

This article was downloaded by: [University of Warwick]

On: 28 December 2011, At: 01:53

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Teaching in Higher Education

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cthe20>

Using peer feedback in a Master's programme: a multiple case study

Oxana Poverjuc^a, Val Brooks^a & David Wray^a

^a Institute of Education, University of Warwick, Kirby Corner Road, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK

Available online: 19 Dec 2011

To cite this article: Oxana Poverjuc, Val Brooks & David Wray (2011): Using peer feedback in a Master's programme: a multiple case study, *Teaching in Higher Education*, DOI:10.1080/13562517.2011.641008

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2011.641008>



PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Using peer feedback in a Master's programme: a multiple case study

Oxana Poverjuc*, Val Brooks and David Wray

Institute of Education, University of Warwick, Kirby Corner Road, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK

(Received 28 March 2011; final version received 16 October 2011)

This article draws on the findings of a longitudinal case study, which investigated the writing experiences of five students who spoke English as an additional language (EAL). The major interest was in examining what it was like to be an EAL writer and what changes occurred in EAL students' perceptions of academic writing and of themselves as academic writers during their one-year Taught Masters course at a major UK University. This article reflects on the perceptions of peer feedback held by research participants and their engagement with providing and receiving peer comments. Although peer feedback is often viewed as an attractive tool for supporting student writing, most participants did not fully capitalise on the benefits of these practices. Such factors as students' lack of prior peer feedback and their perceptions of peers' ability to provide valid feedback constituted potential barriers to the success of peer feedback. The article suggests that the use of well-structured collaborative activities and tutors' intervention are required for peer feedback to be effective.

Keywords: peer feedback; peer interactions; academic writing; EAL students; informal peer support mechanisms; situated learning theory

Introduction

Literature has highlighted that peer feedback is increasingly being viewed as an attractive tool in the teaching of writing (Cartney 2010; Nicol 2010; Van den Berg et al. 2006; Zhu 2001), becoming a common feature in L1 and L2 settings (Liu and Hansen 2002). Peer feedback is often defined as a formative developmental process that gives writers the opportunity to discuss and discover other interpretations of their texts (Hyland and Hyland 2006). In view of the growing support for using peer feedback in the teaching of writing, this article examines the experiences of five students with English as an additional language (EAL) of providing and receiving peer comments while completing their writing assignments as part of their one-year Taught Masters course.

This article starts with a review of theoretical and empirical studies that have investigated the perceptions of peer feedback held by students for whom English was not their native language and the effects of their experiences with peer feedback on their revision and learning. This paper proceeds with a brief discussion of the methods and the data analysis instruments used to obtain and analyse the research data. The article then provides an account of participants' experiences of peer feedback, highlighting the changes they have undergone during their degree course.

*Corresponding author. Email: oxanapoverjuc@yahoo.com

Finally, the paper interprets the findings and advances some approaches to enhancing the effects of peer feedback on student writing.

Theoretical framework: EAL students' perceptions of peer feedback

Researching into peer feedback can be difficult because of the divergent opinions on its effectiveness in teaching of academic writing. The proponents of peer feedback ground their enthusiasm in a rich theoretical framework that emphasises the social nature of language, knowledge-making, collaborative learning theory and writing theory (Bruffee 1984; Flower and Hayes 1980; Vygotsky 1978). It is argued that such feedback create valuable opportunities for learners to negotiate meanings, learn together the conventions specific to their discipline, extend their critical thinking and reasoning skills as they take control of their own learning through interactions with peers (Bruffee 1984; Heywood 2000; Liu and Hansen 2002).

Of great importance to this theoretical framework is the view that learning, as well as knowledge itself, is socially constructed, discovered and transformed among learners rather than between a person and artefacts (Vygotsky 1978). In peer interactions, learners normally assume the roles and responsibilities usually performed by a tutor to comment on and critique each other's drafts in both written and oral forms (Liu and Hansen 2002). Accordingly, peer feedback can enable students to discover the writing conventions appropriate to their discipline and to develop audience awareness, which in turn can lead to the improvement of their writing through negotiating new meanings and effective means of communicating these (Tsui and Ng 2000; Zamel 1998). Such practices can also be an important tool for empowering students to take advantage of assessment processes. Producing feedback is a cognitively demanding exercise that is likely to heighten student engagement with, analysis of and reflection on feedback processes (Nicol 2010). Besides, peer feedback is often considered a viable means of teaching in circumstances when mass Higher Education is experiencing a continuous increase and diversification of the student population and a decrease in individualised tuition (Nicol 2010).

