

Peer-editing With Novice College Writers

Dara LANGLEY

Abstract

A novice writer moves from a focus on form at the sentence level, to a focus on organization and cohesion at the paragraph level, and then on to managing a ‘writing project’ of an academic essay. This research paper investigated how novice college writers learn the academic writing process and apply taught writing skills. In particular, the structural components of an academic essay, as well as the effective integration of outside sources of evidence. As part of this process, peer-editing using checklists was used as a formative assessment tool. The accuracy of student peer-assessments of the first draft was then compared with the teacher-assessments of the second draft. The results showed that while the accuracy of peer-editing using checklists is limited, they do guide students in improving their academic writing.

Introduction

When considering the use of peer review using checksheets it should be noted that the global pandemic necessitated a move from face-to-face classes in 2019, when the self-check sheets were piloted, to an asynchronous ‘On Demand’ Learning Management System (LMS) in 2020, and a more synchronous Zoom classroom environment in 2021. In understanding the application of CALL to peer-reviews, a guiding principle was adopted that new “technologies provide the means to support students to acquire the important academic writing skills in an environment that provides both student-to-student and student-to-teacher interaction and support” (Horstmanshof & Brownie, 2013). The software chosen that matched these requirements was the LMS platform Edulflow. It was intended, in the words of Warshauer et al. (1996) to “promote student autonomy, increase classroom equality, and help students develop a critical learning perspective” (p.11). The research questions are:

How well do novice students understand abstract concepts of academic writing?

How well do novice students apply abstract concepts of academic writing?

How effective is Online Peer-Editing using checklists in improving academic writing skills?

Research Literature Review

As part of the process of writing, feedback and revision play an important role in not only shaping the final text, but also honing the skills of the writer. Kift et al. (2009) make the point that assessment is a fundamental part of the student experience, and it should not only be assessment of learning but also assessment for and as learning. When preparing and teaching a writing course one consideration is discerning the mode of feedback (teacher feedback, peer-review, self-review) for the learning situation at different stages of the course. From their survey of research in this field, Hyland and Hyland (2006) draw the conclusion that effective feedback employs a variety of methods and should include both interaction and a means to respond to the feedback. Traditionally correction and feedback have been the realm of the teacher, studies show that teacher feedback is more effective with students making significant revisions to their writing (Mendonça & Johnson 1994; Saito & Fujita 1994; Zhang, 1995; Sengupta 1998; Paulus, 1999). Furthermore, studies show that students prefer teacher feedback and that there are issues of student inaccuracies and inter-personal problems giving peer feedback (Keh, 1990; Leki, 1990). Cho and Schunn (2007) explain that undergraduate students are not only novices in their disciplines but also in the skill of giving constructive feedback and also there are individual differences between peer reviewers. However, they also explain that some recent studies show peer reviewers are more likely to detect misunderstandings and contradictions as well as provide the perspective of the essay's audience, and that by working together students can learn to avoid these problems. In a study of Japanese EFL university students, Kamimura (2006) found that in terms of overall essay quality, peer feedback had a positive effect on both high- and low-proficient students' writing performance.

If evaluated from a more holistic point of view, the benefits of the peer- and self- review are that they teach students about the editing process, and to self-monitor and improve their writing. In their study of peer- and self-assessments, Saito and Fujita (2004) explain the value of peer-review as: 1) promoting self-awareness and self-reflection, 2) motivation to 'fill the gap', 3) increased responsibility for learning, 4) increased understanding of evaluation criteria, and 5) a greater sense of connectivity to a writing community. Also, it has been found that as a result of the peer-review process, students' ability to self-monitor their writing improves. In

one study Paulus (1999) found that 52% of revisions resulted neither from peer, or teacher feedback. At a form-focused level, a study by Rouhi and Azizan (2013) found that ‘givers’ of feedback performed better on post-tests than ‘receivers. Wakabayashi (2013) adds substance to this by drawing on various studies that showed students learned more about writing by reviewing peer texts than by receiving peer comments. Though a well-scaffolded peer-review system involves a significant amount of planning, student training and lesson time, once it is up and running it also has the advantage of reducing teacher workload (Rada et al., 1994). In short, peer-review tasks can help move the students to a more ‘finished’ product of writing.

In summary, students may be less receptive to peer feedback stemming from a cultural sense that correction and feedback is the traditional domain of the teacher. Also, the sheer range of results of the various studies show that the efficacy of feedback is often situation specific. However, many practitioners agree that the further purposes of peer-review are to provide an audience for writers, and to develop their evaluative skills (Hyland and Hyland, 2006). Because students respond differently to type of feedback and delivery context, a reflective teacher needs to assess the different modes of feedback in their learning context for their relative strengths and weaknesses.

Use of Peer-Review Checklists in L2 Essay Writing

Peer-Review Checklists (See Appendix A, B, C) were used as the main mode of feedback in this study. This was intended to give students a better understanding of academic genre, form, and content. As explained by Macalister and Nation (2019), checklists provide systematic coverage of important points, allow students to compare their writing to others, and serve to provide formative feedback. Garofalo (2013) advocates the use of checklists to focus students on discrete writing skills and ‘treatable issues’ in the student’s writing, and as they progress, new checklists can refocus the students on specifics pertinent to the academic genre. For college students, peer-review checklists serve not only to build competency of the academic genre, but also an understanding of their peer writing community. This ‘assessment as learning’ can also give the students a degree of autonomy and empowerment as participatory stakeholders in the evaluation and essay grading process.

