. Kim (2014) used two-tiered revision types. The first tier consists of five categories: change in surface feature, change in style and expression, addition and deletion of new idea, extension and reduction of existing idea, and re-organization. The second tier is based on the scope of change word, phrase, or sentence level.

Zamel (1983) explored that skilled writers were more tended to focus their revisions on larger level aspects of text, such as reordering paragraphs, than unskilled writers were. Keh (1990) insisted that peers' feedback is superior to teachers' feedback, and the reader can learn more about writing by reading others' drafts. Connor and Asenayage (1994) found that ESL students made both text-based and surface revisions. Peer feedback on revision was extremely limited and more revisions appeared to be derived from teachers' suggestions. Cumming and So

(1996) highlighted students' tendency toward error correction in the revision or editing of texts (p. 200). Paulus (1999) also focuses on the effects of feedback on revision using Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy, and compares findings across teacher and peer feedback. She discovered that students made both meaning and surface changes.

Oh (2014) investigates Korean EFL writer's performance and revision behavior in wiki-mediated collaborative writing projects. The results showed that participants primarily focused on form rather than meaning in the wiki-mediated collaborative writing process. Huh and Lee (2014) mentioned that many EFL students struggled to write highly elaborate arguments. Peer review in revision had positive effects on overall writing quality and made significant contributions to the improvement of students' argumentative writing strategies they employed. Lee (2018) described that the native speakers employed negotiation types to discuss opinion and revise with constructive suggestions, but the second language learners (L2) mainly paid attention to the sequence of the peer review task and showed difficulties in understanding the essay writing drafts. The L2 learners used criticism strategies and mitigating devices in a relatively narrow range.

### 2.3 Attitudes towards Peer Review

In examining effective implementation of the peer review in the educational contexts, one key concern is the attitude of the students and teachers' attitudes towards the peer review activity. Nelson and Carson (1998) in ESL contexts investigated that Asian students with a more collectivist orientation, where saving face is important, may find peer review activity threatening to group harmony and thus might be unwilling to criticize their peers. With attitudes towards peer review, Coomber and Silver's (2010) study explored 70 first-year economics Japanese university students' preferences for either anonymous or face-to-face peer review. The findings suggested that after the peer review students showed an increased

enjoyment with writing and a stronger belief in its effectiveness. Overall students showed no vigorous preference for either mode, but that females preferred anonymous feedback. Silver and Coomber's (2011) subsequent analysis of a sample of the same students' written feedback and revisions showed that anonymous feedback generated more, and more effective feedback and greater learner uptake. Morgan, Fuisting, and White (2014) explored students' attitudes and teachers' perceptions toward peer review in EFL writing at a Japanese university. Results showed that students' enjoyment of writing, students' willingness to offer, and accepting critical feedback increased. In addition, students showed confidence in their peers' abilities to give feedback, but greatly doubted their own abilities. Yoon and Lee (2018) showed that students unwilling to evaluate the writing outcomes critically did so because of their lack of writing skills and possibly because of their hope to keep group harmony judging from the reports.

### III. Method

#### 3.1 Participants

In this study, the participants were twelve freshmen and sophomore undergraduate students (11 females and 1 male) from a student-run English university newspaper club in a metropolitan city in South Korea. In the peer review project, participants were mixed with English and non-English majors and had not experienced the writing essay before entering the university. Data was collected during the peer review project for 15 weeks. All participants were native Korean speakers and had a variety of English proficiency levels from beginning to advanced level. 12 participants made up six pairs randomly during the peer review activity based on the C-test<sup>1</sup> results conducted before the project. Except one pair, each pair consists of the same gender because most male students began their mandatory military service



after their first academic year. Participants' names have been replaced with pseudonyms to protect their privacy. All participants had not experienced peer review interactions. The researcher in this study and taught how to write essays and trained how to perform and join the peer review process.

Table 1. Participants' Background Information

Partici pant	Age	Gender	English Writing Proficiency (C-test Result)	Partici pant	Age	Gender	English Writing Proficiency (C-test Result)
Ara	22	F	High (78)	Seojun	19	M	High (72)
Eunjae	20	F	Low (56)	Suji	20	F	High (76)
Jian	20	F	Low (50)	Sewon	20	F	Low (56)
Nara	20	F	High (78)	Soyun	21	F	Low (68)
Somin	21	F	Low (54)	Yeonu	21	F	Low (50)
Yeeun	21	F	High (82)	Yujin	20	F	Low (60)

### 3.2 Data Collection

Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected during the peer review project. In the quantitative data, paper-based instruments were used: C-test (see Appendix 1), pre- and post- surveys (see Appendix 2), and checklist (see Appendix 4). In addition, the analytic and holistic scoring methods for the quantitative analysis of the writing samples were adopted to evaluate the students' writing outcomes with the criteria of organization, content, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. All three raters including two native English instructors and the researcher joined in assessing the participants' written outcomes. Two native English raters were Canadian English

<sup>1</sup> The C-test is a variation of standard cloze testing. This gap-filling test is usually at least two paragraphs in length to make coherent discourse guesses. Cloze tests can be constructed with eliminating the second half of every other word. Fixed-ratio deletion deletes every seventh word, but many other cloze tests are used a rational deletion to avoid deleting words which would be difficult to guess from the context. The C-test is used as an overall measure of language learners' general language proficiency including vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, and spelling (Brown, 2004).

instructors and proofreaders for the university's English newspaper in Korea. They were given and explained how to use the analytic rubrics for rating composition tasks (Brown & Bailey, 1984) revised by the researcher, as well as the holistic rubrics from the Test of Written English (TWE) by the Educational Testing Service (ETS, 2004) TOEFL writing rubric. For the qualitative data, this study included interviews, peer review comments, and revisions.

Before the peer review project, the researcher conducted C-test for analyzing participants' English proficiency and formed students' pairs based on the C-test results. With the university academic English book, the researcher made a one-page gap-filling vocabulary test including 50 partially eliminated blanks with a total of 100 points. The participants' English background information questionnaire and pre-review survey (revised from Coomber & Siver, 2010; Finch, 2014; Morgan et al., 2014) administrated and collected information regarding their English background and participants' views towards peer review. The writing training was carried out before the project to inform the participants how to write the academic English essay. The writing training included writing instructions with three process writing procedures: before-writing, while writing, after-writing and peer review tutorial with six tips for effective commenting and three procedures to peer review. Also, participants watched video clips<sup>2</sup> regarding effective peer review and comments in the academic essay writing. At the same time, the peer review training introduced peer review rules and a checklist to guide the participants how to go through the peer review process. The checklist was made by the researcher based on the TOEFL TWE (ETS, 2004).

During the peer review process, all participants were required to submit four academic essays and go through four peer reviews and four revisions. Four writing prompts from the TWE (ETS, 2004) were provided for the participants to employ compare and contrast, reasons and examples, and then take a stance. Writing topics were changing school environment(the first topic), knowledge gained from

---

<sup>2</sup> The links are at <https://youtu.be/iBuq4qgRhCc> and <https://youtu.be/VCio7AbO3vo>.

experience or books(the second topic), studying alone or with a group(the third topic), and visiting a foreign country(the fourth topic). In the design of four writing periods, each writing period followed the peer review procedure: (1) writing an essay draft, (2) switching the drafts with their pairs, (3) writing the first peer review comments on the draft, (4) giving back to their pairs to revise their first drafts, (5) switching the first revised drafts with their pairs, (6) writing the second peer review comments on the draft, (7) giving back to their pairs to revise their second drafts, and (8) submitting their second (final) revised drafts. While peer review activity, the participants were asked to give peer review comments based on the checklist including the questions and directions on introduction, body, conclusion, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and the mechanics.

