

Investigating the Effectiveness of Web-Based Peer Review in Students' Drafts Revision: A Critical EAP Perspective

Xu (Jared) Liu*

English Language Center, Shantou University, Shantou City, Guangdong Province, China

Abstract—Previous research on peer review considered it as a strategy of improving students' writing (Baker, 2016; Hu, 2005). To investigate its effectiveness, this research has established a small corpus based on the data from the 22 students' writing drafts and their corresponding written comments of 13,9261 words in total on the Peerceptiv National Writing and Feedback Contest (PNWFC). Then, Python was utilized as a tool to calculate the difference between four dimensions including accuracy, helpfulness, reviewing and writing. According to the quantitative analysis, it showed that students could hardly benefit from peer feedback. After that, three online structured interviews were arranged to further explore the development of English as a Second Language (L2) students' discourse competence development. Given the consequence of qualitative data, students could revise their grammatical errors and language inaccuracies through peer review. They might implicitly develop their ability to think critically, which is the core of the formation of discursual awareness in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course. More importantly, receivers could know of their weaknesses, and also perceive the accuracy and fairness of their discourses. Finally, essential implications might be helpful for teachers to carry out peer review and writing tasks in the future.

Index Terms—peer review, corpus linguistics, EAP, critical thinking, written discourse competence

I. INTRODUCTION

Peer review in the instruction of L2 university writing has been frequently conducted and researched. Nonetheless, this article aims at investigating the effectiveness of L2 students' peer review at a university. First, it presents a review of relevant concepts and existing research articles (e.g., the definition of peer review or peer feedback in the instruction of L2 writing). Research questions and methods are then followed, which lead to a proposal that statistics in four dimensions that have been mentioned above from the PNWFC are calculated to generate contrastive results. The study also presents analyses of the consequences of the difference in four dimensions, written comments sampling, and interviews. Finally, the results are then discussed, followed by suggested pedagogical implications on the development of knowledge in L2 writing instruction.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Peer Review in L2 Writing Instruction

(a). The Definition of Peer Review

As an assessment approach of writing, conducting an instructional activity of providing peer feedback is usually very common either in the English as a second language (ESOL) or non-ESOL classrooms. Peer review, which is also known as peer feedback or peer evaluation, is predominately advocated by many teachers who take the initiative to create a collaborative and student-centered learning environment (Zhang et al., 2020). More specifically, in the L2 instruction context, peer feedback is to be seen as an educational procedure through which students evaluate and make an oral or written comment on the content and quality of their cohorts' writing samples with certain individual assertive affirmation or practical suggestions (Dochy et al., 1999).

(b). The Evolution of Relevant Research

Peer feedback has been researched extensively in L2 writing research and teaching activities. As numerous convincing theories have been established through a great variety of practical activities as well as have been examined in extensive observations and instructional activities, the application of peer review in the L2 teaching and learning classroom has already been underpinned theoretically and empirically (Fan & Xu, 2020). In the theoretical facet, peer feedback has been given a bunch of support in theories such as sociocultural theory, process writing theory, and internationalist theory (Yu & Lee, 2016b). Moreover, from the empirical perspective, the application of peer feedback has showcased multiple advantages in assisting L2 students to improve their writing (Yu & Lee, 2016b). Therefore, the

* Corresponding author. Email: xuli@stu.edu.cn

praxis of peer feedback has experienced a process from a less supported stage by theories to a substantially supported phase by theories and experience substantially.

Although research has found that peer feedback has questionable validity, reliability, and accuracy, and some instructors have considered much of it too uncritical, superficial, vague, and content-focused (Nilson, 2003), peer feedback has been proposed and recommended for more than four decades (Bruffee, 1980; Chang 2016; Gao et al., 2018), and the last three decades have witnessed an increasing trend in research of both first language writing and L2 writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Min, 2008; Hu & Lam, 2010; Zheng, 2012; Yu & Lee, 2016; Gao et al., 2018). Over the last two decades, research on peer feedback has been involved in various issues in relation to the perceptions, process and product of peer review (Li et al., 2016; Gao et al., 2018; Zou et al., 2018). In particular, previous studies have been mainly concerned with the focus on the effectiveness based on rubric dimension of a reviewer or reviewee's comments, a pedagogical syllabus design of a peer feedback course, reviewers' or reviewees' identify, or even the reasonableness and accuracy of comments towards L2 writing problems (Tsui & Ng, 2000; Rollinson, 2005; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Cho & Cho, 2011; Zhao, 2014; Berggren, 2015; Walker, 2015; Gao et al., 2018; Huisman et al., 2018).

B. The Development of Discourse Competence through Written Peer Feedback

Januin and Stephan's (2015) defined that the concept of discourse competence first derives from the theory of communicative competence, and the notion of discourse competence occurs in all models of communicative competence in a language. The view that communicative competence in a language includes a number of different dimensions was first proposed by Hymes (1972, p. 390), as a response to Chomsky's concept of competence as distinct from performance (Chomsky, 1965). The process of providing peer feedback means inherently a method of constructing a critically cognitive perspective with written words, and this kind of words itself is also a discourse capability that L2 students have possessed.

The goal of EAP courses is to enable students to develop a complex integration of knowledge and skills, which sometimes are understood as discourse competence to communicate and participate effectively in higher education as students and researchers (Bhatia, 2004; Ding & Bruce, 2017). Additionally, Bhatia's (2004) concept of discursive competence includes three subsuming areas of social competence, generic competence and textual competence. Presumably, various reasons or perspectives have facilitated a number of researchers to implement their investigation into peer feedback under a theory. However, underpinned by the notion of the development of discourse or discursive competence Bhatia's (2004), the present study has been planned and designed.