Novice Writers in an EFL Context

Based on students answers to a pre-writing questionnaire and an analysis of students writing (Practice Paragraph 1), the majority of students started this course as novice academic writers whose writing skills can be summed up as follows:

- Have good sentence level writing skills
- Have not written an academic English essay
- Write mainly in the first person: In my experience, I think....
- Do not know the conventions of academic writing
- Usually do not give enough examples and supporting sentences
- Have mixed understandings of what constitutes a ‘paragraph’

The experience of novice writers tends to be of shorter writing processes. The format generally being form focused input from the teacher followed by the students writing a short passage, and then a feedback stage sometimes followed with revision. In her study of the writing context of Japanese students, Yasuda (2014) explains that writing in high schools focuses mainly of translation (eisakubun), with its focus on learning grammatical forms. She recommends more free composition (jiyu-eisakubun) tasks, to engage students in not only form but also knowledge of content and genre. She also notes that Japanese students learn less genre-specific rhetorical patterns in L1 and L2 writing and as a result find L2 expository and academic writing more difficult. Graham (2006) explains that skilled writers are more knowledgeable about writing, whereas novice and struggling writers might lack knowledge about what constitutes good writing products and processes. Incorporating evidence from outside sources with citation is usually an entirely new skill for most students. Hauptman et al. (2003) categorize the causes of low-level writing from sources as being due to lack of: explicit task representation, guided practice, and adequate content knowledge. Grabe & Zhang, (2013) explain that learning to write from textual sources is a challenging skill even for students whose L1 is English. Paulus (1999) makes the point that because writing habits and linguistic needs of L2 writers are different from L1 writers, a better understanding of the role of teacher and peer feedback on the quality of writing, revision and multiple redrafting is needed. Indeed, having an understanding or ‘metacognition’ of academic writing as a process forms part of the learning curve of novice writers and the steepness of this curve depends a lot on their ability to understand higher level vocabulary and ‘metalanguage’.

Metacognition and Metalanguage

At college level students need to take more self-responsibility for the progress of their writing through the various processes of writing an academic essay. To do this they need to not only understand a lot of metalanguage that is used in teaching components of an academic essay, but also use this to develop metacognition of their research and writing project. Teng's (2019) study of metacognitive parameters in college EFL writing, found that planning, monitoring, and evaluating correlated with writing performance, and that procedural knowledge highly correlated: "Procedural knowledge, referring to information about how to successfully apply various actions and strategies, seems to promote efficacious planning, monitoring, and evaluating of text production" (p.10). To put this in other words, as part of learning about academic writing, students need to learn abstract rules and unfamiliar processes which can involve unfamiliar metalinguistic terminology. Students not only need to understand and succeed in the task at hand in each lesson, but also build strategic knowledge of how it fits into the process of writing an academic essay. This procedural and declarative knowledge is made even more challenging in a second language. Gillam (1990) sees the development of these critical skills as the progressive acquisition of a metalanguage, by which students become better able to consider the linguistic components of others, and by extension, their own writing. However, if they are unable to grasp one idea or process, then the resulting gap in their knowledge can be like a missing piece of an unfinished puzzle.

Methodology

Participants

The participants in this study were 109 Japanese university students characterized as high-beginner to low-intermediate proficiency level with a CEFR level ranging from A2 to B1. The majority were second-year students (2020 58 yr.2, 1 yr.3. 1 yr.4, 2021 49 yr.2) taking an elective Writing Workshop course that met once a week for 90 minutes, 15 times. In the first lesson as part of a pre-writing survey, students were asked: Have you ever written an English essay? How many words did you write? 48% replied 'No' and 52% 'Yes'. Of those who replied 'Yes', the number of words they wrote, ranged from 50 to 1150 words, with an average of 342 words (SD 254).

Materials and Procedures

The goal of the course was to write an 800-word essay conforming to academic rules and styles of writing. The textbook *Academic Writing Skills 1* (Wray et al. 2012) was used for instruction and assessed classwork. For the peer editing using checklists, the online LMS Eduflow.com was used. Eduflow is designed as a platform that encourages ‘social learning’. The teacher makes a course flow of editing tasks (checklists or questions) and reflection tasks. Students upload their written work, then peer reviews can be manually or automatically assigned. Students read and review a partner’s essay and then receive their reviewed essays and edit any items checked ‘no’ accordingly. See Figure 1 for an example of what students see on Eduflow.com.

Figure 1. Eduflow.com Example Student Screen

The screenshot displays the Eduflow.com student interface, divided into three main sections:

- Progress Bar:** A vertical list of tasks with green checkmarks indicating completion. Tasks include: 'Check another student's writ...', 'Read Your Partner's Feedback', 'Outline & Introduction [Seco...', 'Self-Check', 'Teacher's Grade 先生のグレ...', 'Check your Grade and Feed...', 'Essay First Draft' (with sub-tasks: 'Submit your work', 'Review work done by your p...', 'Reflect on your feedback'), 'Essay Second Draft for Teacher Grading' (with sub-tasks: 'Submit your corrected Seco...', 'Check Your Essay First', 'Instructor review', 'Reflect on your feedback').
- Peer Essay For Review:** A central window showing a student's submission. The text reads: 'Quotient), or EQ (Emotional Quotient). Child poverty can negatively affect children's communication skills, academic ability, and physical and mental health. Firstly, one effect of child poverty is children do have not enough communication skills, because they have not chances to talking. For example children's parents work by midnight, their children have to spend time alone by the time. Therefore, it cause decrease of opportunities for children to talk to someone. Moreover, according to Onishi Ryo, if they put in poverty for a long time, they would be easy to give up, then they will be take it for granted that to give up and less self-esteem in their future life. Thus childhood is essential for make children's good personality and sociality. Having a poor communication skills is very serious problem for children, as communication skills is important skills in daily life or business.'
- Checklist & Feedback:** A panel on the right titled 'Review work done by your peers'. It contains a checklist item: 'Citation is used with all information taken from articles. p. 82-84 Check carefully because any fact or example from an article must have citation. 82-84ページのアーティクルの情報は引用されました。引用のあるアーティクルからの事実もしくは例の為、よくチェックください。 INTRODUCTION TOO!'. Below this is 'QUESTION 9' with two options: 'Pattern 1 Citation is used correctly: INFORMATION + (FAMILY NAME). ----- (Giordano).' and 'Pattern 2 Citation is used correctly: FAMILY NAME + REPORTING VERB.... Giordano claims that -----'. A 'See lesson 9.' link is present. At the bottom, there are radio buttons for 'No' and 'Yes', with 'Yes' selected.