After the peer review project, a post-peer review survey and an in-depth interview (see Appendix 3). were conducted. The survey had 22 items to investigate the participants' perceptions toward the peer review activity including the confidence and motivation. At the end of the post-peer review survey, there were two open-ended questions about the strengths and difficulties of peer review activity. The semi-structured interview implemented with the participants' writing drafts, peer review comments, and revisions. The interview questions include the general feelings about the peer review process, when giving the peer review suggestions, when receiving the peer review suggestions, the impression of the peer, the peer's English language proficiency, the usefulness of peer review, the experience of peer-review revisions. Each interview with participants took almost one hour. The researcher audio-taped the interview and transcribed on the MS-word format.

### 3.3 Data Analysis

For both quantitative and qualitative designs, this study used quantitative analysis with C-test scores, pre- and post- peer review survey, and analytic and holistic writing scores. The survey responses are represented on a five-point Likert scale. Also,

analytic and holistic writing rubrics contain a five-point scale: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Adequate, 2=Unacceptable, 1=Not college-level work. The revised Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy was used to look at the meaning changes or surface changes on a level of operation (addition, deletion, substitution). At the same time, for qualitative analysis, Ms-word and Excel format were used with the peer review, revision, and in-depth interview. The data was sorted to find the coding and categorizing. All codes classified into seven categories from the peer review checklist: (1) overall comments, (2) introduction, (3) body, (4) organization, (5) conclusion, (6) grammar and vocabulary, and (7) mechanics. With the transcribed interview data, the researcher tried to find the meaningful parts with repetitive reading on the NVivo 11, a coding software. And the data classified the general feelings about the peer review process, when giving the peer review comments, when receiving the peer review comments, the impression of the peer, the peer's English language proficiency, and the reasons of revision and no revision (see Appendix 4).

## **IV. Findings**

### **4.1 Peer Review Types**

Participants exchanged their written drafts with their pairs and provided written suggestions and comments based on the peer review checklist. Their peer review comments were examined to take a closer look into the types of peer review by Korean college students provided on their peers' written drafts. The research analyzed the peer review comments from four written drafts with peer reviews by all participants and counted the types of peer review based on the revised Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy. Types of peer reviews include additions, suggestions, corrections, substitutions, deletions, questions, paraphrasing, separation, positive praise, and negative comments.

Table 2. Frequency of Peer Review

Frequency	PR* 1	PR 2	PR 3	PR 4	Total N
Total N	67	70	50	41	228

\*PR 1 and 2 indicate the first and second peer reviews of the second essay. PR 3 and 4 indicate the first and second peer reviews of the third essay.

Participants made a total of 228 peer review comments on their peers' essay drafts during the peer review session. The participants provided more comments to their peers in the first peer review session (67 comments for PR 1 and 70 comments for PR 2), than in the participants provided more number of comments to their peers than the second peer review (50 comments for PR 3 and 41 comments for PR 4). The most peer review comments occurred in the PR 2 with 70 peer review comments. After the first peer review activity (PR 1), the participants became better at giving peer review comments, so they engaged the peer review activity enthusiastically and made more peer review comments in PR 2. On the other hand, participants made less peer review comments in the second peer review session (50 comments for PR 3 and 41 comments for PR 4). The increase from PR 1 to PR 2 may come from noticing how to engage in peer review interactions, finding more on the areas where the peers need to be improved, writing with the different essay topics, and generating the word numbers<sup>3</sup> with the different essay topics. The decrease from PR 3 to PR 4 may come from the participants' repeated engagement for the peer review activities. It could also be because the participants were made to be more careful in their writing after going through the first peer review and revision activity based on the checklist. In addition, all the increase and decrease could be the individual differences.

Table 3 shows the types of peer reviews throughout four peer review sessions. Peer review paid most attention to the additions (57 comments, 25%). The

<sup>3</sup> Total number of words: 2036(First writing), 1755(Second writing), 1952(Third writing), 2067(Fourth writing).

participants added the comments about vocabulary, grammar, and discourse markers on their peers' drafts. They also wrote the positive praise the second most (54 comments, 23.7%). After the peer review training, they focused on the rule or guideline for the peer review such as giving compliments, suggestions, and corrections. They tried to stay positive, be specific, and complete these three steps. However, the participants were not concerned with the questions (5 comments, 2.2%), paraphrasing (2 comments, 0.9%), separation (1 comment, 0.4%). It probably shows that the participants did not know what to ask, paraphrase, and separate, so they did not provide peer review suggestions on their peers' writings in the peer review sessions.

Table 3. Types of Peer Reviews

Types of Peer Reviews		Frequency	
		N	%
1	Additions	57	25
2	Positive Praise	54	23.7
3	Suggestions	38	16.7
4	Corrections	25	11
5	Substitutions	25	11
6	Deletions	13	5.7
7	Negative Comments	8	3.5
8	Questions	5	2.2
9	Paraphrasing	2	0.9
10	Separation	1	0.4
Total		228	100

The consecutive peer review comments on the peers' written drafts resulted in the participants' awareness of providing the peer reviews based on the checklist. Figure 1 illustrates the examples of peer review comments from PR 1 and PR 2. It shows that Yeeun commented the positive praises and suggestion to her peer Yujin such as 'The argument that books are subjective seems to be persuasive.' and 'The conjunctions are well-used' from Yeeun's PR 1. Yeeun indicates the good points of the thesis statement and grammatical usage of her peer Yujin. Also, she suggests her

peer needs to add more content to her argument.

Figure 1. Examples of Peer Review

<p>Additions (Seowon's PR1-2)</p>	<p>There is a phrase that "A thousand hearings are not worth one seeing." This phrase means that <u>experience oneself</u> is more important and worth than hearings or gained knowledge from books. <u>In my opinion, knowledge gained from experience is more important.</u></p> <p><u>If you study about a famous tourist attraction from books or Television, it would be beneficial for you about knowing the attraction. But it is not real studying. If you directly experience this famous tourist attraction for only one time, you would feel like you are real studying as seeing the sights</u></p> <p>→ 본문에 주장에 대한 근거와 예시를 하나 더 들어주면 좋을 것 같아요..</p> <p>So, by this reason, I recommend you to experience knowledge oneself. I think this way is more active than another one.</p>	<p>핵오 포함(P1): 도입부에 독자의 관심을 끌만한 효과적인 문장을 잘 쓴 것 같아요.</p> <p>핵오 포함(P2): experiencing</p> <p>핵오 포함(P3): gaining</p> <p>핵오 포함(P4): 도입부에 자신의 의견을 명확하게 드러낸 점이 좋은 것 같아요.</p> <p>핵오 포함(P5): 본문의 중심문장을 쓴 뒤에 예시를 들면 좋을 것 같아요.</p> <p>핵오 포함(P6): 예시 상황을 쓰는 부분이므로 앞에 'for example' 등을 써주면 더 매끄러워질 것 같아요.</p> <p>핵오 포함(P7): 결론에 자신의 의견을 다시 한번 잘 나타내었지만, 결론을 요약하는 내용을 더 추가하면 좋을 것 같아요.</p>
<p>Positive Praise &amp; Suggestion (Yeeun's PR1-1)</p>	<p>In my opinion, most important source is experience in person. Surely, books or other thing are really good and useful when we learn something. But in my case, seeing <sup>and</sup> <del>and</del> listening <del>are</del> in person <del>are</del> <sup>remain</sup> more long time and <del>we</del> realize more vividly(???)</p> <p>이 책은 주장적이라는 주장은 설득력 있는 것 같아? 첫번째 문장에서 주장을 말하는 효과적인 문장이 있는 것 같아? 접속사가 잘 쓰인 거 같아?</p>	<p>여기 주장에 대한 설득이 주제의 현혹을 띠었다</p>