C. A Critical EAP Approach and Corpus-Based Analysis on Written Peer Feedback

Given some previous research about L2 writing instruction, Chandler (2003) and Bitchener et al. (2005) examined the efficacy and effect of various kinds of corrective feedback. Storch (2005), Lundstrom and Baker (2009) explored the benefits of peer review to reviewers' own writing, language improvements and students' attitudes towards English as a second language (ESL) students' collaborative writing. Moreover, Hyland (2004) and Hyland (2007) focused more on metadiscourse markers and genre pedagogies. Therefore, it is common that, in the teaching of L2 writing, English as a foreign language (EFL) or ESL researchers, teachers or practitioners are always struggling to find a balance of making students both understand the meanings, connotations or ideological issues of a text and take account of linguistic and discursal issues. Nonetheless, critical EAP, as a pedagogical method, has convincingly given EFL or ESL teachers or practitioners a hint of granting students more freedom to think from their own perspectives.

Critical EAP can be first traced back to North America, emerging in a debate about the differences between the first language (L1) writing and the teaching of L2 writing in the inaugural issues of the *Journal of Second Language Writing* (Santos, 1992; Ding & Bruce, 2017). Later on, in developing critical EAP, Benesch (2001) proposes that teachers should assist students in being aware of their social identities and rights and encourage them to face resistance or voice their opinion towards unfavorable circumstances.

In line with the concept of development of discourse or discursive competence (Bhatia, 2004), the critical EAP approach enhances the necessity of implementation of peer feedback instruction, especially the realization of social competence in calling for individual legitimate rights and social justice.

In addition to different notions which underpin teaching or research of peer feedback, the investigation of peer feedback has presented diverse research perspectives and methods. To examine the effectiveness of peer feedback, Liu and Carless (2006) studied the processes of peer assessment and further explored the issue of using grades in the peer assessment by a large-scale questionnaire survey of 1740 tertiary students and 460 academics in Hong Kong, and supplementary interviews, and they find that a significant number of academics and students resist peer assessment using grades. Lin and Chien (2009) researched a prerequisite environment of peer feedback that English writing teachers have obligations to create and the factors of influencing the role of peer reviewers through a questionnaire. With this quantitative method, they have known that most language learners have positive attitudes towards the pedagogy of peer feedback, and social interactions through writing and peer feedback provide them more inspiration and motivations.

In terms of the aspect of learning mechanics research, Huisman et al. (2018) used both pre-test and post-test questionnaires to investigate eighty-three students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. As a result, both providing and receiving feedback led to similar improvements in writing performance,

the presence of explanatory comments positively related both to how adequate students perceived the peer feedback to be, as well as to students' willingness to improve based upon it and no direct relation was found between these peer feedback perceptions and students' writing performance increase. From the perspective of scalar culture, Hu (2019) explains the macrocultural, mesocultural and microcultural influences of scalar culture on L2 peer feedback with data drawn upon from a written survey and written feedback comments of writing drafts in an Advanced English course of 116 junior English language majors at a major university in China, a combination of semi-structured interviews, video recordings of peer-feedback sessions, stimulated recalls and drafts in a case study of two first-semester freshmen and a three-year action research at a Singaporean university. As a result, Hu (2019) finds that students have a strong preference for teacher feedback as it often is regarded as authoritative, trusted and knowledgeable, students' social interaction with learning resources also shape their peer feedback, and students' peer feedback can be guided by new culture practices. Considering the potential approaches of peer feedback, Liu's (2021) research focuses on a combination of face-to-face peer feedback and technology-based peer feedback mainly with a qualitative method to analyze the data collected from interviews, peer feedback on drafts and electronic platforms, observations and students' assignments in a comprehensive public university in China, so it mainly reveals that Chinese students are reluctant to listen to and provide negative feedback, a combination of incorporated approaches of face-to-face peer feedback and electronic peer feedback can help overcome their reluctance to express frank opinions and attitudes and manner of peer feedback can nurture a positive attitude towards their willingness to proactively seek help from each other.

As is stated above, from a variety of research perspectives of peer feedback, many researchers have contributed to a number of cutting-edge studies that L2 writing teachers can create for facilitating an effective peer feedback classroom, the cultural influences on peer feedback, and potential approaches that can help peer feedback activities to be implemented more effectively. Nonetheless, few studies have been referred to the investigation into the effectiveness of peer feedback in terms of accuracy and helpfulness and students' feedback annotations and comments themselves. Moreover, many researchers are inclined to resort to qualitative methods such as interviews and observations. Even if some researchers have used a combined qualitative and quantitative method, they have depended on surveys to analyze the statistics.

Similarly, based on a combined qualitative and quantitative method, the current study however explores how much peer feedback assists students' writing performances as a whole through a Python-based calculation on the scores of each of two pieces of draft feedback, analyses the qualities and features of effective peer feedback in terms of accuracy and helpfulness and investigates how effective the annotations and comments students have made are with a corpus-based approach and an interview.

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- When considering accuracy, helpfulness, reviewing and writing as four grading criteria, in which criterion do students make the greatest progress? Why?
- To what extent do students make progress through peer review?
- What is the effectiveness of students' peer-reviewed feedback?

IV. METHOD

The present study has mainly focused on the peer feedback processes and productions (including two drafts, rubric-based scores and written comments) of twenty-two students in a research-intensive university in China who are not majoring in English but have still actively participated in the PNWFC in 2021. Also, their English proficiency level is on average estimated at the range from A2 to B1, based on the Global Scale of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Even though they are from other a variety of disciplines such as Maine Science and Applied Chemistry, they are the students who are attending my English course. Within the designed syllabus of my English course, the instruction of peer review has been arranged after the first persuasive essay writing task, thereby aiming to tackle some confusing issues and achieve ideal results. Before the contest, I have conducted a one-hour online peer review training course through Tencent Meeting Platform for those twenty-two participants. No matter how the courses of peer feedback take on, these courses are admittedly English for General Academic Purposes (EGAP) (Jordan, 1997) courses, which are one of the two domains (English for General Academic Purposes (EGAP) and English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP)) (Jordan, 1997) of EAP courses.