As part of the course 20% of the student’s final grade was assigned to peer-editing using checklists, the final essay constituted 40%, 20% was given to practice paragraphs and article summaries, and 20% was assigned to 10 assessed classwork tasks (Topic Sentences, Paragraph Structure, Taking a Position, Thesis Statement, Essay Outline, Introduction, Writing Body Paragraphs with Evidence from Articles, Citation & Referencing Verbs, Conclusion, Reference List). The classwork correlated to items on the essay draft checklists, so that if students received a ‘no’ check they could go back to the relevant classwork and review the writing skill. For example, for the classwork on Thesis Statements, students were taught to write a single sentence

thesis statement from their outline, consisting of topic, writer's position and three main points. This became checklist item 1 on the Outline and Introduction Checklist and item 3 on First and Second Draft Checklist. This made it possible to identify problem areas and provide review activities and individual guidance on items that were checked 'no'.

The course was divided into three main parts. Part 1 Pre-Writing (weeks 1-4): students were introduced to academic writing using practical reading and writing tasks. They wrote one practice paragraph on a topic about college life (part-time jobs, university circles etc.) and another on the topic they chose for their main essay. Both practice paragraphs were peer-reviewed on Eduflow using a checklist (See Appendix A). Students were given training on how to use Eduflow and how to make constructive comments on any items that were flagged 'no'. Students then read their feedback and made changes to their paragraphs before conducting a self-check using the same checklist, and then uploaded the second draft for teacher's grading.

Part 2 Researching & Outlining (weeks 5-8): students learnt how to write a thesis statement, topic sentences and an outline. For research, students were shown how to do key-word searches to find 3 online articles, one for each paragraph's topic. Two articles could be in Japanese, one had to be in English. All article reports were written in English and included: Reference Information (Author's Name, Date, Title, URL), and a Summary of Main Points, Key Words and Data. In weeks 6 to 8, for the synchronous Zoom classes, students with the same essay topic were placed in Zoom breakout rooms, where they presented their article reports and shared useful facts with each other. In week 8 students were taught how to write sentences adding information from their article reports, categorized as Reason 理由, Example 事例, Fact 事実, Statistic 統計, Expert Opinion 専門家の意見. After finishing their outline and introduction, a checklist was used for peer-review on Eduflow (See Appendix B).

Part 3 Writing & Editing (weeks 9-15): students finished writing their first draft and uploaded it to Eduflow.com in week 11. In week 12 students logged into Eduflow and found a partner's essay assigned by an algorithm on their workflow screen. Students read and checked the essay using the checklist. They were encouraged to write comments for each section. In addition, as part of this review, students were asked to search the internet, find and recommend an article with some supporting points that could be used in one of the paragraphs. They then received their partner's feedback on their essay and were instructed to make changes. In week 13 and 14, a writing skills review was conducted by the teacher focusing on common errors from the first drafts such as using supporting facts in body paragraphs with in-text citation, formatting the reference list etc. Students were also given the opportunity to talk together in Zoom breakout rooms and make corrections. Each student was asked by the teacher if they

needed any help making corrections, and explicit guidance was provided where needed. It was explained that when partners checked their essay some items are often miss-checked 'yes', so the second draft self-check was more important. Students finished their second drafts and then uploaded to Eduflow for a self-check before teacher grading.

Data Collection

To assess the effectiveness of student peer evaluation of essays, a comparison of 19 of the checklist questions (Appendix C Questions 1-11 and 15-22) was made. These items were checked in Draft 1 (D1) by peer editors and then 3 weeks later in Draft 2 (D2) by the teacher. A comparison of the errors flagged by the peer editors in D1 was made with those flagged by the teacher in D2. This showed 1) if the checker did not flag a mistake in D1 and the writer did not self-check in D2, 2) if the checker flagged a mistake in D1 but no correction was made in D2, and 3) if the checker flagged a mistake in D1 and it was corrected in D2, (see Table 1). The resulting comparison data for each essay D1 and D2 was rechecked by an independent checker, a member of college staff, for accuracy. To assess students' understanding of academic writing, a questionnaire was administered at the beginning and end of the course. One task asked the students to put 6 stages of the writing process in the correct order, based on the assumption that these concepts would be understood by the end of the course. In addition, students answered questions about their experience of Eduflow, the essay checklist, and the course materials.

Results

A comparison was made between checked items by the student reviewer of D1 and checked items by the teacher of D2, see Table 1 below. Out of 109 essays 21 were excluded, for not uploading a D1 for peer editing or for not uploading a D2 for teacher grading, because no comparison could be made. Of 1,672 checked items, 327 were flagged 'no'. However, out of 327 flagged errors only 33 (10.1%) were corrected in D2, 110 flagged mistakes (33.6%) went uncorrected, and 184 (56.3%) errors went unflagged and uncorrected.