Despite this extensive theoretical support for the use of peer feedback, the accumulated empirical data suggest conflicting outcomes in terms of its effectiveness. A number of studies (Berg 1999; Jacobs et al. 1998; Keh 1990; Mendonça and Johnson 1994; Min 2005; Paulus 1999; Tsui and Ng 2000) have revealed evidence of the positive impact of peer feedback on revision processes in writing and on the development of EAL students' writing skills. For instance, Mendonça and Johnson's (1994) study examined the ways in which the peer comments shaped the revision activities of 12 learners with English as a second language enrolled on a writing course. They found that in over half of the instances of revisions, students incorporated peers' comments; and only in one 10th of the cases, they ignored the suggestions even though they had been discussed during face-to-face interactions. On the other occasions, they made changes that were not mentioned by their peers. Furthermore, writers who revised their essays in the light of their peers' comments developed 'the crucial ability of re-viewing their writing with the eyes of another' which 'allowed them to modify their written texts to meet the needs of their audience' (Mendonça and Johnson 1994, 766).

Nevertheless, some studies (Connor and Asenavage 1994; Leki 1990; Nelson and Carson 1998; Zhang 1995; Zhu 2001) have suggested strong reservations about the effectiveness of the revision comments made by EAL students. It has been indicated that these practices are often compromised by students' lack of trust in peers' abilities to provide efficient feedback. Students believe that their peers often offer unconstructive and unhelpful advice, addressing surface problems and mechanical errors at the expense of more meaningful issues such as the development of ideas, organisation or the overall focus of what they are trying to write (Liu and Hansen 2002). Such comments do not lead to learning improvements. For instance, Connor and Asenavage (1994) revealed that, although their research participants engaged in providing and receiving peer comments, a surprisingly small number of revisions were triggered by peer feedback.

The literature has suggested numerous challenges that may affect peer feedback. Firstly, peer feedback entails some complex dynamics, which are characterised by a series of recursive communicative activities and social behaviours that, if not addressed may result in students' failure and withdrawal from peer interactions. For instance, Peyton and Jones (1994) suggested that some students believe that they are not good critics and have nothing valuable to offer; whilst, teachers are regarded as a unique expert who may offer effective directions for revising and improving their writing. Secondly, it has also been argued that some problems with peer feedback are specific to EAL writers (Zhu 2001). Such factors as students' language proficiency and cultural background may constrain their participation in peer feedback. EAL learners may encounter difficulties when commenting on peers' writing in a language in which they are still developing their communication skills, and when they should respond to the various communication styles of peers who come from different cultures (Hyland 2003). They also have to cope with 'different attitudes toward working in groups and different expectations concerning group norms' (Nelson and Murphy 1992, 173). Nelson and Carson (2006) stated that the function of a peer-response group in China and Japan was to serve the needs of the whole group; whereas in the US it served the needs of individual writers. The authors ascertained that some EAL students viewed the dynamics of peer feedback groups as being antithetical to their values and goals. However, other studies (Hyland 2003; Spack 1997) asserted that it is erroneous to assume that particular groups of students or, indeed, individuals will behave in certain ways in accordance with their cultural differences.

Of great importance to an understanding of this area has been Hyland's (2000) study on peer conferencing that illustrated that the aspects of peer feedback mentioned most positively by respondents were informal peer support mechanisms. Most interactions functioned mainly at the affective level and did not involve providing comments on completed drafts. Instead, students turned to one another for support and advice on understanding task requirements, language and vocabulary problems. Hyland (2000) suggested that encouraging spontaneous peer talk during the writing process was a better strategy than using formally conducted peer feedback sessions, perhaps through the use of guidance sheets. By contrast, formal feedback sessions, where students had to complete peer feedback sheets, appeared to lose their meaning as a communicative event, becoming just another class task where the teacher controlled and assessed peer interactions.

Based on these conflicting findings, this study aims to explore the perceptions of peer feedback held by EAL students, the changes that occurred in their views during one-year Masters programme, as well as the lessons that can be learned from these experiences to improve the effectiveness of peer feedback.