To examine a more accurate improvement result, this study has employed a corpus method to conduct my research on the effectiveness of peer feedback. Data in this research are from the two drafts, rubric-based scores and comments, as well as rubric-based back-evaluation scores and comments of twenty-two participants of the PNWFC in 2021, which are all collected and stored in my self-established corpus.

V. DATA ANALYSIS

Based on the data collected from the online platform of PNWFC in 2021, this study examines the difference of grades of four dimensions --- accuracy grades, helpfulness grades, reviewing grades and writing grades of twenty-two students' peer feedback tasks including two drafts and peer feedback comments.

Altogether there are twenty-two first-year non-English major students participating in this contest, and they all have accomplished their writing and feedback-giving tasks. On account of the unfamiliarity with the contest requirements, the operational platform, and process, after receiving a series of online training sessions, teachers also more or less arranged training sessions, in whichever form, online or on-site for their students who were aiming at participating in the contest. Then, teachers released and assigned the topic of writing tasks and feedback requirements, and students had to accomplish and deliver their first draft of writing tasks through the online platform of PNWFC within a given time, and each of them could see three drafts from other different students, and then gave them corresponding scores and written feedback. After that, once students received their scores and feedback, they had to re-evaluate the effectiveness of the scores and feedback that other students gave with scores or written feedback as well. Students had to revise their first draft according to students' plausible and agreeable feedback and then delivered their second draft. Likewise, each of them should mark and provide feedback to three drafts, and once they received their own feedback, they had to re-evaluate the effectiveness of the grades and feedback. Therefore, depending on their two rounds of grades and feedback, the platform of PNWFC has recorded and calculated their rating marks as a direct database.

VI. RESULTS

A. Research Question 1 and 2: The Dimension in Which Students Have Made the Greatest Progress and the Holistic Helpfulness of Peer Feedback

To investigate the effectiveness of peer review outcomes, the data of four dimensions --- accuracy grades, helpfulness grades, revision grades and writing grades, which were generated and transformed from the performance in providing their feedback and re-evaluating the feedback that they have received through PNWFC were analysed and compared. With regard to the generation of these results, Python was resorted to calculating the statistics at first, and then those statistics were verified by the manual calculation formula within Microsoft Excel. As is shown below, Table 1 shows the results of difference and difference rate between two rounds of accuracy grades and helpfulness grades, and Table 2 shows the results of difference and difference rate between two rounds of reviewing grades and writing grades. In this case, Python was utilized as a tool to help calculate the results effectively.

TABLE 1
RESULTS OF COMPARISON WITHIN TWO ROUNDS OF ACCURACY GRADES AND HELPFULNESS GRADES

RESULTS OF COMPARISON WITHIN TWO ROUNDS OF ACCURACY GRADES AND HELPFULNESS GRADES									
	Accuracy		Accuracy Rate		Helpfulness		Helpfulness Rate		
Positive	A(17)		A(0.27)		B(3) D(1) F(2)		B(0.03)		
	H(21)	I(1)	H(0.33)	I(0.013)	M(5)	N(1) P(2)	D(0.0119) F(0.03)		
	K(16)	L(1)	K(0.23)	L(0.014)	Q(5)	S(1)	M(0.062)		
	O(12)	S(7)	O(0.17)	S(0.10)			N(0.0118) P(0.02)		
	T(9)	U(16)	T(0.11)	U(0.23)			Q(0.061) S(0.012)		
Negative	C(-7)				A(-2) C(-2)				
	E(-11)	F(-15)			E(-2) G(-1) K(-1)				
	G(-4)	J(-9)			L(-2) O(-4) R(-5)				
	M(-20)	N(-8)			T(-2) U(-1) V(-1)				
	P(-9)	R(-4)							
	V(-6)								
Zero	B D O				H I J				

From the Table 1, the numbers refer to students' second performance rate minus their first performance rate. If the number is large than 0, it means that this student made progress on the second try. The figure in accuracy difference --- 0 appearing in three students (B, D, and Q), figures in accuracy difference which are positive are presented in nine students. More specifically, the highest accuracy difference rate is pertaining to student H (0.33), while the lowest is pertaining to student I (0.01). Concerning the figures in helpfulness difference, 0 appears in students H, I and J, and eight students (B, D, F, M, N, P, Q and S) have positive numbers which are 3, 1, 2, 5, 1, 2, 5 and 1. Correspondingly, student M displays the highest helpfulness difference rate at around 6%, while student N shows the lowest helpfulness difference rate at 1.1% approximately. It is strikingly noted that within nine accuracy difference ratios, only three rates are below 0.1, but within eight helpfulness difference rates, all rates are below 0.1.

TABLE 2
RESULTS OF COMPARISON WITHIN TWO ROUNDS OF REVIEWING GRADES AND WRITING GRADES

	Reviewing	Reviewing Rate	Writing	Writing Rate
Positive	A(7) B(1) H(10) I(1) K(8) O(5) Q(2) S(4) T(4) U(8)	A(0.09) B(0.01) H(0.14) I(0.01) K(0.10) O(0.06) Q(0.03) S(0.05) T(0.04) U(0.10)	B(13) C(17) F(17) J(13) K(20) P(1) Q(12)	B(0.17) C(0.22) F(0.24) J(0.16) K(0.28) P(0.01) Q(0.21)
Negative	C(-5) E(-6) F(-7) G(-2) J(-4) L(-1) M(-7) N(-4) P(-4) R(-5) V(-3)		A(-8) E(-3) G(-4) L(-9) M(-12) N(-11) R(-6) S(-8) T(-16) U(-13)	
Zero	D		D H I	

As the Table 2 shows, with only one student (D) having 0 in the reviewing difference, ten students (A, B, H, I, K, O, Q, S, T, and U) have positive numbers, which are 7, 1, 10, 1, 8, 5, 2, 4, 4, and 8. Regarding the reviewing difference rate, student H has the highest reviewing difference rate (about 14%), but student B has the lowest reviewing difference rate (about 1.1%). With respect to the writing difference, five students (D, H, I, O, and V) have 0 and seven students have positive numbers. More specifically, student H has the highest writing difference rate, which is 0.28, while student P has the lowest writing difference rate, which is 0.01.