Table 1. Error Checking and Error Correction Draft 1 to Draft 2

	D1 Peer Edited & D2 Submitted	Checker does not flag mistake in D1 & writer does not self-check D2	Checker flags mistake in D1 but no correction D2	Checker flags mistake in D1 & corrected D2	Total Number of flagged items
2020	48	117 (62.5%)	56 (30%)	14 (7.5%)	187
2021	40	67 (47.9%)	54 (38.6%)	19 (13.5%)	140
2020-21	88	184 (56.3%)	110 (33.6%)	33 (10.1%)	327

Note: *21 Essays were excluded for not uploading a D1 or D2

* Total Number of Checked Items (n x 19 flaggable Items) = 1672 (2020 = 912, 2021 = 760)

When viewed by error type as shown in Table 2, 50% of uncorrected errors (checklist items 6 – 11) pertained to use of evidence and citation. For both courses a review workshop on in-text citation was conducted in lesson 13 after peer-editing of the first draft to focus students on how to make corrections. Checklist items 3, 4, 18 and 19, show that some students continued to struggle with writing topic sentences, thesis statements and summary sentences. Another area where academic style and accuracy posed problems for the students was a correctly formatted reference list, checklist item 22.

Table 2. Flagged Error Types

Essay Checklist Items	Uncorrected	Corrected
2 Introduction: Background Sentences	3	0
3 Introduction: Correctly written Thesis	26	3
4 Paragraph: Topic Sentences	10	1
5 Paragraph: Transition Words	0	1
6-8 Paragraph: No Evidence Paragraphs 1, 2, or 3	33	1
9 Citation: Citation with all Facts	32	0
10 Citation: Correct In-Text Citation	42	0
11 Citation: Both Citation Pattern 1 and 2 used	42	6
15 Language: Personal Language	16	4
16 Structure: Correctly Formatted Paragraphs	6	2
18 Conclusion: Restated General Thesis	13	0
19 Conclusion: Sum Up Main Points	13	2
20 Conclusion: Final Thoughts	6	0
21 Reference List: 3 References	6	2
22 Reference List: Correct Formatting	46	11
Total	294	33

Note: Checklist Numbers same as Appendix C

These figures may seem surprising, and it is an area where a reflective process of course improvement by the teacher is needed. When placed into the context of the finished essay grade, as shown in Table 3, 75% of essays passed as academic essays, with 39.77% rated A 80-89 with 3-5 flagged errors, and 35.23% rated A+/S 90-100 with 1-2 minor errors. 21 essays 23.86%

merited a B which meant the essay was completed with 5 or more flagged errors, and crucially a lack of evidence and citation. Furthermore, 21 students were unable to finish a first draft in time for peer-checking or did not upload a revised second draft. These students are recorded separately as ‘procrastinating writers’, their mean essay score was 76.29% (SD 9.54) compared to 85.58% (SD 7.6) for the 88 students who completed all peer and self-checking tasks.

Table 3. Essay Grade Bands and Number of Checksheet Errors

	Fail / Not Submitted	60 – 69 Incomplete Essay	70 - 79 5+ flagged Errors, Parts Missing	80 - 89 3-5 Errors	90 - 100 1-2 Minor Errors
2020 n.48	0	0	15 (31.25.%)	12 (25.0%)	21 (43.75.%)
2021 n.40	0	1 (2.5%)	6 (15.%)	23 (57.5%)	10 (25.0%)
2020/21 N.88	0	1 (1.14.%)	21 (23.86.%)	35 (39.77%)	31 (35.23%)
Procrastinating Writers n.21	1	5	5	7	3

Note:

* Procrastinating writers 2020 n.12, 2021, n.9

* 11 did not upload to Eduflow on time but submitted an essay to the teacher, 10 uploaded D1 on time to Eduflow but did not upload D2 so D1 was graded.

Metacognition of Essay Writing Process

A PDF file containing the course outline and schedule was posted on the student course webpage and explained in the first lesson, along with a slide showing the 6 stages of process writing. At the end of the lesson students, as part of the pre-writing survey, were asked to put the 6 stages of the writing process in order: 1 Brainstorming, 2 Outlining, 3 Researching, 4 Writing, 5 Editing, 6 Rewriting. For this task, the order of 2 Outlining and 3 Researching was interchangeable as these processes often occur simultaneously. Only 26% of students were able to correctly order the stages of writing. Over the following 14 weeks students followed the schedule and writing process, then in the end of course survey they were given the same task. Though the number of correct answers improved, only 56% of students selected the correct orders.

Also, as part of the peer-review process, see Appendix B questions 12 to 14, reviewer students were asked to choose a paragraph that has little or no supporting points from an article and then search the internet and find some supporting points that could be used in their partner’s essay. This was meant to reinforce the research skills that were taught in the course, show that the checker understood the main points of what they were reading, and push the editing towards a more collaborative process. Out of 88 peer reviewers, 26 students did not recommend an article, 62 recommended an article but only 4 students used the recommended article to revise

their D2. In the end of semester survey, when asked if any points had been added from the article their peer review partner had recommended, 51% reported No and 49% reported Yes (see Table 5).

Student Reflections

Students conducted several reflections during the course. In Eduflow after completing peer editing, students then read the feedback that they received from another student. To mark this Eduflow task as complete students had to answer two reflection questions intended to provide a focus for the subsequent D2 revision: Q1 What did you learn from the feedback you received? Q2 What will you change in your essay? Using qualitative analysis, four categories were derived inductively through careful reading of the students' comments as shown in Table 4. These results show that about two-thirds of students were able to use the peer checklist feedback reflection to clearly identify parts of their essay writing for improvement.