Data collection and analysis

The findings presented in this article is part of a larger research that examined the writing experiences of five EAL students enrolled on one-year Taught Masters programme at a major UK University in academic year 2007/2008. The project adopted a longitudinal case study to answer the research questions. The case study participants were following different Masters courses in an Education department, where the principal means of assessment was written assignments typically of 5000 words and a final dissertation of 20,000 words. The case study participants' demographic and educational information are included in Table 1.

This article draws on selected items from self-completion questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The questionnaires explored the perceptions of peer feedback held by both native speakers of English (NES) and EAL students and were administered in October 2007 and October 2008. In total, one hundred and thirty students completed the questionnaires. Ten questionnaires were excluded as these respondents were reading for a M.Phil./Ph.D. course, while the research sample included only Taught Masters students. One hundred and twenty questionnaires were, therefore, analysed by employing the SPSS software to carry out descriptive and correlational statistical analyses. Importantly, data were analysed according to student status of English language and gender.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with five EAL students throughout the academic year 2007/2008. The case study participants were volunteers selected from the pool of respondents who had completed the questionnaire in October 2007. I carried out between six and nine semi-structured interviews with each participant, each of which lasted from 35 minutes to 1 hour and 27 minutes. A total number of 35 interviews were collected. The frequency of interviews depended largely on how many assignments participants completed and unexpected events that occurred during the course of the year 2007/2008 (e.g. the failure of assignments).

Content analysis was employed to analyse the semi-structured interviews. Categories were developed and applied to the interview texts using NVivo software. To enhance the reliability of codes, inter-reliability checks on coding data and on coding process were run. The inter-coder agreement index was 82%, denoting that the categories were discreet enough to cover all the narratives and express the same meaning (Miles and Huberman 1994).

Findings

The analysis of the research interviews indicated that only two out of the five participants had experienced peer feedback in their previous degree course(s). These results are consistent with the quantitative data from questionnaires that revealed that over one third of the Masters students who completed the questionnaires (36.1%) had never experienced peer feedback. Nearly half of the respondents (47.1%) had rarely received peer comments and only less than one fifth (16.8%) had

Table 1. Background information of the case study participants.

Name	Age range	Sex	Countries of residence	Subject of first degree	Other higher education degrees	Taught Masters course at Institute of Education, Education Department	Passed/failed assignments
Mary	20–29	Female	Eastern Europe ^a	Psychology	Completed 1 year of 2-year Masters Course in Psychology	MA Educational studies	All passed
Oliver	30–39	Male	Nigeria	Animal Sciences	Masters in Educational Studies PGDE	MA Educational studies	All passed
Hannah	20–29	Female	China	Chinese Language and Literature	None	MA Educational studies	One failed
Rita	30–39	Female	China	Law	None	MA Educational studies	One failed
Molly	20–29	Female	Hong Kong	English Language and Literature	None	MA Drama and Theatre Education	All passed

^aTo guarantee participants' anonymity, I have not included Mary's home country as it may disclose her identity.

experienced peer feedback on more than three occasions. The lack or limited participation in previous peer feedback constituted a potential impediment for EAL students to engage with such practices:

I am afraid to receive feedback from others. [A friend] told me ‘send your assignment and I will look over it’ and I don’t know why – I don’t want to do it. [...] I am not used to send my friends my assignments. (Mary)

At the beginning of the academic year, all five participants were negative about peer feedback and exhibited strong reservations about engaging with it. Most students criticised their peers’ tendency to provide comments based mainly on surface issues and mechanical errors.

... sometimes I find it that it [peer feedback] is not in-depth enough. [...] It tends to be shallow. It is like ‘okay, good language skills’, the comment will be supportive, something like that. I really do not find very helpful comparing to the tutors’ comments. (Molly)

These results corroborated the questionnaire findings that showed that over one third of respondents either gave a neutral rating for peer feedback or considered it ineffective.

This quotation also suggests that the case study participants preferred tutors’ feedback to peer feedback, perceiving it as more credible and attractive. This is consistent with the questionnaire findings that indicated that more respondents tend to value tutor feedback than peer feedback (see Table 2). The great majority of respondents reported that tutor feedback was either very useful or useful; whereas just under two thirds thought that peer feedback had positive effects on student writing.

