

Appendix 3 a

Published texts: Analyses of higher level Theme and New

Key to analyses

M-Th: Macro-Theme

H-Th: Hyper-Theme

M-N: Macro-New

H-N: Hyper-New

Note: (i) For analysis of text P1 see chapter 5.
(ii) Texts retain original spelling

Text P2

M-Th

Introduction

Peer review is a process where students read drafts written by their fellow students and give each other suggestions to improve the writing. Peer review, however, differs from *peer editing*, *peer evaluation*, and *peer assessment* in that the focus of the former is on the review process, which includes not only editing, evaluating, and assessing, but also responding to the content of the essay and how the essay is written (Mangelsdorf, 1992). Students' attention is focused on how meaning is created in writing and on writing as a vehicle for communication, rather than writing as a formal product. Peer reviews, therefore, "support the shift from a product to a process emphasis in writing instruction" (DiPardo & Freedman, 1988, p.124). Such a technique in writing pedagogy is underpinned by writing research theories that advocate writing as a process of drafting and redrafting, as well as writing as process of communicating to a *real* audience. It is also in line with the goals of a learner-centred classroom, which *promote the development* of **autonomy** through collaborative learning.

M-Th

Benefits of peer review

The **usefulness** of peer review as a technique for L1 writing pedagogy is *well* documented in the literature (*Barnes 1976; Brief 1984; Cazden 1988; Forman & Cazden, 1985*). There is also research evidence to *point to* the **benefits** of peer review in L2 writign instruction (*Mendonca and Johnson, 1994; Mittan, 1989; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Stanley and Tipper, 1995*).

H-Th

In the **traditional** classroom, writing is often done in isolation

H-N

Peer reviews reflect writing as a *truly* communicative process rather than an **artificial, lonely** exercise where students write for a **pseudo**-reader, the teacher, who reads students' essays *predominantly* for assessment purposes rather than for *real* communication

H-Th

Peer review is a **useful** technique for encouraging revision in writing.

H-N

Peer review provides the **best** means for writers to turn "writer-based prose" into "reader-based prose" (Flower, 1979)

H-Th

Peer reviews also provide **opportunities** for collaborative learning.

H-N

Peer reviews can *boost confidence*, make writing a *more positive* learning activity, and help students *develop greater independence* in writing.

M-Th

Implementing peer reviews: Background

H-Th

The peer reviews *described* in this article took place in the Hong Kong Polytechnic University...

Text P3

M-Th

It has always seemed to me that the standard procedure for dealing with student compositions yields results that never *quite* justify the time and effort involved. One can always make a series of marks on a paper, hand it to the student and then hope for the **best**, but whether this is to be an **effective** teaching strategy rather than *primarily* a testing device depends on *some complicated* planning and *extreme care* in deciding just what those marks ought to be. Though the **problem** can be *alleviated somewhat* by assigning **carefully controlled** compositions (see Palston 1972) or by the use of a checklist (see Knapp, 1972, and Robinett, 1972, for checklist models), I have always been sceptical as to how much **good** it does a student to see an error marked and then, alone at his desk, fix it up as **best** he can. In such a situation, his **chief** concern, more than likely, is merely that of getting another homework assignment off his agenda.

H-Th

Several related observations have brought me to this *lack of* faith in **conventional** correction techniques.

H-Th

Peer correction as a *solution* to these **problems** has been the subject of *some minimal amount* of research.

H-Th

The following assumed **advantages**, however, are what I have thought might be reasonable to expect from an *extensive* use of peer correction.

M-N/M-Th

With these points in mind I have *experimented* with *four* procedures involving peer correction of student essays.

Text P4

M-Th

Research findings on the *limited* and even **negative** effects of traditional product-oriented feedback on and correction of students' work by teachers have been reported *for at least 30 years, from the work of Stiff (1967), Marzano and Arthur (1977) to findings reported by Hendrickson (1981), Sommers (1982), Hillocks (1982) and Graham (1983) in the early 1980s.* Further studies carried out *in the late 1980s and more recently (e.g. Cohen 1987; Robb et al. 1988; Anson 1989; Hyland 1990; Lockhart and Ng, 1993) all report similar findings.* Goodlad and Hirst (1989) found *over 1,000* articles on peer tutoring published between 1975 and 1989.

M-Th

The **benefits** of using peer groups have also *long* been recognised, *from the early studies carried out by Piaget (1959), Vygotsky (1962) and Dewey (1966) to more recent studies, such as those by Johnson et al. (1994), who believe that "peer relationships are the key to reaching students' hearts" (p.21). Peer feedback has been shown to be a useful alternative or supplement to end-product teacher-centred feedback.*

H-Th

Winter (1996) *points out that not all of the reasons for the increased interest in peer tutoring in recent years have been based on purely pedagogical concerns.*

H-Th

Statman (1980) encourages the use of peer teaching and group work in the English language classroom and *shows that language teachers have also long recognised the value of these procedures.*

H-Th

Lockhart and Ng (1993) *list, under seven categories, more than twenty studies carried out between 1973 and 1989,*

H-Th

A process approach to writing, like the use of peer groups, is also 'nothing **new**'

H-Th

Several reasons have been put forward to explain why process writing is still considered an **innovation** in Hong Kong.

M-Th

Rationale for the study

H-Th

It is possible that working with *small numbers* of in-service teachers to bring about change within an educational system (*e.g. Brock 1994; Pennington and Cheung 1995*), although **useful**, might be a case of '*too little too late*'.

H-Th

In addition to the possible **problem** of '*too little too late*', the time required to carry out a *full* version of process writing is *another constraint*.

H-Th

Another difficulty related to time is the peer training period, during which time the students are taught how to give and receive feedback.

M-N/M-Th

Following the emphasis placed by White and Arndt (1991) on revision and rewriting, "writing is re-writing; that re-vision – seeing with **new** eyes – has a

central role to play” (p.5), it was decided, in the present study to focus on these areas.

The purpose of our study, motivated in part by the calls of Li for *more Hong Kong-based* research on process writing, and Miller and Ng (1996) for *more* research on peer assessment, was, therefore, to introduce a group of student teachers to peer feedback and a student-centred process-oriented approach to writing, focusing on the rewriting and revision stages. We could then assess their attitudes, in terms of their views and reactions, after a *brief initial* exposure, with *minimal* training, towards this ‘**innovation**’, as an *indication* of *how* likely or unlikely they are to use such an approach in their own classrooms when they themselves become teachers.