Table 4. Student Reflections on Draft 1 Peer Feedback

Category	Examples of Student Reflections	Q1	Q2
Positive Comment	I could understand what was missing in my essay. / By asking someone to read my essay, I was able to find something I hadn't noticed.	30	0
General Comment about writing	I will increase the statistics. I would like to practice writing better sentences.	33	30
Specific Comment about Checkpoint	I need to change the way of citation. / I will rewrite the reference list in the correct order. / I will use the pattern 1 to quote the facts in my essay.	53	82
States no action will be taken	No particular change. Nothing	2	6

At the end of the course a survey was conducted about the course materials and peer editing online. The results of the survey are shown in Table 5. For the online course materials only 10.6% reported that they were very difficult, 23% found the materials to be at their level, and 65.4% reported that they were challenging and took longer than expected. 83.6% reported that they spent less than 120 minutes a week on course materials with 16.4% spending between 120-180 minutes. About two thirds of students agreed that the difficulty and amount of the writing tasks was appropriate for them, with one third disagreeing. Most, 83.7% found Eduflow easy to use. However, only 38.5% reported that they could understand the checkpoints clearly and check and change their essay, 47.1% could understand the check points but found it difficult to change their essay and 14.4% had difficulty understanding the checkpoints so changing their essay was also difficult. 93% agreed that by checking other student's mistakes they could notice

mistakes in their own writing, and 95% reported that they made changes to their essays as a result of reading the peer checking.

Table 5. End of Semester Survey on Course Materials

How do you rate the Online Course Materials? オンラインコース教材に対する貴方の意見はどうです	Easy	At my level	Challenging	Very difficult
How much time did you spend on course materials each week? このクラスの課題 (教材ビデオの閲覧やライティング、リスニングなど含む) の学修時間は、平均して週にどのくらいでしたか。	1.0%	23.0%	65.4%	10.6%
	30-60 min	60-90 min	90-120 min	120-180 min
	17.3%	26.9%	39.4%	16.4%
	I don't think so at all 全くそう思わない	I don't think so そう思わない	I think so そう思う	I strongly think so 強くそう思う
Was the difficulty level of writing appropriate for you? このクラスで出されたライティング課題の難易度は、ご自身にとって適切だったと思いますか。	3.9%	24.0%	61.5%	10.6%
Was the amount of writing tasks appropriate for you? このクラスで出されたライティングタスク課題の量は適切だったと思いますか。	2.8%	28.9%	59.6%	8.7%
Was Eduflow easy to use? Eduflow は使いやすくなりましたか。	2.8%	13.5%	57.7%	26.0%
By checking other student's writing, I could notice mistakes in my own writing. 他の学生のライティングをチェックすることで、私のライティングの間違いに気づいたことがある。	0	6.7%	52.0%	41.3%
	I could not understand	I had difficulty understanding	I could understand	I could clearly
Could you understand all of the check points for Essay Draft 1. Essay Draft 1 の全てのチェックポイントは理解できましたか。	1.9%	12.5%	47.1%	38.5%
Did you make any changes to your essay as a result of reading the peer checking? Peer Checking を読んで、貴方のエッセイを修正しましたことがありますか。			No 5%	Yes 95%
Your partner recommended an article for your essay. Did you add any points from that article to your essay? 貴方のパートナーが貴方のエッセイの為、アートを推薦しました。そのアートをから貴方のエッセイに追加されたポイントがありますか。			No 51%	Yes 49%

Discussion

How well do novice students understand abstract concepts of academic writing?

Most students gained a working understanding of research supported writing. When reviewing and reading other student's essays, students were able to correctly identify the type of evidence used (Reason, Example, Fact, Statistic, Expert Opinion, None). Also 62 out of 88 students were able to find and recommend additional articles when reviewing their partner's essays. However, many students struggled with the process of source integration and citation. In addition, students found the 'metalanguage' difficult. In many cases the language of instruction was new, and students had to grapple not only with new vocabulary but also with a lack of understanding and experience of their implicit and explicit meanings in L1. This can be seen in areas where students performed weakly on the checklist, such as writing thesis statements, topic sentences, evidence sentences with citation, and summative writing. Also, the fact that at the end of the course only 50% of the students could correctly order the stages of process writing also shows a weak declarative knowledge of process writing. Teng (2019) makes the distinction between metacognitive knowledge that measures whether learners understand the essential elements, characteristics, and strategies for high-quality compositions, and metacognitive regulation that measures whether learners have identified various self-regulation strategies for managing the multiple facets of composition. It may be that though students will remember what to do and how to do it, they may not necessarily recall the conceptual language used to explain or define that process.

How well do novice students apply abstract concepts of academic writing?

Based on the grading bands as shown in Table 3, 75% of students were able to write an academic essay (grade A 80% and above), with a further 24% writing an essay of 5 paragraphs with some key components of academic writing missing (grade 70-79%). It can be concluded that though many students have gained the procedural knowledge of writing an academic essay further training and practice is needed. The new and key skill of incorporating evidence from outside sources proved to be the most challenging, accounting for 50% of flagged errors. More work is clearly needed on this process with a further focus on form and accuracy with in-text citation. Also, it should be noted that many students also struggled with the more concrete 'rules' of academic writing. For example, many students made mistakes with writing a reference list

using two simple models [Author reference & No Author reference], and many of these minor errors went unchecked when reviewing.

How effective is Online Peer-Editing using checklists in improving academic writing skills?

When writing their essays many students could access the checklists and use them to guide their writing. However, this aspect is difficult to measure in this current study. In the editing tasks, the fact that 56.3% of errors went unflagged by both peer-check and self-check, is indicative of a very demanding task difficulty and complexity. It can also be attested that if a peer has checked 'yes' the impetus to search carefully for a 'no' on that item in the self-check is coincidentally lessened. In addition, out of the 327 flagged errors only 10% were subsequently corrected. It can never be assumed that merely pointing out the mistake will lead to its correction. Even though key areas of error were reviewed in class in weeks 13 and 14 many students failed to make revisions. This is why subsequent annotation and formative feedback from the teacher is needed for some students to write a 3rd draft and complete the assignment successfully. It is possible that training in peer-feedback and collaborative correction will help to move students further along this editing process. Kamimura (2006) explains that numerous studies on the social nature of peer reviews suggest that guided training is a key to realizing collaborative peer interactions. Macalister & Nation (2019) also write on the social nature of peer-review, explaining that it is important for all participants to feel the evaluation is worthwhile and not a potential loss of face. A more structured approach to collaborative feedback and goal setting is one area of possible future research.