These results are in the line with several empirical studies that have challenged the effectiveness of peer feedback in supporting student writing (Connor and Asenavage 1994; Mangelsdorf 1992; Nelson and Carson 1998; Nelson and Murphy 1992; Zhang 1995). For instance, Zhang’s (1995) research showed that a significant percentage of participants preferred the traditional teacher feedback to non-teacher feedback. Nevertheless, those findings cannot be considered uncritically as the participants were asked to make a choice between teacher and peer feedback.

The Taught Masters courses being studied by these students have set up several formal peer support mechanisms (i.e. oral presentations, group tutorials) where students could share their written work, receive and provide feedback. One module

Table 2. Responses regarding the usefulness of peer and tutor feedback.

	Very useful	Useful	Neither useful nor useless	Not very useful	Not at all useful
Tutor feedback (%)	51.5	29.1	8.7	8.7	2.0
Peer feedback (%)	34.6	26.7	22.8	9.9	6.0

required students to complete peer feedback sheets, prompting them to give comments and suggestions to writers.

After my presentation, there were some questions raised by other group members. [...] some of the questions inspired me and some of them remind me I need to put more efforts in each parts in my written work. (Rita)

Furthermore, two modules provided oral presentations and another offered group tutorials that created venues for discussing writing processes and for receiving feedback from multiple sources (i.e. tutor and peer support). However, most students suggested that feedback was mainly provided by tutors and only occasionally by their peers. This corroborates the findings of previous empirical studies (Connor and Asenavage 1994; Nelson and Carson 1998; Paulus 1999; Tsui and Ng 2000) that revealed that group performance was sometimes low because not all students were involved in interaction and in verbalising their opinions. The groups were usually led by more able members and the less able were marginalised, playing a passive part in group work.

To sum up, EAL students' perceptions of peer feedback were not exactly consistent with theoretical claims (Bruffee 1984; Flower and Hayes 1980; Vygotsky 1978) that advocate its formative, developmental role in student writing. Instead, the case study participants expressed negative perceptions of peer feedback and reluctance about engaging with these practices, considering peers as less competent and tutors as the important source of credible feedback. A closer look at the research interviews conducted later in the year indicated some positive shifts in students' perceptions of peer feedback and in their involvement in such interactions.

Changes in students' perceptions of peer feedback

The analysis of the interviews over the course of the academic year suggested a qualitative change in all five students' perceptions of peer feedback. While initially all participants were negative about peers' ability to offer useful feedback, during the year they started to seek each others' opinions and support. Findings indicated that most peer feedback was received during informal peer support interactions, when participants turned to peers to share their writing experiences, to exchange opinions on each other's topics and to ask for clarification about task requirements and subject knowledge.

I always discuss about my topic with my friends: do you think my topic is okay or [could] you give me some advice. When we discuss maybe there are new ideas come out. (Hannah)

Interviews showed that these informal peer interactions played a fairly important role in helping students make sense of writing conventions and of tutors' oral and written feedback. For instance, after the submission of her third assignment Mary happened to discuss the assignment task with a colleague.

... one of my friends told me – when you have to write something critical you have to compare with what you have to write with what is in England or UK, or other parts of the country. But I have not done it.

This chance allowed Mary to learn an important strategy for presenting her materials critically, suggesting the potential of peer feedback to support her writing. Furthermore, Mary turned to her colleague, who she believed to be more proficient in English, to proofread some parts of her written assignments. At the end of the year, she acknowledged that her colleague's assistance in proofreading was important to improving the quality of her writing.

Hannah admitted that most support provided during her writing processes had come from her peers. She did not only turn to her classmates for support but she also approached her peers studying at other departments from the same University and her colleagues who were teachers in her home country. She reported that her peers had helped her to proofread, search for materials and revise the written work and to take decisions about the working topic, the feasibility of her project and about the data collection instruments.

I always ask my friend to have a look at dissertation- is it logically? Or do you think the question is necessary? But which one is useless? I always ask them and talk with my friends in China, they are teachers. [...] When I finish one part I will ask them 'could you have a check? Check it just for the language, sentence, or just something strange you feel'.

Clearly, she was more confident interacting with peers rather than with tutors.

They [tutors] are always very busy and I don't want to disturb them. [...] I can ask other students to help me, just to give me some advice.

Findings suggested that Hannah's reliance on peer feedback was due to her strongly-held beliefs on the authority of tutors whom she could not approach easily. However, Hannah noted that she mainly interacted with peers from the same cultural background, because, in her experience, NES and EAL students hardly communicated.