From the two tables shown above, less than half of all participants ($N < 11$) have positive numbers in four dimensions of criteria, which means participants can hardly enjoy the effective benefits of peer feedback in a holistic way, but with ten students having positive numbers, reviewing difference which is mainly related to a student's reviewing punctuality, accuracy and accomplishment relatively show its process in which participants have tried to engage. "Feedback from a high competent peer resulted in more willingness to improve" (Berndt et al., 2017). When students finish the first-draft revision and receive the online written feedback from other peers, they are able to understand better both the errors that they have made and the clarification of accurate comments that they should provide to other students. More specifically, student H with the highest accuracy difference rate (around 3.3%) among the four dimensions of criteria, has made the greatest progress in accuracy. Likewise, compared with the number of participants who have made progress in writing grades ($N=7$), more participants ($N=9$) have made progress in accuracy grades. Therefore, in accuracy grades, participants have made the greatest progress.

To understand the helpfulness of students' feedback, students' written comments based on given rubrics from my self-established corpus have been analyzed. There were two rounds of reviewing and commenting for draft one and draft two respectively. Once a participant submits his/her draft, his/her draft will be reviewed and commented by other three participants. Even though within two rounds of providing feedback, one participant probably has to review and comment two drafts from two different participants, the ability of making comments can be reasonably considered. Accuracy scores, as one of four grading dimensions, are seen as the direct reflection of the quality of reviews, so a detailed analysis on this dimension is shown below. According to Table 1, student H has achieved the largest positive difference, standing for a decent quality of his/her feedback.

TABLE 3
STUDENT H'S COMMENTS ON DRAFT 1 AND DRAFT 2

Comments on the Draft 1	Comments on the Draft 2
<p>Content 1. The explanation of the first opinion should precede the example. 2. The explanation of the second opinion is inaccurate, because responsibility and social responsibility are different. I think you can substitute "in daily life" for "in society".</p> <p>Organisation 1. In the second paragraph, "s" should be removed from "For the common examples" and remove "and go through the red light" from "if parents often break the traffic rules and go through the red light". 2. In the last paragraph, the author should add a comma behind "In short".</p> <p>Language 1. I think the author should remove "the" from "For most of the children" in the second paragraph. 2. "helping" should be substituted for "help" in the last sentence of the second paragraph. 3. In the third paragraph, it is a past simple tense in your example. So the "punish" should be substituted for "punished", and substitute "anything" for "thing". I think you can add "which" before "let me know" or substitute "to" for the comma. 4. In the last paragraph, because "teach" is before "distinguish", so it should be "distinguishing" and then remove "to" from "to shoulder their responsibility in society" and use "shouldering" instead of "shoulder".</p> <p>Mechanics There are few or no errors in standard writing conventions per paragraph.</p>	<p>Content 1. Thesis has two main points, but the second point can be included in the first point. A warm home atmosphere can help children develop well. You can think of another debatable point. 2. I think you can repeat your opinion at the beginning of each body paragraph and emphasize your opinion in each body paragraph. 3. Personally, you can add your own experiences in the third paragraph.</p> <p>Organisation 1. In the third paragraph, maybe you want to write a sentence. If so, you should add "and" in front of "thereby" and add the subject in front of the "causes". If not, you should add a comma in front of the "thereby" and use "causing" instead of "causes". 2. In the last paragraph, you should substitute "encouraging education" for the second "it", otherwise others can't understand your meaning. 3. In the last paragraph, I think you can remove "After that", because its front part isn't associated with the following part. 4. In the second sentence of the second paragraph, I think if you use "Although" instead of "though" and use a period instead of the second comma, it would be better.</p> <p>Language There are errors in the third paragraph. First, you shouldn't use "feel" and "be" together and you can remove the "be". Second, "key" is an adjective in the first sentence, so you should remove "s" from "keys". Third, "against" is a preposition, so you should add "be" in front of "against". Fourth, maybe you want to use "ragard" instead of "regrade". And I hope you can use the attributive clause in your essay.</p> <p>Mechanics There are few or no errors in standard writing conventions per paragraph.</p>

As can be seen from Table 3, as a whole, student H's comments on Draft 2 tend to be seemingly longer than the original comments on Draft 1. More specifically, in the part of Content of Draft 2, student H has discovered more accurately the overlapped idea, and has proposed his/her solution. For example, "Thesis has two main points, but the second point can be included in the first point. A warm home atmosphere can help children develop well". In contrast to its counterpart of Draft 1, student H's explanation appears to be a bit objective, without sufficient examples and suggestions. Also, in the part of Organisation of Draft 2, student H starts to focus on the logical flow of writing, especially cohesion and coherence, like "3. In the last paragraph, I think you can remove 'After that', because its front part isn't associated with the following part". However, in its counterpart of Draft1, student H has only picked up a few inappropriate language problems. For the part of Language of Draft 2, the comments become more accurate and heterogeneous. Not only have some errors been picked up, but also a suggestion on the use of sentence patterns has been added. Zhang and Cheng (2021) proposed that students' grammatical accuracy in English writing improved because of comprehensive written corrective feedback. Whoever has to comment or receive comments, participants have already benefited from the process of providing and receiving more accurate feedback.