Limitations

With regards to active involvement in the peer review and draft revision process of this course, the student grade bands in Table 3 show some correlation with a study by De Guerrero & Villamil (1994) that focus on patterns of interaction in peer review. They categorized participants into 3 types: 1) Self-regulated: capable of solving problems independently, having self-confidence in terms of content, language use, tasks, and procedures. 2) Other-regulated: willing to solve their problems with the guidance of others, do not seem to have a complete grasp of task goals, unable to undertake revision on their own initiative, but could let themselves be guided. 3) Object-regulated: controlled by their drafts and cannot see ways to improve them or respond to revision prompts. Satisfied with their rudimentary first drafts, and fail to understand the purpose of the revision process.

Another limitation was class size and range of student abilities and motivation. A huge concern of any teacher when faced with a large class size of mixed abilities is how to make the materials challenging enough so that students with more experience or ability can improve, whilst at the same time ensuring that the course is accessible to all, and enough help is given to avoid situations of learned helplessness. A mitigating factor in this reflective process, is time on task, novice writers clearly need to spend more time to complete an activity. Students may also feel that they have finished their essay, and minor errors such as correcting the reference list represent one more thing to do, which they then determine either to be necessary and merit more of their time 'on task', or unnecessary. It may be that intrinsic motivation of writing their essay does not carry over to the editing process, nor is the extrinsic motivation of a perceived improved grade enough to prompt further action.

Conclusion

For many novice writers, when they finish their essay there is a sense of relief, accomplishment, and attachment to what they have written. The subsequent summative evaluation of an expert (usually the teacher) is an acknowledgment of their achievement. In contrast an expert writer with knowledge of the writing process understands that a formative evaluation by a peer-editor, teacher, or editor, then follows, resulting in further revision to their writing. The use of peer-review using checklists as part of the editing process has a role to play in developing the social nature of process writing. It is clear from this study, that for novice writers, peer-review/editing tasks need to be shorter and easier. In addition, task scaffolding and training needs to be given for the peer feedback so that the social aspect is more comfortable for all learner types. Finally, goal setting and a follow-up revising activities are needed to make revision an easier task.

References

- Cho, K., & Schunn, C. D. (2007). Scaffolded writing and rewriting in the discipline: A web-based reciprocal peer review system. *Computers & Education*, 48(3), 409–426. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2005.02.004>
- De Guerrero, M. C. M., & Villamil, O. S. (1994). Social-Cognitive Dimensions of Interaction in L2 Peer Revision. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 484–496. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02065.x>
- Garofalo, R. (2013). How the Implementation of Peer-editing Checklists Impacts the Peer Revision Process in EFL Writing Classes. *立命館言語文化研究*, 24(2), 143–160. doi:10.34382/00002732
- Gillam, A. (1990). Research in the Classroom: Learning through Response. *The English Journal*, 79(1), 98. <https://doi.org/10.2307/818918>

- Grabe, W., & Zhang, C. (2013). Reading and Writing Together: A Critical Component of English for Academic Purposes Teaching and Learning. *TESOL Journal*, 4(1), 9–24. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.65>
- Graham, S. (2006). Writing. In P. A. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 457–478). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Hauptman, S., Rosenfeld, M., & Tamir, R. (2003). Assessing Academic Discourse: Levels of Competence in Handling Knowledge from Sources. *Journal of Writing Assessment*, 1(2). Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/20w3m5d9>
- Horstmanshof, L., & Brownie, S. (2013). A scaffolded approach to Discussion Board use for formative assessment of academic writing skills. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(1), 61–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.604121>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2015). *Teaching and Researching Writing* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Kamimura, T. (2006). Effects of Peer Feedback on EFL Student Writers at Different Levels of English Proficiency: A Japanese Context. *TESL Canada Journal*, 23(2), 12–39. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v23i2.53>
- Keh, C. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: a model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294–304. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/44.4.294>
- Kift, S. M., & Moody, K. E. (2009). Harnessing assessment and feedback in the first year to support learning success, engagement and retention. *ATN Assessment Conference 2009 Proceedings*, RMIT University, Melbourne.
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response, In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second Language Writing*, (pp. 57–68). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, J., & Sadler, R. W. (2003). The effect and affect of peer review in electronic versus traditional modes on L2 writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2(3), 193–227. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1475-1585\(03\)00025-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1475-1585(03)00025-0)
- Macalister, J., & Nation, I.S.P. (2019). *Language Curriculum Design* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429203763>
- Mendonça, C. O., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer Review Negotiations: Revision Activities in ESL Writing Instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 745. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587558>
- Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265–289. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743\(99\)80117-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743(99)80117-9)
- Rada, R., Michailidis, A., & Wang, W. (1994). Collaborative hypermedia in a classroom setting. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia Archive*, 3(1), 21–36. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ485234>
- Rouhi, A., & Azizian, E. (2013). Peer review: Is Giving Corrective Feedback Better than Receiving it in L2 Writing? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 1349–1354. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.042>
- Saito, H., & Fujita, T. (2004). Characteristics and user acceptance of peer rating in EFL writing classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 31–54. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168804lr133oa>
- Sengupta, S. (1998). Peer evaluation: “I am not the teacher.” *ELT Journal*, 52(1), 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/52.1.19>
- Teng, F. (2019). The role of metacognitive knowledge and regulation in mediating university EFL learners’ writing performance. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(5), 436–450. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2019.1615493>
- Wakabayashi, R. (2013). The Effects of the Peer Feedback Process on Reviewers’ Own Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 6(9). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n9p177>
- Wang, H. C. (2009, August 31). Weblog-mediated peer editing and some pedagogical recommendations: A case study. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 5(2), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v5n2.78>