You know the X [name of] module, there are lots of local people. [...] they don't want to talk to you: maybe ... they don't want to talk with you ... just we don't have same topic. And when we discuss something, we couldn't understand what they said. [...] Yes, it is part of my fault because my English is not very good, so if I talk to others, it is difficult for others to understand us clearly.

This account revealed her difficulties in interacting with NES students, both because of her lack of linguistic fluency and the NES students' reservations about mingling with students from other cultural backgrounds.

Despite having negative perceptions at the beginning of the course, Rita asked a colleague to proofread an assignment. Throughout the year, she reported to have started to value sharing her writing experience with other students in terms of understanding how they improved as academic writers and what techniques they employed to produce a successful assignment, what did not work for them. At the end of the year, Rita conceded that her peers had contributed to some extent to her writing development.

If you discuss your writing with other classmates and maybe they can introduce their own ideas. [...] So I think I got some motivation and inspiration from peers' ideas and peers' writing style. And if you are isolated and being a lonely writer you couldn't improve your work.

This excerpt suggests that interactions with more experienced members of the discourse community had a motivational power. Similarly to Hannah, Rita perceived that there was no collaborative interaction among NES and EAL colleagues.

It is not very cooperative, it is not very... I mean we didn't keep contact with each other. So it is not like a group work; it is very, very personal, individual. So I didn't get some help or cooperation or collaboration.

These accounts show that some students also viewed interactions with peers as a means of developing a sense of belonging to the community.

Oliver did not tend to seek peer feedback, believing that tutors' help and his ample disciplinary knowledge were enough to guarantee high grades.

I have ample knowledge about the topic before. [...] At times there are some work you are confident about it, what is the point [of seeking peer feedback].

Later in the year, when tutor feedback sheets for assignment four and five suggested that one of his weaknesses was making grammatical and typographical errors that cost him points, he asked colleagues to proofread his dissertation. In addition, he sought other perspectives on the topic of his dissertation.

Interaction with the colleagues at times helped. Because you talk about the project and say what you are writing, then they can give a general idea of what they are doing as well.

The most impressive changes in the perceptions of peer feedback occurred to Molly. She was the only student who experienced ongoing peer feedback. This was due to the nature of her Masters course that encouraged collaborative work among students. For instance, students were expected to devise together teaching schemes to be taught in schools. Based on similar interests, Molly teamed up with two NES students to work on a teaching project, which was a valuable opportunity to interact with other colleagues, work collaboratively and receive feedback on practical and writing activities. Having engaged in regular interactions with her peers, Molly acquired important writing conventions valued in her discipline and which she managed to transfer successfully to her final assignments.

The other thing we try to help each other to find our position as I said, cause you have to find how specific you are. [...] it was my friend who told me that I don't have to write every game that you play with the children, just have an overall discussion: what is the main focus of the lesson and how do we link the whole ten or fifteen together. [...] So I learnt to be specific.

Over the course of the academic degree, Molly came to regard peer feedback as a formative developmental process that gave opportunities to discuss each other's texts and discover writing conventions. By the end of the course, Molly acknowledged that

she relied on peers' feedback more often than on tutors' feedback and regarded these interactions as enriching learning experiences.

We have an active group, hardworking people and everyone is genuinely interested in what we are doing. So we got practitioners, we got theatre people, we got teachers, we got clown, yes—we got a classmate who is a clown and we got like normal English teachers, we got researchers. [...] we even got drama therapist—so it is a very, very good diversity. . . . and we have some previous students. I rely on them.

This excerpt also suggests that students on this course were a diverse group in the terms of their educational, professional and cultural backgrounds, which served as a valuable resource for student learning. Most importantly, Molly appeared to engage actively with the course activities and to move to a growing participation in Master's course.