On the other hand, Seowon directly wrote and added the grammatical comments on her peer, Jian. She gave peer review comments like a teacher or professor, who normally provides direct adding for the students' grammatical errors. For example, Seowon added the grammatical suggestion ('you feel real studying as seeing the sights' → 'you would feel like you are real studying as seeing the sights.'). Both suggestions have grammar errors (It's better to say 'you would feel like you're really studying'), but she tried to provide the review comments as much as possible. Seowon also provided the suggestion for the overall contents such as adding the support details and examples for the argument in the body parts on her peers' drafts. The participants had difficulty in providing peer review comments. They made the comments in general at the beginning of the peer review session as shown in PR1, but they made more comments on the other categories of the checklist in PR 2.

## 4.2 Revision Types

Participants were asked to revise according to their peers' peer review comments. All four revisions by all participants on their written drafts were examined to determine to what extent Korean college students reflect their peers' comments in their revisions. The research analyzed the revisions reflected in their peer review comments from four written drafts by all participants and counted the types of revisions based on the revised Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy. Type of revisions involve corrections, additions, deletions, reordering, combining, refutations, separations, paraphrasing, ignorance, substitutions, no change.

Table 4. Frequency of Revision

Frequency	R* 1	R 2	R 3	R 4	Total N
Total N	65	51	58	41	215

\*R 1 and 2 indicate the first and second revisions of the second essay. R 3 and 4 indicate the first and second revisions of the third essay.

The revisions included all changes and corrections on two essays during the four revision sessions. The original writings were compared with revised written drafts. Each change counted and categorized into each type of revisions. In Table 4, participants made a total of 215 revisions during the revision session. In the first revision session (65 revisions for R 1 and 51 revisions for R 2), the participants provided more number of revisions than the second revision (58 revisions for R 3 and 41 revisions for R 4). The most revisions occurred in the R 1 with 65 revisions. After the first revision activities (R 1 and R 2), the participants made a decreased number of revisions (51 revisions and 41 revisions). It means that participants engaged in the revision activity repeatedly and made a successful incorporation of their peers' review comments. On the other hand, participants did not reflect all their peers' comments (2 comments in R 1; 19 comments in R 2; 8 comments in R 3)



in their revised drafts. No revisions indicate that the participants experienced difficulty in revising with their peers' comment or left the confusing and ambiguous parts without changes. They made the most no revision in R 2, which may be the result of the participants' inadequate revision skills for each category on the checklist.

Table 5. Types of Revisions

Types of Revisions		Frequency	
		N	%
1	Corrections	81	38.0
2	Additions	71	33.3
3	No change	24	11.3
4	Deletions	16	7.5
5	Reordering	5	2.3
6	Combining	4	1.9
7	Refutations	4	1.9
8	Separations	4	1.9
9	Paraphrasing	2	0.9
10	Ignorance	1	0.5
11	Substitutions	1	0.5
Total		213	100

Table 5 shows the types of revisions throughout the four revision sessions. Participants made the most revisions with corrections (81 revisions, 38%). They corrected the content, grammar, and vocabulary followed by the peers' comments. The participants revised the grammatical errors and vocabulary the most among the revision categories on the checklist. It indicates that the participants seemed to consider both categories as the important components among the revision types. The participants also added (71 revisions, 33.3%) the sentence and paragraph with more ideas such as the supporting details. The higher proficient participants made more self-revision by adding the contents, as well as the lower proficient participants wrote more contents because they did not complete their writing tasks on their first

writings. They also made no revisions in the third most (24 comments, 11.3%). It may indicate that the participants had trouble with revising the thesis statement, proper essay structure, topic sentence, provoking interest, the flow of ideas, confusing parts, coherent response, run-on sentences or fragments, summary, and the restatement of the thesis statement.

Comparing the revisions with corrections, additions, no revision, the participants made fewer revisions on the reordering (2.3%), combining (1.9%), refutations (1.9%), separations (1.9%), paraphrasing (0.5%), ignorance (0.5%), and substitutions (0.5%). The participants reflected their peers' comments well as seen in the corrections during the revision session. It may be due to the fact that the higher scoring participants like writing or made sure they revised focused on the detailed revisions, whereas the lower scoring participants did not know how to develop their thoughts and writing contents. The participants made more surface-level revisions such as grammar and vocabulary than meaning-level revisions. However, based on the checklist, the participants tried to focus on the balance between surface-level and meaning-level revisions. They used the guiding questions from the checklist with both surface-level and meaning-level. Liu and Hansen (2002) pointed out that the best way to focus on global concerns like rhetoric and organization is to model the global content, practice with it, and develop guide question sheets for different genre of writing.

The participants received constructive comments from their peers, and they engaged the repeated revisions. Figure 2 illustrates the examples of revision from Nara and Somin's Revisions. It shows that Nara made revisions with the correction ('We are living in real life in the world which is changing so fast.' → 'We are living in real life in the rapidly changing world.') from R 1. Nara tried to correct the clausal sentence ('which is changing so fast') into the simplified sentence (in the rapidly changing world'). She also added the adverb 'rapidly' instead of 'so fast' and the conjunctive particles such as 'And' or 'Also'. She even put more ideas at the end of her writing ('Over time, things change, and that's why the time we are

living now and the time the writers wrote the book is not the same.’).

Figure 2. Examples of Revision

<p>Corrections &amp; Additions (Nara's R1-1)</p>	<p>We are living in real life in the <u>world which is rapidly</u> changing <del>so fast. So when</del> world. <u>When</u> we are in troubles, we can get some solutions from the books. However, can we always be helped by the books?</p> <p>I don't think so. Of course there is common thought that we can learn from the past and from the intellectuals. <del>Books</del> <u>And the books</u> are written in the past, either long time ago or recently, <del>and</del> <u>Also</u> the writers may be more professional and they know about the world better than us. But the point is this knowledge couldn't be appropriate for the situations that "we" are facing "now". <u>Over time, things change, and that's why the time we are living now and the time the writers wrote the book is not the same.</u></p>
<p>Addition &amp; No Change (Somin's R1-1)</p>	<p>My major is tourism management. Last semester I learnt Airline management, Hotel service management, etc. These studies include many cases. For example, there are hotel service, aircraft service: how to welcome guest and how to give them aircraft tickets. Among these service process, workers often make mistakes. We study all these things. Professor taught us how to service to customer and what is the best way to serve customers. <u>But</u>, it is not enough especially in my major. Students can grow up when they experience all things. If students study all these service from <u>the</u> book, it is not enough. Usually, tourism management students hope to be aircrew, hotel manager, etc. I think they need to learn how to service to people from part-time job or internship. They can <u>get</u> many things from that experience. <u>When they do part-time job or internship, they may experience some mistake. Through these things, they get skill.</u></p> <p>In conclusion, people can get knowledge from experience. They can get many things from their experience. Therefore, not knowledge from <u>the</u> book but knowledge from experience is more important.</p>

On the other hand, Somin made no revision at the beginning part of her writing. Although her peer Yeonu suggested Somin to put more discourse markers, she added the article 'the' and the verb 'get' in her writing. She made self-revision by adding the sentence such as 'When they do part-time job or internship, they may experience some mistake. Through these things, they get skill.'