B. Research Question 3: The Effectiveness in Students' Annotation of Peer Feedback

An online interview, as a further investigation on the effects that peer feedback has brought to students, has been conducted, especially to explore the specific aspects of writing rubric requirements in which students have made great progress. Due to the above table containing dimension differences that have been calculated with Python, it has been easier to identify those students who have achieved much larger breakthroughs and improvements. Students with distinct differences in writing itself have been invited to participate in the online interview and they are student C, student F, and student K.

(a). Students' Attitudes towards the Engagement in Peer Feedback

In this online interview, three students have expressed their own surprisingly different attitudes towards peer feedback on writing when they knew about peer feedback initially. Some audio transcripts are as follows,

Student C: ... at first, I was not very willing to review writing drafts of other cohorts, because it's a little bit troublesome, but when I participated in this writing and feedback contest, I felt that I learned and harvested something from it.

Student F: I was holding a neutral belief in peer feedback...

Student K: I think that I tend to be in favor of this contest, or peer feedback very much. Through peer feedback, we can share our views with others and make them revise and modify their writing, and we are not only reviewing other students' writing, but also reviewing our own writing. Peer review can help us retrospect what we need to improve...

Fan and Xu (2020) claimed that peer feedback has been increasingly utilized and favored in the second or foreign language writing classrooms because it has brought facilitative effects to students and teachers. Even though these three participants have shown different attitudes towards peer feedback at the beginning, two of them (i.e., student C and student K) have already acknowledged and found the benefits before and after the contest, and one participant has

showed his/her neutral preference about peer feedback at the beginning. Notably, despite the different attitudes or views expressed at the beginning, three participants have participated in this contest voluntarily. Hence, peer feedback is now becoming more acceptable in second or foreign language writing classrooms.

(b). *Language Enhancement and Development of Written Discourse Competence*

Students often pay much attention to linguistic aspects in second language writing, because linguistics features are the most straightforward and conspicuous elements that can be able to take on in a writing text. Concerning the most significantly improved aspect that participants have considered in their writing, three students all have proclaimed that their language knowledge has been improved such as grammatical accuracy, vocabulary fluency, and diverse sentence structures. Some audio transcripts are as follows:

Student C: ... *language organization (is the part where I have greatly improved), I think my weakest aspect of writing is language organization. When I read other participants' writing drafts, I can discover some grammar that I have never used, and some advanced expressions...*

Student F: *the usage of sentences (is the part where I have made remarkable progress), I have spotted different sentences... and also structure...*

Student K: *I think I have made great progress in grammar and the use of vocabulary... I am not that good at grammar... through viewing other participants' writing drafts, I found that I never used this grammar ever before, so when viewing or commenting their writing drafts, I also learned their grammar and the use of vocabulary... my perception on a certain word was merely onefold, and then I realized that the use of a certain word could be manifold...*

Three participants have all mentioned language features such as grammar, vocabulary and sentences, so it is clear that linguistic knowledge is still the mainstream aspects that students focus on in second language writing activities.

With respect to the less improved aspect that participants have considered in their writing, two students started focusing on the logic and writing perspectives, but one student still cares about grammar and vocabulary. Some audio transcripts are as follows,

Student C: ... *grammar and vocabulary are also two aspects that I have worried, because students may resort to other e-dictionaries or grammar-modifying websites to check...*

Student F: *I think the angle of participants' writing, as it seems to be similar, not very unique...*

Student K: *I feel that I have made little progress in logic within paragraphs. In most cases, three writing drafts that I have viewed have similar logics. If the perspectives are always the same, it will be easy to lead to fatigue in appreciating the charm of writing tasks.*

Apart from language aspects, students have started thinking more of text ideas, and perspectives. Even though students have been concerned about these aspects in which they might feel relatively unskillful, they have not only considered those micro linguistic features, but also moved towards social, cognitive and textual analysis. Tuzi's (2004) research shows that "e-feedback had helped L2 writers to focus on larger chunks of text involving ideas, introduction, conclusions or examples rather than smaller elements such as grammar, and punctuation, and hence, might incline them towards making macro revisions" (as cited in Lam, 2021, p. 2). This transition from a focus on micro linguistic features to macro cognitive features marks an implicit development of discourse competence. Canale (1983) proposed his sociolinguistic competence to include discourse competence, as mastery of combining grammatical forms and meanings to achieve a unified spoken or written text in different genres. Therefore, online written feedback itself does not only provide students opportunities to know of and modify their language mistakes, but also facilitates students to seek specific meanings in a social context.

C. *Pedagogical Implications*

Even though students are from various subjects, needs analysis is always central to the EAP classroom teaching. The genre of tasks in this writing and feedback contest is about an argumentative essay, which is in alignment with the content of the participants' English writing class. At their level of English writing class, students are required to write a persuasive essay or argumentative essay with a clear structure and cohesive words and a peer review task has also to be implemented. Furthermore, Bruce's (2016) framework for EAP course design that links needs analysis and course development with theories of discourse, teaching and learning has revealed, in addition to writing tasks, the necessity of teaching the knowledge of providing peer feedback. More specifically, students with different majors may encounter situations of assessing themselves or others in future careers, so EAP courses should provide students with an opportunity of making assessments in an appropriate and critical way.

In terms of students' written discourse competence, students do not only develop their own linguistic, cognitive and social abilities through writing itself, but from the results of qualitative and quantitative analysis, they can also improve their discursual competence by writing comments to their cohorts. Under the genre-based approach and constructive teaching methods, specific language knowledge can be arranged to the sessions of writing and peer feedback, such as suggestive sentence patterns, interactive and interactional metadiscourse resources (Hyland & Tse, 2004). Furthermore, given one of the distinct results in relation to the improvement of lexicogrammatical issues, Hyland and Tse (2004) and Hyland (2005)'s interactive and interactional resources, which include transition markers, frame markers, code glosses, hedges, boosters, attitude markers and engagement markers, can systematically help students address their confusion in

the usage of grammar, discoursal organizations (sequencing, addition, comparison and contrast, elaborating), and expressions of engaging withers themselves or readers.