Discussion

This research showed that the participants underwent noticeable changes in their views of peer feedback throughout the academic year. If at the beginning of the year they all held negative perceptions of the effectiveness of peer feedback and displayed resistance to participate in peer interactions; then later in the year, they began more often to seek their colleagues' opinions. Students turned to their peers and friends for affective support and help with clarifying task requirements, editing and proof-reading written work, searching for reading materials, designing and conducting micro-studies. It has been suggested that the informal peer support mechanisms were viewed as an increasingly valuable provision among research participants. These findings are consistent with several empirical studies (Bloxham and West 2007; Hyland 2000) that suggest how much students value spontaneous peer conversations while they are writing their assignments. Although participants gradually changed their perceptions of the effectiveness of peer feedback, there were clearly instances, particularly at the beginning and in the middle of the year, in which they had failed to avail themselves of the benefits of these interactions. Such factors as students' lack of prior peer feedback, their perceptions of peers' ability to provide valid feedback as well as limited formal peer support mechanisms did not always encourage students to proactively engage with peer interactions.

The case of Molly illustrates ways in which student participation in peer feedback can be enhanced. Findings suggested that Molly's Masters course provided support to maintain peer interactions that seemed to work well. More specifically, a distinctive feature of the programme was the use of collaborative work that entailed students performing and working together on devising and teaching schemes of work in schools. Importantly, only the report produced at the end of teaching was assessed. The collaborative activities encouraged students to create a supportive environment that was characterised by a dynamic and constant communication between EAL and NES students. Moreover, Molly reported receiving ongoing support from tutors and teacher-assistants who had intervened in the teaching schemes to advise on her teaching, performing and writing decisions. In addition, the course entailed group work and student-led workshops. These events, coupled with informal peer interactions, impacted considerably on Molly's trust in and views about the

effectiveness of the peer feedback she was offered. She clearly viewed her peers as important in helping her to construct and gain access to academic knowledge. Her perceptions that interactions with peers had facilitated her growing participation in her academic community and had enhanced her sense of belonging to this are supported by situated learning theory (Lave and Wenger 1991) and Vygotsky's (1978) concept of Zone of Proximal Development. These theoretical tenets argue that an individual can learn to extend his/her current competence through the guidance of more capable peers. Accordingly, some students seem to be better equipped and positioned to make sense of the implicit and explicit knowledge embedded in the course than are others. Therefore, peer interactions may facilitate students' understanding of the writing conventions and requirements they found it difficult to make sense of. Overall, Masters students can constitute a culturally, socially and educationally diverse pool of resources that, if harnessed adequately, could engender enriching learning experiences amongst students.

As discussed earlier, peer feedback may lead to many potential benefits, which is widely advocated as an enriching support possibility (Nicol 2010) for students who learn to write in a new educational context. Nevertheless, this study suggests that these practices should not be regarded as a substitute for formative *tutor* interventions in student writing. Most importantly, this article highlights the need for a careful planning and monitoring of peer feedback by academics, which is particularly important in the current environment when many students entering Higher Education have never experienced peer feedback and indeed display strong reservations about the usefulness of this process. It is widely accepted that peer feedback can be beneficial for EAL writers provided that they are trained in offering peer feedback and structuring peer feedback sessions (Berg 1999; Jacobs et al. 1998; Min 2005; Stanley 1992). These studies have revealed that trained participants, regardless of their proficiency levels, demonstrated a greater level of student engagement in the task of evaluation, more productive communication about writing and greater writing improvement in revised drafts. Furthermore, Northedge (2003) argues that tutors need to monitor group discussions, as they can easily be pitched too low, meaning students continue to use an everyday discourse and make no progress towards the values and conventions specific to their discipline. Alternatively, these interactions can be pitched too high, so that few students can genuinely participate in them. The interviews carried out in the current study suggested that there were many occasions on which tutors and teacher-assistants intervened in the collaborative schemes in which Molly engaged to advise on her teaching, performing and writing decisions. Accordingly, the provision of participatory venues in which students learn to trust peers' knowledge and skills can potentially lead to positive changes in their perceptions of peer feedback and their engagement in both formal and informal peer support mechanisms. As Peyton and Jones' study (1994, 480) stated: 'effective responding takes time, patience, and a lot of modeling and practice'.

Conclusions

To sum up, it is widely acknowledged that peer feedback may constitute a vital tool for supporting student writing. While the theoretical framework has advanced strong support for the use of peer feedback, this study has indicated that peer interactions were shyly used in the given context. The degree course entailed quite few and

unstructured formal peer support mechanisms, which did not always encourage EAL students to engage proactively with seeking and providing peer feedback. Furthermore, this research, as other studies, has suggested that many students entering Higher Education hold negative perceptions of peer feedback and have reservations about engaging with these practices. Hence, there is a call for more action plans to integrate peer feedback into teaching of academic writing at Higher Education level.