#### 4.3 Effects of Peer Review on Students' Writing Skills

The pre- and post- C-test scores were measured by the Paired Samples t-test in order to measure participants' general language proficiency and analyze if there were

any improvements before and after the peer review session. The same C-test was conducted before and after the research. The result might be the same task effect. The results of the C-tests show a statistically significant difference in the language proficiency before and after the peer review project ( $t = -2.795$ ,  $p < .05$ ). In Table 6, the mean score of participants' language proficiency significantly improved, increasing 11.250 from 65 to 76.25 scores.

Table 6. Results of C-test

	Paired Differences					
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pre-Post	-11.250	13.942	4.025	-2.795	11	.017**

Meanwhile, two native English professors and the researcher assessed the participants' essay in holistic and analytic scores. Both assessors have been well qualified to evaluate TWEs to increase the reliability of the tests. Two native raters and the researcher (non-native rater) evaluated a total of 48 essay writings during the peer review process. In holistic scoring result, the holistic scores ranged from 1 to 5. The inter-rater reliability among three raters, computed using Pearson Correlation, was 1, .882, .836 respectively. Comparing to the pre- and post- essay writings, only two participants received increased holistic scores (Yeeun 4.5 to 5; Jian 2 to 3) and three participants' scores were the same (Yeonu 2; Seojun 3.5; Seowon 3). The other six participants scores decreased from the first to the fourth writing.

Table 7. Results of Holistic Scores

Holistic Scores	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST		Paired Samples t-test			
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean difference	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	3.375	.7724	3.042	.7821	.3333	1.685	11	.120

Table 7 presents the results of holistic scores with the Paired Samples t-test. The mean difference between the two writings was 0.333 lower on the post-writing than on the pre-writing, which was not statistically significant. Most participants had a higher score in their first essay writing and then the rest of their essay scores were slightly lower than the first one. This implies that as they went further, their writing did not improve. The five-month writing process is too short to evaluate how much students can actually improve their writing quality. Table 8 presents all five analytic scores with the Paired Samples t-test results.

Table 8. Results of Analytic Scores

Analytic Scores	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST		Paired Samples t-test			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean difference	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Content	22.458	4.6878	20.917	3.7889	1.5417	1.422	11	.183
Organization	15.042	4.0083	14.375	2.8375	.6667	.638	11	.537
Grammar	17.792	4.3141	17.167	3.8514	.6250	.535	11	.603
Vocabulary	15.708	2.4630	14.000	2.6199	1.7083	2.430	11	.033*
Mechanics	3.625	.5691	3.250	.7833	.3750	1.827	11	.095

\* $p < .05$

In analytic scoring results, this paper examined the pre- and post- writing to better state what features contributed to the writing quality. Table 8 illustrates the results how much peer review would help participants improve their writing skills with the revision process. The results show no significant mean difference in their essay writings (for the content ( $t = 1.422, p > .05$ ); organization ( $t = .638, p > .05$ ); Grammar ( $t = .535, p > .05$ ); mechanics( $t = 1.827, p > .05$ ) except vocabulary( $t = 1.827, p < .05$ ). The findings on participants' writing skills indicate that peer review does not have any effect on improving participants' writing skills under the following considerations: content, organization, grammar, and mechanics because no significant differences are found between the two writings. However, the result

shows that vocabulary did enhance the quality of participants’ revisions based on peer reviews.

The almost five-month of peer review project did not reach the expected increase in writing quality. This implies that the task-related factors might influence their writings, such as different writing topics, writing context, writer’s culture, and lack of application in their academic class. Because writing is a highly complex skill, it takes time to improve writing skills. However, participants increased in C-test scores and employed many writing strategies from their peers, and most participants are still improving their writing skills.

From the interview, Yeonu mentioned that she just wrote the short sentences because she did not know how to write the essay and discovered what she needed what to write after the peer review project. Yujin pointed out that she felt her English skills had begun to improve while thinking about various topics during the writing process. Moreover, she was aware of how to organize the contents and focused on revising the structure. Meanwhile, Ara increased her motivation for a careful writing with grammar and vocabulary. She also viewed the different logical flow and the individual personality in writing. This indicates that participants noticed how to improve their writing skills and gain general language proficiency based on the C-test results which assessed English vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, and spelling.

Figure 3. Interview with Students

<p>Yeonu’s Interview</p>	<p>K: 저는 writing수업 처음 받아봤거든요. 그래서 처음에 적을 때는 막막하고 되게 그랬는데 이제 peer review 받고 고치고 하다보니까 네, 좋았던 것 같아요.</p> <p>T: 아~ 동료수정할때 좋았다고 했는데 왜 좋았어요?</p> <p>K: 음. 제가 글을 처음 썼을 때는 막 어떻게 적어야 될지 몰라서 그냥 짧게 짧게 적고 이렇게했는데 peer review 받으면서 볼 추가해야될지 알게 됐고 네.</p>
<p>Yujin’s Interview</p>	<p>P: 쓰는 과정에서 여러가지 주제를 생각해 보면서 영어실력이 향상되는 것 같고 그리고 동료수정을 함으로써 서로에게 도움을 주니까 이제 유대감도 형성되는 것 같고 여러가지로 도움이 되는 것 같습니다.</p> <p>T: 어떤 여러가지가 도움이 됐어요?</p> <p>P: 제가 영어실력면에서 영어 글하나를 구성하는 그런 뭐 짜임이나 형식도 더 고쳐진 것 같고</p>

Ara's Interview	<p>S: 꼭 같은 주제를 받았지만 저랑 글을 쓴 다른 친구랑 비교하면서 같이 피드백한다는 점에서 내가 생각을 못했던 의견을 같이 피드백 주고받는 친구가 또 생각하고 그 친구가 생각 못했던 것이 제가 생각해서 서로 상호 의견교환할 수 있는게 재밌었던 것 같고 그리고 제가 문법적인 면이나 단어수정에 있어서 다른 친구가 도움을 줘서 그 부분에 대해서 좀더 꼼꼼하게 글을 쓸 때도 주의를 해야겠다는 그런 모티브를 얻었고 그리고 peer review할 때 글의 논리성 같은 경우도 사람마다 각자 다르구나 글에도 자기의 개성이 녹아나는 것을 느꼈습니다.</p>
-----------------	---

#### 4.4 Students' Perceptions towards Peer Review

At the beginning of the peer review process, the participants struggled with incorporating the peer review in their writing process. Based on the surveys, the participants became slightly more positive to writing in English because they became less anxious when it comes to writing as they repeatedly engaged in the writing process. There were no remarkable changes on the improvement of the confidence and motivation. However, participants like Eunjae had a more favorable attitude towards the peer review interaction. She thought that peer review activity was evaluative in the beginning, but over time peer review was greater than she expected. She also mentioned that she recognized effective writing and learned how to engage effective writing. After all peer review and revision sessions, participants learned how to write an academic essay writing, review their own and peers' drafts, and how to incorporate peers' comments. Most participants were aware of the helpfulness of peer review. Yujin mentioned that peer review interaction was meaningful because she could reflect her own writings and felt that her writing skills had improved. Yujin also had a chance to see her strong points as well as her points of weakness in her writing and used many writing strategies.

