



Effect of teacher modeling and feedback on EFL students' peer review skills in peer review training



Hui-Tzu Min *

National Cheng Kung University, Tainan 70101, Taiwan

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 1 July 2014

Received in revised form 27 January 2016

Accepted 27 January 2016

Available online 18 February 2016

Keywords:

Modeling

Feedback

Peer commenting skills

Peer review training

ABSTRACT

Scant knowledge is available about the separate and combined effects of teacher modeling and feedback on peer reviewers' commenting skills in peer review training studies. The study, drawing on a social cognitive model of sequential skill acquisition (Schunk & Zimmerman, (1997). *Educational Psychologist*, 32, 195. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep3204_1), aimed to examine the effect of two modeling (mastery and coping) and two feedback (praise and correction plus explication) types and their combinations on EFL students' independent use of trained peer review skills for higher-order issues in academic paragraphs in a 7-week instructional training program. 53 college freshmen were divided into two groups, one observing a video of a mastery model flawlessly demonstrating a 4-step peer review procedure, and the other observing a coping model showing a flawed demonstration of steps and subsequent strategies for solving the problems. Half of each group then received praise on their correctly learned steps in the practice session, and the other half received correction plus explication on their incorrectly learned ones. Results of the posttest and delayed posttest show that the two modeling types interacted with the two feedback types to produce differential effects on each group's peer review skills over time, with the combination of mastery modeling and correction and explication being the most effective approach. Subjects' background knowledge and task demands appear to mediate the effectiveness of the two models. Research and pedagogical implications are discussed.

© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The past two decades have witnessed an upsurge in research on peer review in ESL/EFL writing. Advocates have provided convincing arguments and sound evidence in support of this practice from multiple perspectives. In terms of its cognitive advantages, peer review is deemed conducive to enhancing students' ability to grasp the goals and criteria of feedback given the relative plainness of peer language (Gielen, Tops, Dochy, Onghena, & Smeets, 2010). It has also been proven to be instrumental in fostering a deeper insight into writing and revision processes among both college (de Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996) and secondary school students (Peterson, 2003; Tsui & Ng, 2000). In terms of its social benefits, the presence of an equal-status reader helps raise students' awareness of audience (Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Mittan, 1989; Tsui & Ng, 2000), alert them to a potential loss of face before their classmates,

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +886 6 2757575.

E-mail address: minhuitz@mail.ncku.edu.tw

thereby prompting them to expend more time and effort on their writing (Tsui & Ng, 2000; Gibbs & Simpson, 2004), and assist them in developing a sense of ownership of their text (Tsui & Ng, 2000). With regard to its affective benefits, peer review can help reduce “emotion-defence system” in students (Higgins, 2000, as cited in Gielen, Peeters, Dochy, Onghena, & Struyven, 2010) and generate more positive attitudes toward writing (Min, 2005). Regarding linguistic advantages, peer review can facilitate students’ second language acquisition (Lockhart & Ng, 1995) and oral fluency development (Mangelsdorf, 1989).

Many ESL/EFL writing teachers, having learned about these advantages, have attempted to incorporate peer review into their writing classes, only to find that students need proper training to reap reported benefits. With this emergent understanding, some ESL/EFL writing researchers have turned their attention to instructional intervention and provided peer review training to students in traditional face-to-face (Berg, 1999; Hu, 2005; Lam, 2010; Stanley, 1992; Zhu, 1995) or on-line situations (Liou & Peng, 2009; Yang & Meng, 2013). All have reported positive impact on various areas, including peer negotiation tactics (Stanley, 1992; Zhu, 1995), reviewers’ stances and awareness of the effectiveness of their comments (Lam, 2010), reviewers’ ability to focus on high-order issues (Min, 2005; Zhu, 1995) and to produce revision-oriented comments (Liou & Peng, 2009; Min, 2006), writers’ use of peer comments (Liou & Peng, 2009; Min, 2006) and their revision types and quality (Berg, 1999; Liou & Peng, 2009; Min, 2006).

Despite the reported success in previous literature on peer review, scarce knowledge is available about the separate and combined effect of specific instructional components on students’ learning of peer review skills. This information is important because ESL/EFL writing teachers, more often than not, are unable to implement the entire training procedure reported in the literature in their writing classes given different writing contexts. They need to select, adapt, and design appropriate peer review training activities pertaining to their writing classes. Yet a wise selection of a particular training component or appropriate combination of multiple ones hinges on one’s knowledge about the effectiveness of each. Unfortunately, there is a paucity of information in empirical studies in this regard. Moreover, almost all ESL/EFL peer review training studies have been drawn on writing teachers’ practical classroom experiences (Berg, 1999; Lam, 2010; Liou & Peng, 2009; Min, 2005, 2006; Stanley, 1992; Zhu, 1995). Despite the value of teachers’ plausible senses of what works and fails in their classes, little is known about how and why their training activities facilitate students’ peer review skill development. There is a need to check this practical instructional knowledge-base against theoretical skill-learning theories if the ultimate goal of peer review training is to devise instructional interventions that can address most students’ learning needs and have wider utility in various writing contexts. Given the previous two gaps, this study, drawing on a social cognitive model of sequential skill acquisition (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997), aims to investigate the separate and combined effects of two commonly used instructional activities in peer review training, teacher modeling and teacher feedback, on peer review comments on higher-order issues in academic paragraphs.

2. Literature review

Peer review has been increasingly emphasized in both L1 discipline writing (Cho & Schunn, 2007) and ESL/EFL writing classes (Rollinson, 2005). Students, once mastering peer review skills, can not only detect, diagnose, and revise others’ writing problems but also reflect on and improve their own writing (Cho & Cho, 2011; Cho & MacArthur, 2011; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009). Many writing teachers thus have conducted peer review training to help students develop this critical skill. But this strand of research has been premised on teacher researchers’ practical classroom experiences rather than on specific learning theories (see Section 2.3). While these classroom-based peer review training studies have yielded important pedagogical insights, they have failed to shed light on why and how their training activities, separate or combined, facilitate students’ peer review skills. To better understand the why and how questions, we need to turn to skill-learning theories.

2.1. Social cognitive model of sequential skill acquisition

One skill-learning theory that can better inform research on peer review training is Schunk and Zimmerman’s (1997) social cognitive model of sequential skill acquisition. It was originally developed to assist L1 children and adolescents to develop self-regulation of academic competence and skills required by schools. According to this model, skill acquisition consists of four phases—observation, emulation, self-control, self-regulation (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997, 2007). The first two social learning experiences are prerequisites for students’ successful acquisition of academic competencies at the latter two phases. Observational learning takes place when novice writers receive information by “watching models’ actions, hearing their descriptions, and discerning their consequences” (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2002, p. 660). Novices are said to possess this “observational level of skill” (p. 660) when models present them with clear procedures for skill performance. Emulative learning takes place when novice writers attempt to imitate the observed skill performance. They are said to acquire the skill at this level when they can mimic “the general form of a model’s skill” (p. 660). Social feedback to novices’ mimicry at this phase will help calibrate their performance criteria and enhance their mastery of this skill at the next stage. When students internalize observed skills and independently demonstrate these skills, they are considered to have reached the third phase, self-control. When they can “adapt skills to changes in personal and contextual conditions”, they reach the last phase, self-regulation (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2007, p. 12).

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/363938>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/363938>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)