- Warschauer, M., Turbee, L., & Roberts, B. (1996b). Computer learning networks and student empowerment. *System*, 24(1), 1–14. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x\(95\)00049-p](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251x(95)00049-p)
- Wray et.al. (2012). *Academic Writing Skills 1*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yasuda, S. (2014). Issues in teaching and learning EFL writing in East Asian contexts: The case of Japan. *Asian EFL Journal*, 16(4), 150–187.
- Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 209–222. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743\(95\)90010-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(95)90010-1)

Appendix A: Practice Paragraph 1 & 2 Checklist

1. OUTLINE: The Topic Sentence gives the topic and writer's main idea. トピック文章から作者のアイデアとトピックが分かります
2. OUTLINE: The Outline has a 3 supporting points. アウトラインは三つのサポーターティングポイントを持っています。
3. PARAGRAPH: The paragraph is correctly formatted. 正しい形式の段落で。Correct Punctuation and Capitalization are used. 句読点と大文字を正しく修正する。
4. PARAGRAPH: The paragraph is 5 or more sentences. パラグラフは五つ以上の文章です。
5. PARAGRAPH: The Topic Sentence from the OUTLINE is the first sentence of the paragraph. アウトラインのトピック文章はパラグラフの一番最初の文章です。*Added this to practice paragraph 2 because some students were not putting the topic sentence from the outline in their paragraph.
6. PARAGRAPH: The supporting points give reasons, examples, and explanations. サポーターティングポイントは理由、例示、説明を与えます。[Does not have to be all 全部する必要はありません].
7. PARAGRAPH: Some Transitional Phrases are Used. 段落の最初の接続の言葉
Firstly, First of all, Secondly, Finally, Lastly / Because, One reason, For this reason, Since / For example, For instance, According to, In fact / Therefore, As a result, So, Due to, This shows / In short, In conclusion, To sum up
8. WRITING: Sentences do not start with And, But, So. 文章は And, But, So で始まりません。 Sentences are connected using: and, but, so. 文章は and, but, so を使って連結する。
9. WRITING: The writing style is not Personal it is Academic & Formal: ライティング スタイルですが、私的な内容ではなくアカデミックで形式（フォーマル）のあるものです。The writer does not use first person 'I....' 'I think...' 'In my opinion....' 'We....' 'We Japanese...' 'We should....' ということで文章には「私は、私は～～考えます、私の意見は、私たちは、我々日本人は」のようなファーストパーソンを使いません。The writer does not use second person 'You....' 'You should....' 「貴方、貴方は～するべき」などのセカンドパーソンも使いません。
10. WRITING: Grammar mistakes are few and do not affect meaning. 文法の間違ひは少なくて意味を変えていません。 Sentences are not made with translation software. 文章は翻訳ソフトウェアを使いません。
11. FEEDBACK: Mention one thing your partner did well. パートナーがよく出来たことを一つ書きます。 Mention something that your classmate could add or improve クラスメートが追加、改善できる何かのメンション
Ask a question about the topic of your partners writing. パートナのライティングトピックに関する質問。

Appendix B: Outline and Introduction Checklist

FIRST CHECK THE OUTLINE

1. The THESIS STATEMENT HAS: Essay Topic, Writer's Position, 3 Main Points エッセイ トピック、作者のポジション、三つ主要ポイント The

2. Paragraph 1 has a Topic Sentence with the Essay Topic and the Main Idea of the Paragraph

段落 # 1 のトピック文章から作者のアイデアとトピックが分かります。

3 Paragraph 2 has a Topic Sentence with the Essay Topic and the Main Idea of the Paragraph

段落 # 2 のトピック文章から作者のアイデアとトピックが分かります。

4. Paragraph 3 has a Topic Sentence with the Essay Topic and the Main Idea of the Paragraph

段落 # 3 のトピック文章から作者のアイデアとトピックが分かります。

5. There are 2+ supporting points for each Topic Sentence 格 Topic Sentence は 2+以上のサポーティングポイントがあります。The supporting points give reasons, examples, and explanations. サポーティングポイントは理由、例示、説明を与えます。

6. There is evidence of research: Facts are used from research articles / the internet

リサーチの証拠がある：ファクトはリサーチ記事・インターネットから引用されている。

Please check THE INTRODUCTION

7. The introduction has an interesting hook. 導入は興味フックを持つ。

8. 3+ background sentences introduce & explain the topic 三つ以上のバックグラウンド文章はトピックを紹介し、説明します。

9. The Thesis Statement is the last sentence of the introduction. 論文のステートメントは序論の最終の文章です。

PLEASE CHECK THE LANGUAGE & STRUCTURE

10. The writing style is not Personal it is Academic & Formal: ライティングスタイルですが、私的な内容ではなくアカデミックで形式（フォーマル）のあるものです。The writer does not use first person 'I.....' 'I think...' 'In my opinion....' 'We.....' 'We Japanese...' 'We should....' ということて文章には「私は、私は～～考えます、私の意見は、私たちは、我々日本人は」のようなファーストパーソンを使いません。The writer does not use second person 'You....' 'You should....' 「貴方、貴方は～するべき」などのセカンドパーソンも使いません。

11. The introduction is a correctly formatted paragraph. 導入は正しい形式の段落です。Correct Punctuation and Capitalization are used. 句読点と大文字を正しく修正する。