Most participants recognized that peer review interaction is useful for content, logical flows, clearing up ideas, sentence structure, vocabulary, and grammar. Yeeun was worried about providing wrong information to her peer and she recognized that she required more study of grammar. She acknowledged her own weaknesses and she tried to find out more accurate grammar information. Although the participants doubted if peer review interaction was helpful to improve their writing skills, they identified

their own deficient areas to improve and noticed the requirement of continuous study and attention on their weaknesses. Meanwhile, the participants' anxiety rose because of providing critical comments to their peers. They felt that providing comments is not an easy work. At the beginning of the peer review activity, the participants had little knowledge of each other well, but during the peer review session they built the closer relationship with their colleagues and developed their rapport.

During the peer review activity, the participants preferred teachers' feedback to peers' feedback because they did not trust their peers' comments and explanations on their writing. Also, they were not ready and competent to provide comments to their peers. In the preferences towards the peer review interaction, the participants liked both teachers' and peers' feedback, face-to-face work, and the written e-mail comments. Meanwhile, the participants preferred working work with the highly proficient colleagues in the same age to less proficient colleagues and their seniors. During the interview, some participants mentioned that they wanted to work with the higher proficient colleagues because the higher-level reviewers have more linguistic knowledge, but after the peer review activity they recognized that lower-level reviewers can work on sharing ideas, negotiating the meaning, and joining in collaborative interactions. The participants preferred receiving comments because corrections are easily implemented through comments from their peers. However, providing comments was not an easy task because they had to rack their brains and figure out the parts that required improvement. The participants also preferred critical comments to compliments because it helped them improve their writing skills while revising their mistakes.

Most participants described themselves as ineligible reviewers because they had not participated much participated in student-directed language learning. After the peer review activity, the participants recognized the peer review interaction helped them improve their learning on how to compare different thoughts of peers, organize their writing, share ideas, read each other's writings, and recognize their own strengths and weaknesses.



## V. Discussion and Conclusion

The current study explored the types of peer reviews and revisions and also investigate participants' perceptions towards peer review interaction during the peer review process. In the peer review session, the participants paid more attention to addition, and positive praise. Nelson and Carson (1998) mentioned that Asian students tried to maintain saving face and thus might be afraid of criticizing their peers' written works. Instead of critical negative comments, participants commended their peers. In the revision session, the participants made revisions with corrections, additions, and no revision. They incorporated their peer review comments in their writings and also made more self-revisions by adding contents. In addition, the participants made no revisions because they might have had trouble revising the content-related category based on the checklist such as the thesis statement, topic sentence, essay structure, provoking interest, the flow of ideas, confusing parts, run-on sentences, coherent response, summary, and the restatement of the thesis statement.

In the holistic and analytic scoring results, the findings indicate that the peer review activity did not reach the expected increase in writing quality except vocabulary. It may show that the five-month peer review activity is too short to investigate how participants actually improve their writing quality. As writing is a highly complex skill, the improvement takes time. However, participants increased in C-test scores and vocabulary, and employed many writing strategies from their peers. This indicates that the participants learned how to improve their writing skills and develop their general English proficiency.

Over time, the participants became more confident writing the academic essay because they were less anxious in writing as they repeatedly engaged in the peer review process. After all peer review and revision sessions, the participants learned how to write an essay, review their own and peers' drafts, and incorporate peers' comments. Most participants recognized that peer review interactions are useful for contents, logical flows, clearing up ideas, sentence structure, vocabulary, and grammar.

During the peer review session, the participants particularly added the comments about vocabulary, grammar, and discourse markers on their peers' drafts. Participants had a chance to examine the target language while generating the comments to their peers and struggle with right choice of words and grammar structures. In this process, participants had more practice with other English language skills, thereby improving their general English language proficiency (Liu & Hansen, 2002).

The participants recognized their strengths and weaknesses while reading their personal and peers' drafts, as well as built close ties with their peers during the peer review sessions. After the peer review activity, the participants liked both peers' and teachers' feedback, face-to-face interaction, and the written e-mail comments. They also liked working with teachers and the high proficient peers of the same age. After the peer review activity, they recognized that lower-level reviewers can work on the negotiation of meaning, sharing ideas, and joining in collaborative interactions. Ryu (2013) pointed out that the vigorous revisions produced by Korean college students of a low English proficiency level failed to bring considerable improvement to their writings. Most participants portrayed themselves as ineligible reviewers because they did not have much experience in student-driven language learning. After the peer review activity, the participants recognized that the peer review interaction had helped them improve their learning on how to share ideas, organize their writing, compare different thoughts of peers, read each other's writings, and discover their own strengths and weaknesses.

The present study was explored with the limitation of the small sample size and not in a classroom setting. To provide authentic descriptions of the peer review activity, this research analyzed the correlation between the quantitative and qualitative data of peer review. It also showed how the peer review activity affects students' writing skills. Future studies can include different sample size, different English proficiency and grouping, and the students' identity from the peer review interaction.

## Works Cited

- Allaei, Sara Kurtz, and Ulla Maija Connor. "Exploring the Dynamics of Cross-cultural Collaboration in Writing Classrooms." *Writing Instructor* 10 (1990): 19-28. Print.
- Allen, David, and Amy Mills. "The Impact of Second Language Proficiency in Dyadic Peer Feedback." *Language Teaching Research* (2015): 1-16. Print.
- Amores, Maria. J. "A New Perspective on Peer Editing." *Foreign Language Annals* 30.4 (1997): 513-23. Print.
- Berger, Virginia. "The Effects of Peer and Self-feedback." *CATESOL Journal* 3 (1990): 215-41. Print.
- Bridwell, Lillian S. "Revising Strategies in Twelfth Grade Students' Transactional Writing." *Research in the Teaching of English* 14 (1980): 197-222. Print.
- Cheng, Winnie, and Martin Warren. Making a Difference: Using Peers to Assess Individual Students' Contributions to a Group Project. *Teaching in Higher Education* 5.2 (2000): 243-55. Print.
- Choi, Hyunsik, and Iwashita, N. "Interactional Behaviours of Low-proficiency learners in Small Group Work." *Peer interaction and second language learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda*. Ed. Masatoshi Sato and Susan Ballinger. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2016. 113-134. Print.
- Connor, Ulla, and Karen Asenavage. "Peer Response Groups in ESL Writing Classes: How Much Impact on Revision?" *Journal of Second Language Writing* 3 (1994): 257-76. Print.
- Coomber, Matthew, and Richard Silver. "The Effect of Anonymity in Peer Review." *JALT 2009 conference proceeding*. Ed. Stoke A. M. Tokyo: The Japan Association for Language Teaching, 2010. 621-26. Print.
- Silver, Richard, & Matthew Coomber. "How Anonymity Affects Feedback in the Peer Review process." *KOTESOL Proceedings 2010* (2011): 299-308. Print.
- Cumming, Alister, and Sufimi So. "Tutoring Second Language Text Revision: Does Approach to Instruction or the Language of Communication Make a Difference?" *Journal of Second Language Writing* 5 (1996): 197-226. Print.
- Dao, Phung, and Kim McDonough. "The Effect of Task Role on Vietnamese EFL Learners' Collaboration in Mixed Proficiency Dyads." *System* 65.1 (2017): 15-24. Print.
- Educational Testing Service. *Test of Written English Guide*. Princeton, NJ: Author, 2004. Print.
- Faigley, Lester, & Steven P. Witte. "Analyzing Revision." *College Composition and Communication* 32 (1981): 400-14. Print.
- Hirvela, Alan. "Collaborative Writing Instruction and Communities of Readers and Writers."