With respect to the instruction of critical thinking, it is a challenging but important part for an EAP course. However, many L2 teachers are used to omitting or skipping the section of peer review in a writing class no matter what reasons they are able to rely on, such as limited time or no trust in the effectiveness of peer review. The process of providing comments is closely associated with the process of thinking critically, as L2 teachers could train or lead students to express their own ideas in a given context. Therefore, the section of peer review is worth being remained or embarked.

VII. CONCLUSION

This study has examined through a survey how one group of students has conducted their writing feedback and reacted to the feedback from their cohorts in a writing and feedback contest. Results show that based on the quantitative analysis, the study has first found that overall, it is hard for participants, by and large, to feel the great efficiency in peer feedback, but for a few participants, they have made colossal progress in accuracy of giving feedback. Besides, based on the qualitative analysis, the study has found that students still have more trust in the authority of teachers' comments rather than peers' comments. Instead, more delightfully, the study has also found that students' language mistakes have been revised and their linguistic knowledge has been improved with a large extent. Based on qualitative and quantitative data, in terms of written language literacy and discoursal knowledge, as an ultimate goal of an EAP class, the study has discovered that students' discourse competence has been improved in the process of both completing writing tasks and writing comments.

APPENDIX 1. PEERCEPTIV WRITING REVIEW RUBRICS

Review Rubrics: Comments and ratings should consider four dimensions: content, organization, language, and mechanics. Within each dimension, the detailed instructions on commenting and rating are given as shown in **Table 1**.

Table 1 Review Rubrics

No.	Dimensions	Description of dimension: Commenting on the response to the prompt (with "●") and Rating the response to the prompt (with "◆")
1	Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Is there a thesis statement on family education in the essay? Is the thesis statement well supported? Are there sentences or details that do not support the thesis statement and therefore should be eliminated or rewritten? Be specific about your suggestion.</u> ◆ Thesis: Is the thesis statement about family education stated clearly? #weight=1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rating 1:1-The thesis statement is not clear. Rating 2:2 Rating 3:3-The thesis statement is somewhat clear. Rating 4:4 Rating 5:5-The thesis statement stands out. Rating 6:6 Rating 7:7-The thesis statement is clearly stated. ◆ Thesis: Is the thesis adequately supported in each paragraph? #weight=1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rating 1:1-Not supported. Rating 2:2 Rating 3:3-Somewhat supported. Rating 4:4 Rating 5:5-Mostly supported. Rating 6:6 Rating 7:7-Fully supported. ◆ Relevance: Are relevant personal experiences developed regarding family education? #weight=1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rating 1:1-Not relevant OR not enough to evaluate. Rating 2:2 Rating 3:3-A little bit relevant. Rating 4:4 Rating 5:5-Mostly relevant to family education. Rating 6:6 Rating 7:7-Relevant to the assigned topic.
2	Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>COHERENCE: Do transitional words and phrases help make the sentences and paragraphs coherent? Please be specific about your suggestion.</u> ◆ Coherence: Are the paragraphs organized coherently? #weight=1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rating 1:1-In random, repetitive, or illogical ways. Rating 2:2 Rating 3:3-With jumps in logic, or repetition. Rating 4:4 Rating 5:5-Somewhat coherently. Rating 6:6 Rating 7:7-Coherently. ◆ Coherence: Are the sentences in each paragraph organized coherently? #weight=1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rating 1:1-In random, repetitive, or illogical ways.

		<p>Rating 2:2 Rating 3:3-With jumps in logic, or repetition. Rating 4:4 Rating 5:5-Somewhat coherently. Rating 6:6 Rating 7:7-Coherently.</p> <p>◆ Cohesion: How well are transitional words and phrases used? #weight=1 Rating 1:1-A very limited range of transitional words and phrases are used. Rating 2:2 Rating 3:3-Many inadequate transitional words and phrases are used. Rating 4:4 Rating 5:5-Most transitional words and phrases are used appropriately. Rating 6:6 Rating 7:7-Transitional words and phrases are used appropriately.</p>
3	Language	<p>● WORDING AND SENTENCE SKILLS: <i>Is the essay concise? Are there a variety of sentence structures in the essay? Are there any errors regarding gender, tense, agreement, comparative construction, non-predicate verb, parallel structure, inconsistent point of view in the essay? Please describe the type of problem including the location of one instance and how they should be fixed.</i></p> <p>◆ Word Choice: Words convey the intended message in a specific, precise, and engaging manner. #weight=1 Rating 1: Words are too limited or difficult to understand. Rating 2:2 Rating 3: Many words are not understandable. Rating 4:4 Rating 5: Most words are understandable and specific in this context. Rating 6:6 Rating 7: Words are specific, precise and engaging.</p> <p>◆ Word Count: Does the essay meet the requirement of word tokens? #weight=1 Rating 1: Less than 100 words. Rating 2:2 Rating 3: At least 100 words but less than 140 words. Rating 4:4 Rating 5: At least 140 words but less than 180 words. Rating 6:6 Rating 7: At least 180 words and no more than 250 words.</p> <p>◆ Sentence Structure: Are there a variety of sentence structures in the essay? #weight=1 Rating 1: A very limited range of sentence structures. Rating 2:2 Rating 3: A limited range of sentence structures with some improper usages. Rating 4:4 Rating 5: A variety of sentence structures with few errors. Rating 6:6 Rating 7: A wide range of sentence structures with full flexibility and accuracy.</p>
4	Mechanics	<p>● Are there any common problems in terms of punctuation, spelling, capitalization, paragraphing in the essay? Please describe the type of problem including the location of one instance and indicate how it should be fixed.</p> <p>◆ Writing Convention: Standard writing conventions (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing) are used effectively to enhance readability in the essay. #weight=1 Rating 1: There are many serious errors in standard writing conventions; these errors frequently obscure meaning. Rating 2:2 Rating 3: There are occasional major errors or frequent minor errors in standard writing conventions; these errors can interfere with meaning. Three to five errors might occur per paragraph. Rating 4:4 Rating 5: There is one or two errors in standard writing conventions per paragraph. Rating 6:6 Rating 7: There is few or no errors in standard writing conventions per paragraph.</p>