As this article has suggested, several approaches were found particularly useful to enhance the effectiveness of peer feedback. For instance, a participant gained trust and regarded her peers as valuable assets to her learning experiences while she engaged in well-structured collaborative and group work. Tutors' interventions at different stages of these collaborative schemes fostered a supportive and encouraging ethos of collaboration and trust amongst NES and EAL students. Such experiences can further prompt students to create informal support networks that were viewed, in this study, as an increasingly valuable provision.

This study suggests the need for further research into means of establishing effective intervention mechanisms to empower students to make the most of peer feedback. It is also crucial that these mechanisms are feasible in the current situation when there is ongoing diversification of the student population and a steady decrease in human and financial resources.

References

- Berg, E.C. 1999. The effects of trained peer response ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8, no. 3: 215–41.
- Bloxham, S., and A. West. 2007. Learning to write in higher education: Students' perceptions of an intervention in developing understanding of assessment criteria. *Teaching in Higher Education* 12, no. 1: 77–89.
- Bruffee, A. 1984. Collaborative learning and the "conversation of mankind". *College English* 46, no. 7: 635–52.
- Cartney, P. 2010. Exploring the use of peer assessment as a vehicle for closing the gap between feedback given and feedback used. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 35, no. 5: 551–64.
- Connor, U., and K. Asenavage. 1994. Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How Much Impact on Revision? *Journal of Second Language Writing* 3, no. 3: 257–76.
- Flower, L.S., and J.R. Hayes. 1980. The dynamics of composing: Making plans and juggling constraints. In *Cognitive processes in writing*, ed. L.W. Gregg and E.R. Steinberg, 31–50. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Heywood, J. 2000. *Assessment in higher education*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Hyland, F. 2000. ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research* 4, no. 1: 33–54.
- Hyland, K. 2003. *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K., and F. Hyland. 2006. *Feedback in second language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, G.M., A. Curtis, G. Braine, and S. Huang. 1998. Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7, no. 3: 307–17.
- Keh, C.L. 1990. Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal* 44, no. 4: 294–304.
- Lave, J., and E. Wenger. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leki, I. 1990. Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. In *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*, ed. B. Kroll, 57–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Liu, J., and J.G. Hansen. 2002. *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Mangelsdorf, K. 1992. Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think? *ELT Journal* 46, no. 3: 274–84.
- Mendonça, C.O., and K.E. Johnson. 1994. Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly* 28, no. 4: 745–69.
- Miles, M.B., and A.M. Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA and London: SAGE.
- Min, H.T. 2005. Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System* 33, no. 2: 293–308.
- Nelson, G.L., and J.G. Carson. 1998. ESL Students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7, no. 2: 113–31.
- Nelson, G.L., and J.G. Carson. 2006. Cultural issues in peer response: Revising "culture". In *Feedback in second language writing*, ed. K. Hyland and F. Hyland, 42–59. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, G.L., and J.M. Murphy. 1992. An L2 writing group: Task and social dimensions. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 1, no. 3: 171–93.
- Nicol, D. 2010. From monologue to dialogue: Improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 35, no. 5: 501–17.
- Northedge, A. 2003. Rethinking teaching in the context of diversity. *Teaching in Higher Education* 8, no. 1: 17–32.
- Paulus, T.M. 1999. The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8, no. 3: 265–89.
- Peyton, J.K., and C. Jones. 1994. Implementing writing workshop with ESOL students: Visions and realities. *TESOL Quarterly* 28, no. 3: 469–87.
- Spack, R. 1997. The rhetorical construction of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, no. 4: 765–74.
- Stanley, J. 1992. Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 1, no. 3: 217–33.
- Tsui, A.B., and M. Ng. 2000. Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing* 9, no. 2: 147–70.
- Van den Berg, B.A.M., W. Admiraal, and A. Pilot. 2006. Designing student peer assessment in higher education: Analysis of written and oral peer feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education* 11, no. 2: 135–47.
- Vygotsky, L. 1978. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Zamel, V. 1998. Questioning academic discourse. In *Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures*, ed. V. Zamel and R. Spack, 187–99. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zhang, S. 1995. Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 4, no. 3: 209–22.
- Zhu, W. 2001. Interaction and feedback in mixed peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10, no. 4: 251–76.