- TESOL Journal* 8.2 (1999): 7-12. Print.
- Huh, Myung-Hye, and Inhwan Lee. Applying Toulmin: Does Peer Response Play a Role in Korean EFL College Students' Revision Quality? *ENGLISH TEACHING* 69.3 (2014): 3-23. Print.
- Hyland, Ken, and Fiona Hyland. "Feedback on Second Language Participants' Writing." *Language Teaching* 39.2 (2006): 83-101. Print.
- Johnston, Lucy, and Lynden Miles. Assessing Contributions to Group Assignments. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 29.6 (2004): 751-68. Print.
- Kang, Dongho. "Feedback on EFL Writing: Teacher, Peer, and Self-review." *Foreign Languages Education* 15.1 (2008): 1-22. Print.  
[강동호. 「EFL 쓰기에서의 피드백: 교사, 동료, 그리고 자기평가」. 『외국어교육』 15.1 (2008): 1-22.]
- Keh, Claudia. L. "Feedback in the Writing Process: A Model and Methods for Implementation." *ELT Journal* 4 (1990): 294-394. Print.
- Kim, Hoonmil. *Writing, Peer Feedback, and Revision: A Comparison of L1 and L2 College Freshmen with Longitudinal Analyses*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, 2013. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Revision Types and Their Effect on Writing: A Case Study of Korean College Participants." *English Language Teaching* 26.4 (2014): 25-48. Print.
- Lee, Ji Hye. Negotiations and Criticisms in L2 Peer Review Sessions. *Modern English Education* 19.4 (2018): 59-71. Print.
- Leki, Ilona. "Coaching from the Margins: Issues in Written Response." *Second language writing*. Ed. Kroll Barbara. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 57-68. Print.
- Liu, Jianguo. "Peer Review with the Instructor: Seeking Alternatives in ESL Writing. Ed. J. Richards. *Teaching in Action: Case Studies from Second Language Classrooms* (pp. 237-240), Alexandria, VA: TESOL, 1998. Print.
- Liu, Jun, and Jette G. Hansen. *Peer Response in Second Language Writing Classrooms*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2002. Print.
- Mendonça, Cassia O., and Karen E. Johnson. "Peer Review Negotiations: Revision Activities in ESL Writing Instruction." *TESOL Quarterly* 28.4 (1994): 745-69. Print.
- Ministry of Education. *English Curriculum* (Notification No. 2015-74, Appendix 14). Seoul, Korea: Author, 2015. Print.
- Mittan, Robert. "The Peer Review Process: Harnessing Participants' Communicative Power." Eds. D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen. *Richness in Writing: Empowering ESL Participants* (pp. 207-219), New York: Longman, 1989. Print.
- Morgan, Brett, Bjorn Fuisting, and Jeremy White. "University Student Attitudes towards Peer Review in EFL Writing: A Quantitative Study." *Language Education in Asia* 5.1

(2014): 93-116. Print.

- Neff, Peter. *Peer review use in the EFL writing classroom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, (2015). Print.
- Nelson, Gayle L., and Joan G. Carson. "ESL Participants' Perceptions of Effectiveness in Peer Response Groups." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7.2 (1998), 113-31. Print.
- Nelson, G. L., and Murphy, J. M. "An L2 Writing Group: Task and Social Dimensions." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 1.3 (1992): 171-93. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Peer Response Groups: Do L2 Writers Use Peer Response Groups." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7.2 (1993): 113-31. Print.
- OECD. "Definition and selection of competencies; Theoretical and Conceptual Foundations (DeSeCo), 2013. Web. 20 April 2018. Print.
- Oh, Hae Jin.. Learners' Writing Performance, Revision Behavior, Writing Strategy, and Perception in Wiki-mediated Collaborative Writing. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning* 17.2 (2014): 176-99. Print.
- Paulus, Trena. M. "The Effect of Peer and Teacher Feedback on Student Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8.3 (1999): 265-89. Print.
- Silver, Richard, & Matthew Coomber. "How Anonymity Affects Feedback in the Peer Review process." *KOTESOL Proceedings 2010* (2011): 299-308. Print.
- Sivan, Atara. The Implementation of Peer Assessment: An Action Research Approach. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice* 7.2 (2000): 193-213. Print.
- Sommers, Nancy. "Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers." *College Composition and Communication* 31 (1980): 378-88. Print.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Responding to Student Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 33 (1982): 148-56. Print.
- Topping, Keith. Peer Assessment between Students in Colleges and Universities. *Review of Educational Research* 6.3 (1998): 249-76. Print.
- Yoon, Kyeong-ok and Lee, Jeong-Won. "Features and Perception of EFL Students' Feedback on Their Peers' Writing." *English Language & Literature Teaching* 24.3 (2018): 69-87. Print. [윤경옥, 이정원. 「EFL 학생의 쓰기 피드백의 특징과 인식」. 『영어어문교육』 24.3 (2018): 69-87.]
- Zamel, Vivian. "The Composing Processes of Advanced ESL Participants: Six Case Studies." *TESOL Quarterly* 16 (1983): 165-87. Print.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1. C-test Paper

#### C-test

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Do you often use shampoo or put ketchup on your food? Have you ever visited a sauna? If y\_\_\_\_\_ think th\_\_\_\_\_ words a\_\_\_\_\_ originally Eng\_\_\_\_\_, you'd bet\_\_\_\_\_ think ag\_\_\_\_\_. In fa\_\_\_\_\_, each o\_\_\_\_\_ these wo\_\_\_\_\_ comes fr\_\_\_\_\_ a diff\_\_\_\_\_ language! Sha\_\_\_\_\_, for exa\_\_\_\_\_, is actu\_\_\_\_\_ a wo\_\_\_\_\_ from t\_\_\_\_\_ Hindi lang\_\_\_\_\_ in In\_\_\_\_\_. This wo\_\_\_\_\_ originally me\_\_\_\_\_ 'massage'. I\_\_\_\_\_ hair sh\_\_\_\_\_ in In\_\_\_\_\_, barbers mas\_\_\_\_\_ your he\_\_\_\_\_ while was\_\_\_\_\_ your ha\_\_\_\_\_. Over ti\_\_\_\_\_, British peo\_\_\_\_\_ in In\_\_\_\_\_ used th\_\_\_\_\_ word t\_\_\_\_\_ mean\_\_\_\_\_ liquid th\_\_\_\_\_ cleans ha\_\_\_\_\_. Almost ever\_\_\_\_\_ knows wh\_\_\_\_\_ ketchup i\_\_\_\_\_. People a\_\_\_\_\_ over t\_\_\_\_\_ world li\_\_\_\_\_ to po\_\_\_\_\_ this tom\_\_\_\_\_ sauce o\_\_\_\_\_ French fr\_\_\_\_\_ or sandw\_\_\_\_\_. This wo\_\_\_\_\_ is origin\_\_\_\_\_ Chinese (fr\_\_\_\_\_ ketsiap, \_\_\_\_\_ fish sauce). In the 1600s, British and Dutch sailors brought this fish sauce to Europe. Over time, people changed the sauce by adding tomato flavor to it, but the name basically stayed the same.