12. Grammar mistakes are few and do not affect meaning. 文法の間違ひは少なく意味を変えていません。Sentences are not made with translation software. 文章は翻訳ソフトウェアを使いません。

13. Mention one thing your partner did well.

14. Mention something that your classmate could add or improve クラスメートが追加、改善できる何かのメンション

Appendix C: First & Second Draft Checklist

Please check THE INTRODUCTION

1. The introduction has an interesting hook. 導入は興味フックを持つ。

[SCALE: Does not grab reader's attention 読者の好奇心が掴まれてない, Quite Standard スタンダード, Interesting, 面白い, Very Interesting とても良い]

2. 3+ background sentences introduce & explain the topic 三つ以上のバックグラウンド文章はトピックを紹介し、説明します。

3. The THESIS STATEMENT HAS: Essay Topic, Writer's Position, 3 Main Points エッセイトピック、作者のポジション、三つ主なポイント. The Thesis Statement is the last sentence of the introduction. 論文のステートメントは序論の最終の文章です。

Please check THE THREE BODY PARAGRAPHS

4. Each Paragraph 1-3 has a Topic Sentence with the Essay Topic and the Main Idea of the Paragraph 各段落 1-3 のトピック文章から作者のアイデアとトピックが分かります。
5. Transition Words are Often Used: よく使われる単語を翻訳 Topic Sentence: Firstly, First of all, Secondly, Finally, Lastly, Reasons: Because, One reason, For this reason, Since Examples: For example, For instance, According to, In fact Explaining: Therefore, As a result, So, Due to, This shows Concluding: In short, In conclusion, To sum up, To summarize
6. What type of supporting evidence is used in the first body paragraph? [Not the introduction] 最初のパラグラフで使われた証拠補助のタイプは？ Choices: REASON 理由, EXAMPLE 例えば, FACT 事, STATISTIC 統, EXPERT OPINION 専門家の意見, NONE なし
7. What type of supporting evidence is used in the second body paragraph? 二番目のパラグラフで使われた証拠補助のタイプは？ [Same Choices as 6]
8. What type of supporting evidence is used in the third body paragraph? 三番目のパラグラフで使われた証拠補助のタイプは？ [Same Choices as 6]

Please check CITATION

9. Citation is used with all information taken from articles. アーティクルの情報は引用されました。
10. Pattern 1 Citation is used correctly: INFORMATION + (FAMILY NAME). Pattern 2 Citation is used correctly: FAMILY NAME + REPORTING VERB....
11. Pattern 1 & 2 are used at least once. Each paragraph has at least one citation. パタン 1 と 2 は 1 回以上は使われました。各パラグラフは 1 回以上の引用を持っています。
12. Search the internet and find some supporting point that can be used in the essay. ネット検索をしてエッセイで使われるサポーティング・ポイントを探します。Chose a paragraph that has little or no supporting points from an article. アーティクルからサポーティング・ポイントが少しもしくは全く使われてないパラグラフを選択します。Paste the URL here. URL をここにペースト（複製）してください。
13. What type of supporting evidence are you recommending? Why?どのタイプのサポーティング証拠を推薦しますか。なぜですか。 Choices: REASON 理由, EXAMPLE 例えば, FACT 事実, STATISTIC 統計, EXPERT OPINION 専門家の意見
14. Explain how it can be used in the essay. エッセイでどう使われたか説明してください。For Example: Hi, I like your essay. I found one article you might be interested in. It can be used in Paragraph 1/2/3. The point you can use is:

Please Check THE LANGUAGE & STRUCTURE

15. The writing style is not Personal it is Academic & Formal: ライティング スタイルですが、私的な内容ではなくアカデミックで形式（フォーマル）のあるものです。The writer does not use first person 'I.....' 'I think...' 'In my opinion....' 'We.....' 'We Japanese...' 'We should....' ということで文章には「私は、私は～～考えます、私の意見は、私たちは、我々日本人は」のようなファーストパーソンを使いません。The writer does not use second person 'You....' 'You should....' 「貴方、貴方は～すべき」などのセカンドパーソンも使いません。
16. There are correctly formatted paragraphs. 正しい形式の段落で。Correct Punctuation and Capitalization are used. 句読点と大文字を正しく修正する。
17. Grammar mistakes are few and do not affect meaning. 文法の間違いは少なくて意味を変えていません。Sentences are not made with translation software. 文章は翻訳ソフトウェアをしません。

Please check THE CONCLUSION

18. The essay Thesis is restated in different words. エッセイ論文は別のワードで書き換えられます。
19. The main points and reasons are summed up 主なポイントと理由はまとめられています。
20. The writer finishes with some final thoughts: 作者は最終的な考えを以て終えます。

An OPINION or JUDGEMENT 意見 見解 A SOLUTION or RECOMMENDATION 解決 提案
A PREDICTION or SPECULATION 憶測 予測 [does not have to be all].

Please check THE REFERENCE LIST

21. There is a Reference List with at least 3 references, at the end of the essay. See page 87-89 of your text book. エッセイの最後には少なくとも3つの参考リストがあります。

22. The articles in the Reference List are organized alphabetically. 参考リストのアーティクルはアルファベット順になっています。Each citation has the correct order of information. 各引用は情報の正しい順番を持ちます。Correct order: Family name, First name, Year, Title, WEB + date you used internet, URL
Correct order: No Name: Title, Year, WEB + date you used internet, URL

Please give FEEDBACK

23. Mention something that your classmate could add or improve クラスメートが追加、改善できる何かのメンション Especially if you checked No to a point explain how to correct it. 特にどう修正するか説明するポイントがないとか。For Question number XX you need to....質問番号 XX 貴方は~~すべき