APPENDIX 2

TABLE 4
GRADE REPORTS OF DRAFT 1 EXTRACTING FROM THE PEERCEPTIV PLATFORM

2021 Peerceptiv English Writing and Teaching Contest - Spring 2021 - (06/28/2021)												
Student Name	Document	Task Grade	Weighted Task Grade	Accuracy Grade	Helpfulness Grade	Reviewing Grade	Reviewing Late	Weighted Reviewing	Writing Grade	Writing Late	Weighted Writing Grade	OVERALL DRAFT GRADE
A	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	64	85	75	0	30	77	0	31	81
B	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	82	87	85	0	34	77	0	31	85
C	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	75	82	79	0	31	76	0	30	82
D	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	88	84	86	0	34	68	0	27	82
E	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	67	80	73	0	29	96	0	38	88
F	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	86	80	83	0	33	72	0	29	82
G	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	81	79	80	0	32	65	0	26	78
H	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	63	81	72	0	29	71	0	28	77
I	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	78	83	80	0	32	92	0	37	89
J	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	87	88	87	0	35	82	0	33	88
K	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	69	87	78	0	31	71	0	29	80
L	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	72	83	78	0	31	80	0	32	83
M	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	85	81	83	0	33	96	0	38	92
N	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	85	85	85	0	34	87	0	35	89
O	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	69	88	78	0	31	84	0	33	85
P	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	81	87	84	0	34	78	0	31	85
Q	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	77	82	80	0	32	58	0	23	75
R	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	81	89	85	0	34	80	0	32	86
S	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	73	83	78	0	31	85	0	34	85
T	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	83	82	82	0	33	88	0	35	88
U	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	70	87	78	0	31	92	0	37	88
V	Document 1, Draft 1	100	20	77	88	82	0	33	84	0	34	87

TABLE 5
GRADE REPORTS OF DRAFT 2 EXTRACTING FROM THE PEERCEPTIV PLATFORM

2021 Peerceptiv English Writing and Teaching Contest - Spring 2021 - (06/28/2021)												
Student Name	Document	Task Grade	Weighted Task Grade	Accuracy Grade	Helpfulness Grade	Reviewing Grade	Reviewing Late	Weighted Reviewing	Writing Grade	Writing Late	Weighted Writing Grade	OVERALL DRAFT GRADE
A	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	81	83	82	0	33	69	0	28	80
B	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	82	90	86	0	34	90	0	36	90
C	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	68	80	74	0	30	93	0	37	87
D	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	88	85	86	0	35	68	0	27	82
E	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	56	78	67	0	27	93	0	37	84
F	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	71	82	76	0	30	89	0	36	86
G	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	77	78	78	0	31	61	0	24	75
H	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	84	81	82	0	33	71	0	28	81
I	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	79	83	81	0	32	92	0	37	89
J	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	78	88	83	0	33	95	0	38	91
K	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	85	86	86	0	34	91	0	36	90
L	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	73	81	77	0	31	71	0	29	79
M	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	65	86	76	0	30	84	0	34	84
N	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	77	86	81	0	33	76	0	30	83
O	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	81	84	83	0	33	84	0	34	87
P	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	72	89	80	0	32	79	0	31	84
Q	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	77	87	82	0	33	70	0	28	81
R	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	77	84	80	0	32	74	0	30	82
S	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	80	84	82	0	33	77	0	31	83
T	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	92	80	86	0	34	72	0	29	83
U	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	86	86	86	0	34	79	0	32	86
V	Document 1, Draft 2	100	20	71	87	79	0	32	84	0	33	85

APPENDIX 3. ONLINE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Before our peer review course and Peerceptiv writing competition, what was your attitude or opinion about peer feedback? Are you supportive of it, against it or keeping neutral?
2. In general, do you think, peer review can help students improve their writing or not?
3. As a reviewer, in which aspect or aspects, have you made the greatest progress? Why?
4. As a reviewer, in which aspect or aspects, have you made the smallest progress or no progress? Why?
5. As a reviewer, what was your reviewing procedures, criteria and methods?
6. As a reviewer, in the four grading rubric dimensions (*Content, Organisation, Language and Mechanics*) on writing itself, which were given by Peerceptiv writing competition committee, have you had a special focus? If so, on which dimension have you had a special focus? And why have you had a special focus on the dimension? If not, why not expect a dimension? Or have you had another dimension you would like to focus on?
7. As a reviewee, has your writing been improved? How much has it been improved? Why? Please give examples.
8. Do you think the length or elaboration degree of written comments can have an influence on reviewees' writing development? Why?
9. Do you think the positive and negative comments can affect the development of reviewees' writing? Why?
10. Do you think the mood such as indicative, interrogative or imperative mood can affect reviewees' writing improvement? Why?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to express my gratitude to my students who have participated in the research and my loving families, especially Ms. ZHANG Qian and Ms. Mary Christine Webb for their support. Also, I am grateful to anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on the article.