#### C-test Answer

Do you often use shampoo or put ketchup on your food? Have you ever visited a sauna? If you think these words are originally English, you'd better think again. In fact, each of these words comes from a different language! Shampoo, for example, is actually a word from the Hindi language in India. This word originally meant 'massage'. In hair shops in India, barbers massage your head while washing your hair. Over time, British people in India used this word to mean a liquid that cleans hair. Almost everyone knows what ketchup is. People all over the world like to pour this tomato sauce on French fries or sandwiches. This word is originally Chinese (from ketsiap, a fish sauce). In the 1600s, British and Dutch sailors brought this fish sauce to Europe. Over time, people changed the sauce by adding tomato flavor to it, but the name basically stayed the same.

### Appendix 2. Post-Peer Review Survey

#### 동료수정 사후 설문지

\*이 설문은 여러분들이 동료 수정에 대해 어떻게 생각하고 있는지 알아보기 위한 것입니다. 다음 문항을 읽고 자신에게 해당하는 대답에 √ 표하거나 자유롭게 답을 써주세요. 솔직하게 빠짐없이 답하기 바랍니다.

전공: \_\_\_\_\_ 학년: \_\_\_\_\_ 이름: \_\_\_\_\_

나이: \_\_\_\_\_ 성별: \_\_\_\_\_ 날짜: \_\_\_\_\_

1	2	3	4	5
전혀 그렇지 않다	그렇지 않다	보통	그렇다	매우 그렇다

문항번호	설문내용	설문답변				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	친구가 쓴 글을 읽는 것이 즐거웠다.					
2	친구의 글을 읽음으로써 새로운 아이디어를 얻을 수 있었다.					
3	나는 친구에게 도움이 되는 제안을 하려고 노력하였다.					
4	나는 나의 수정제안이 정확하다고 생각했다.					
5	내 친구의 피드백이 내 글을 향상하는데 도움이 되었다.					
6	나는 친구의 글에 수정 제안을 쓰는 것이 어려웠다.					
7	나의 수정 제안에 대해 친구가 고마워하는 것을 느꼈다.					
8	수정과정에서 수정한 부분에 대해 서로 의견을 교환했다.					
9	동료수정이 글의 내용에 대해 생각하도록 도움을 주었다.					
10	동료수정이 문장을 논리적이고 구조적으로 연결하는데 도움을 주었다.					
11	동료수정이 나의 생각을 명확히 표현하는데 도움을 주었다.					
12	동료수정이 문장의 구조와 길이를 다양하게 표현하는데 도움을 주었다.					
13	동료수정이 어휘에 대해 생각하도록 도움을 주었다.					
14	동료수정이 문법을 바로잡는데 도움을 주었다.					
15	내 친구가 수정제안한 내용을 적극적으로 반영하여 수정본을 작성했다.					
16	나보다 영어를 잘 한다고 생각하는 친구에게 피드백을 받는 것을 선호한다.					
17	나와 영어 실력이 비슷한 친구와 피드백을 교환하는 것을 선호한다.					
18	나보다 영어실력이 모자라는 친구에게 피드백을 주는 것을 선호한다.					
19	동료수정은 영어쓰기에 대해 자신감을 더 가질 수 있게 했다.					
20	동료수정은 영어쓰기에 대한 동기부여가 되었다.					
21	위에 언급되지 않은 내용 중 동료수정의 좋은 점이 있다면 써주세요.					
22	위에 언급되지 않은 내용 중 동료수정의 어려운 점/문제점이 있다면 써주세요.					

### Appendix 3. Interview Questions

#### *General feelings about the peer review process*

1. How was the peer review writing study?
2. How were the peer-review revisions? Were they good or not good? Why?

#### *When giving the peer review suggestions*

3. How did you feel when giving suggestions during the process of peer review? Did you give praises more often? Were there critical or negative comments? Do you think it is appropriate?
4. On which part did you give comments to your peers the most often?
5. Why did or didn't you change this?
6. Why did or didn't you have many changes?
7. Why did you focus on content/ structure/ grammar/ formation?

#### *When receiving the peer review suggestions*

8. How did you feel when you received peers' suggestions during the peer review process? Did you receive praises more often? Were there critical or negative comments? Do you think it is appropriate?
9. Why did or didn't you change this?
10. Why did or didn't you have many changes?
11. Why did you focus on content/ structure/ grammar/ formation?

#### *The impression of the peer*

12. How was your peer when giving or receiving feedback? Was your peer active or passive in a peer review process? Why did you feel like that?
13. Who was most comfortable with the peer review revisions? Why do you think so?

#### *The peer's English language proficiency*

14. What do you think about your peer's English language proficiencies, compared to yours?
15. Do you think your peers are good or not good enough to give you suggestions? Why do you think so?

#### *The usefulness of peer review*

16. Were your peer's comments helpful? Did you reflect upon them when you revised your writings?
17. Why did or didn't you use the suggestions on your draft revisions?
18. Was other material helpful to your draft revisions? If so, what is it?



*The experience of peer-review revisions*

19. Which do you prefer giving or receiving suggestions? Why?  
 20. What kind of experience did you have in your peer revision process?

## Appendix 4. Peer Review Checklist

**Peer Review Checklist**

\*Please refer to the following questions and give feedback to your partner. 1) Read what your partner wrote. 2) Please make sure that you have any of the following, and write your comments or suggestions on your peer's essay.

<b>1. Overall Comments</b>	
<b>1-1</b>	Does the paper meet all of the requirements of the assignment? Does it identify 2-3 supportive ideas to demonstrate a strong commitment to the topic? If it has any weakness, please write notes in the margin of the essay.
<b>1-2</b>	Is there a thesis statement or introduction? Does it include reasons and specific examples to support the answer throughout the paper? If it has any weakness, please write notes in the margin of the essay.
<b>1-3</b>	Does it have the proper formatting (introduction-body-conclusion)? If not, make comments in the margins to address specific cases.
<b>2. Introduction</b>	
<b>2-1</b>	Does the introduction include an effective hook (opening line)? If so, please indicate these areas on the draft itself. Does the introduction include the effective sentence that grabs the reader's attention? If so, please indicate what the part is. If not, offer any suggestions to address where the effective hook is going to be.
<b>2-2</b>	Please ask any questions or offer any suggestions for the thesis statement.
<b>3. Body</b>	
<b>3-1</b>	Do the body paragraphs indicate what the main topic of each paragraph is going to be? Do they connect back to the thesis statement? Offer a suggestion for one topic sentence to make it more effective.
<b>3-2</b>	Please underline the reasons, examples, details that support each topic statement. If not, provide a comment for details or examples in the margins of the draft.
<b>3-3</b>	Are the examples easy to understand and descriptive enough to provoke interest? Please highlight the example that is done well and one that could be improved upon. Make suggestions for revision.

<b>4. Organization</b>	
4-1	Do the ideas flow clearly from sentence to sentence and paragraph to paragraph? Does the paper use transition words (in addition to, as a result, in conclusion) or conjunctive adverbs (however, therefore) so that one idea flows smoothly into another? On the draft, indicate paragraphs that are disconnected and provide comments in the margins.
4-2	Are there any places in the paper where you were confused? If so, offer any suggestions for a better way to organize the paper in the margins of the draft.
4-3	Does the paper write a unified, well-organized, and coherent response based on the prompt? Please provide a comment in the margins.
<b>5. Conclusion</b>	
5-1	In the conclusion, does it do more than just summarize or restate what's already been said? Offer any suggestions on how it could be made more interesting and more effective at answering the 'so what' question.
5-2	Does it rephrase the writer's ideas? If not, offer specific suggestions for improvement on the draft itself.
<b>6. Grammar &amp; Vocabulary</b>	
6-1	Does it have any major grammatical? Point out one example of each type that you see and offer a suggestion of how the writer might could fix the problem. (Look for errors with subject/verb agreement, pronoun/antecedent agreement, and vague pronoun usage)
6-2	Does it have varied sentence structure and length? Are there run-on sentences or sentence fragments? If so, please underline them and offer a suggestion for revision on the draft.
6-3	Does it use specific, precise, varied and engaging vocabulary? If not, please provide a comment in the margins. Does it use the repetition and redundancies? If the sentences are simply restating old information, please make a suggestion for revision.
<b>7. Mechanics</b>	
7-1	Does it have any spelling errors? Are there any typos that you notice? If so, please circle or highlight them and make a suggestion on the draft.
7-2	Are there any punctuation marks errors? (Look for errors with commas, periods, apostrophes, hyphens, and semi-colons) If so, please explain in the margins and offer suggestions for improvement.
7-3	Do all sentences begin with capital letter? If not, offer suggestions for correction on the draft.

## Appendix 5. Peer Review Types

Types of Peer Reviews		
Category		Definition
1	Additions	Add or unite new ideas, expansion, clarification
2	Corrections	Be substituted for what is wrong in order to increase accuracy, Provide the correct form
3	Deletions	Remove ideas to be explicit
4	Negative comments	Express or contain negation or denial
5	Paraphrase	Express what they have written in a different way
6	Positive compliments	Demonstrate that another peer values your qualities and idea
7	Separation	Move apart or move ideas from one to another
8	Substitutions	Put in the place of another
9	Suggestions	An idea someone proposes
10	Questions	The message has not been understood, clarification request

## Appendix 6. Revision Types

Types of Revisions		
Category		Definition
1	Additions	Add or unite new ideas, expansion, clarification
2	Corrections	Be substituted for what is wrong in order to increase accuracy, provide the correct form
3	Deletions	Remove ideas to be explicit
4	No change	Not to make any forms and contents
5	Paraphrase	Express what they have written in a different way
6	Refutations	an argument is something that proves it is wrong or untrue
7	Reordering	Request to be moved, arrange in a different way
8	Restatement	State the idea again or differently to be more clear or convincing
9	Separations	Move apart or move ideas from one to another
10	Substitutions	Put in the place of another

Appendix 7. Interview Coding on the NVivo 11

The screenshot displays the NVivo 11 interface for coding interview data. It is organized into a hierarchical tree structure under the main node 'Interview'.

- Interview**
  - 동료수정 프로젝트에 대한 인상**
    - 교사의 제안이 동료제안보다 나오면 동료수정방법에 익숙하지니 서로 도와주고해서 좋았음
    - 동료수정은 평가이고 문제점을 지적하는 평가는 전문가인 교사의 몫이지 전문직이 없는 동료의 몫이 아니다
      - 교사는 전문가이자 평가자라 문제점 정확히 지적해줌
      - 실력이 좋은 친구는 교사 문제지적 업무대행
      - 문제점 지적하는 동료수정과정은 평가
      - 평가는 전문가의 몫
      - 실력이 높지않은 동료는 교사업무대행 업무를 과중시킴뿐 평가업무에 도움이 되지않음
    - 동료수정 방법을 알게되서 익숙해지고 좋았음
      - 시작할때 수정 제안방법을 몰라 당황스럽고 막막함
      - 다양한 주제로 글을 많이 쓰고 있는 동료수정은 글의 향상도모
      - 여러번 해보니 동료수정의 방법을 알게되고 익숙해짐
      - 이메일 제안은 빠르게 할수 있고 면대면은 자세한 설명가능
    - 동료수정에서 서로 도움을 주니깐 좋음
      - 다른 생각을 가진 동료와 의견교환을 하면 재밌다
      - 서로 도움을 주면 동료간에 유대감이 형성된다
      - 자신과 동료의 글을 동시에 보면 서로 비교가 되서 자신의 글에서 실수한 부분 생각하고 친구의 아이디어와 글쓰기에 참고가 된다
  - 수정된 이유와 하지 않은 이유**
    - 수정한 이유**
      - 여러번 자신글을 읽으면 많은 수정과정을 거쳐게 되서 글쓰기 실력이 향상된다
      - 제안의 양이 적으면 자기주도적 수정을 더 많이하고 두번째수정에서 구조와 내용을 생각해서 글 향상을 위해 수정한다
      - 좋은 글을 많이 읽어보지 않고 글쓰기 습관이 길러지지않아 수정과정의 방향을 잃어버리다
    - 수정하지 않은 이유**
      - 가이드로 제시한 체크리스트를 자기주도적으로 활용하지 않고 전문가인 교사에게 의존하여 답을 찾으려는 습관이 있다
      - 동료의 불성실로인해 계속되는 문법과 단어제안으로 반박하느라 본인의 글을 수정하지 않음
      - 잘된 글을 많이 읽고 써보는 경향이 부족하여 자기만족감을 쉽게 느껴 수정하지 않음
      - 항상 평가를 받고 제안받는 것에 익숙해서 자기주도적으로 수정할 필요성을 느끼지 못함
    - 시간이 충분하면 생각할 시간이 있어서 글의 질이 향상됨**
      - 생각할 시간이 부족해서 글을 많이 못씀
      - 시간부족해서 문법만 확인하고 불리한 상황때문에 내용을 많이 못씀
      - 검토할 충분한 시간과 노력이 있으면 스스로 수정하고 결과적으로 내용과 질도 향상됨
    - 제안중에서도 문법을 신경을 많이 쓰는데 자신의 글에서 부족한 부분은 구조,어휘,예시와 내용**
      - 제안에 신경을 많이 쓰는 성격이라 자신이 놓친 부분을 동료로 제안해주는데 특히 문법을 더 제안해줌
      - 자신의 글에 문법 말고 구조, 어휘, 예시와 내용을 더 수정제안받고 추가해야한다고 생각함

Kwon, Eunsook (Keimyung University/Instructor)  
 Address: (42965) 1095, Dalgubeol-daero, Dalseo-gu, Daegu, Korea  
 Email: gorgeousann@naver.com

Received: December 29, 2018 / Revised: January 31, 2019 / Accepted: February 7, 2019