REFERENCES

- [1] Baker, K. M. (2016). Peer review as a strategy for improving students' writing process. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17(3), 179-192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787416654794>
- [2] Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for academic purposes: Theory, politics, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [3] Berggren, J. (2014). Learning from giving feedback: a study of secondary-level students. *ELT Journal*, 69(1), 58-70. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu036>
- [4] Berndt, M., Strijbos, J.W. & Fischer, F. (2018). Effects of written peer-feedback content and sender's competence on perceptions, performance, and mindful cognitive processing. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 33, 31-49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-017-0343-z>
- [5] Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View*. London: Bloomsbury Academic. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310633029X>
- [6] Bitchener, J., Young, S. and Cameron, D., (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), pp.191-205.
- [7] Bruce, I. (2016). *Theory and Concepts of English for Academic Purposes*. Beijing, China: Tsinghua University Press.
- [8] Bruffee, K. A. (1980). *A Short Course in Writing. Practical Rhetoric for Composition Courses, Writing Workshops, and Tutor Training Programs*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- [9] Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2-28). London, UK: Longman.
- [10] Chandler, J., (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), pp.267-296. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9)
- [11] Chang, C. (2016). Two Decades of Research in L2 Peer Review. *Journal of Writing Research*, 8(1), 81-117. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2016.08.01.03>
- [12] Cho, Y., & Cho, K. (2010). Peer reviewers learn from giving comments. *Instructional Science*, 39(5), 629-643. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-010-9146-1>
- [13] Chomsky, N. (1965). Persistent Topics in Linguistic Theory. *Diogenes*, 13(51), 13-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/039219216501305102>
- [14] Council of Europe. (2022). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/table-1-cefr-3.3-common-reference-levels-global-scale>
- [15] Ding, A., & Bruce, I. (2017) *The English for Academic Purposes Practitioner*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59737-9>
- [16] Dochy, F., Segers, M., & Sluijsmans, D. (1999). The use of self-, peer- and co- assessment in higher education: A review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 24, 331-350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079912331379935>
- [17] Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 50, 100775. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100775>
- [18] Gao, Y., Schunn, C., & Yu, Q. (2018). The alignment of written peer feedback with draft problems and its impact on revision in peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation In Higher Education*, 44(2), 294-308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1499075>
- [19] Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language teaching research*, 9(3), 321-342.

- [20] Hu, G. (2019). Culture and Peer Feedback. *Feedback in Second Language Writing*. (1st ed., pp. 45-63). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547.005>
- [21] Hu, G., & Lam, S. T. E. (2010). Issues of Cultural Appropriateness and Pedagogical Efficacy: Exploring Peer Review in a Second Language Writing Class. *Instructional Science*, 38 (4), 371–394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9086-1>
- [22] Huisman, B., Saab, N., Driel, J., & Broek, P. (2018). Peer feedback on academic writing: undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. *Assessment & Evaluation In Higher Education*, 43(6), 955-968. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1424318>
- [23] Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary interactions: metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(2), pp.133-151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.02.001>
- [24] Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Continuum.
- [25] Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), pp.148-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005>
- [26] Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing. *Language Teaching*, 39 (2), 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- [27] Hyland, K., Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156-177. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.156>
- [28] Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.
- [29] Januin, J., & Stephen, J. (2015). Exploring Discourse Competence Elements in EAP Class Presentations through Document and Ethnographic Analyses. *Procedia - Social And Behavioral Sciences*, 208, 157-166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.192>
- [30] Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for Academic Purposes: A Guide and Resource Book for Teachers*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- [31] Lam, S. (2021). A web-based feedback platform for peer and teacher feedback on writing: An Activity Theory perspective. *Computers and Composition*, 62, 102666. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2021.102666>
- [32] Lin, G. H. C., & Chien, P. S. C. (2009). An investigation into effectiveness of peer feedback. *Journal of Applied Foreign Languages Fortune Institute of Technology*, 3, 79-87.
- [33] Liu, N. F., & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: the learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11, (3), 279-290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582>
- [34] Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 30-43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002>
- [35] Min, H. T. (2008). Reviewer Stances and Writer Perceptions in EFL Peer Review Training. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27 (3), 285–305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2008.02.002>
- [36] Nilson, L. (2003). Improving Student Peer Feedback. *College Teaching*, 51(1), 34-38. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000161>
- [37] Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccj003>
- [38] Santos, T. (1992). Ideology in composition: L1 and ESL. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1, 1–15.
- [39] Storch, N., 2005. Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), pp. 153-173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.002>
- [40] Tsui, A., & Ng, M. (2000). Do Secondary L2 Writers Benefit from Peer Comments?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147-170. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(00\)00022-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00022-9)
- [41] Tuzi, Frank. (2004). The impact of feedback on the revisions of L2 writers in an academic writing course. *Computers and Composition*, 21(2), 217–235.
- [42] Walker, M. (2014). The quality of written peer feedback on undergraduates' draft answers to an assignment, and the use made of the feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation In Higher Education*, 40(2), 232-247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.898737>
- [43] Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016b). Peer feedback in second language writing (2005-2014). *Language Teaching*, 49(4), 461–493. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000161>
- [44] Zhang, F., Schunn, C., Li, W., & Long, M. (2020) Changes in the reliability and validity of peer assessment across the college years. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45 (8), 1073-1087. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1724260>
- [45] Zhang, L., & Cheng, X. (2021). Examining the effects of comprehensive written corrective feedback on L2 EAP students' linguistic performance: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 54, 101043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101043>
- [46] Zhao, H. (2014). Investigating teacher-supported peer assessment for EFL writing. *ELT Journal*, 68(2), 155-168. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct068>
- [47] Zheng, C. (2012). Understanding the Learning Process of Peer Feedback Activity: An Ethnographic Study of Exploratory Practice. *Language Teaching Research*, 16 (1), 109–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811426248>

Xu (Jared) Liu was born in Yueyang, Hunan Province, China in 1994. He received his Postgraduate Diploma in English as Second Language Teaching and Masters Degree in Applied Linguistics at the University of Waikato in New Zealand in 2018.

He is an English instructor at English Language Center of Shantou University in China. His research interests relate to Corpus Linguistics, English for Academic Purposes, English for Specific Purposes, English writing, Second Language Acquisition, and Discourse Analysis.