Volume 4 / Issue 3, 2016
Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi - ENAD
Journal of Qualitative Research in Education - JOQRE

Deeper insights into University Students' Perceptions about Peer Feedback in Second Language Writing: A Phenomenological Approach

Üniversite Öğrencilerinin İkinci Dilde Yazma Konusunda Akran Dönütüyle İlgili Algılarına Yönelik Derinlemesine Bakış: Fenomenolojik Bir Yaklaşım

Eda Duruk*

To cite this article/Atıf için:
Duruk, E. (2016). Deeper insights into university students' perceptions about peer feedback in second language writing: A phenomenological approach. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi - Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 4(3), 28- 42. [Online] www.enadonline.com
DOI :10.14689/issn.2148-2624.1.4c3s2m

Article Info
Received: 05.06.2016
Revision: 01.11.2016
Accepted: 13.11.2016

Abstract. This phenomenological study was carried out to analyze whether students attending to a preparatory programme in a Turkish state university changed their perceptions about peer feedback after training them. The study was conducted with 25 students from the department of Medicine all of whom were attending the Mandatory English Preparatory Program in 2014 academic year. In this qualitative study, the research data were obtained from students via semi-structured interviews which were applied at the beginning and at the end of the study to have clear insights about students' perceptions on peer feedback before/after training them. During each training process, students were asked to write reflections after each feedback session, and each of them was analyzed to design the next training session. The data collected in the study were analyzed by content analysis technique and all the data were analyzed manually. The study findings revealed that training students on peer feedback yielded different results about their perceptions on peer feedback.

Keywords: Second Language Writing, Peer Feedback, Teacher Feedback.

Öz. Bu fenomolojik çalışmanın amacı Türkiyedeki bir devlet üniversitesinde hazırlık okuyan öğrencilerin akran dönütüyle ilgili görüşlerinin onları eğittikten sonra değişip değişmediğini incelemektir. Çalışma 2014 yılında zorunlu olarak hazırlıkta okumakta olan 25 Tıp Fakültesi öğrencisini kapsamaktadır. Katılımcıların eğitim öncesi ve sonrası görüşleriyle ilgili daha açık bir inceleme yapmak için bu nitel çalışmada veriler eğitim öncesi ve sonrası uygulanan yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşme ile toplanmıştır. Her bir eğitim süresince, öğrencilerden eğitim sonrası yansımalarını yazmaları istenmiştir ve bunların incelenmesi sonucunda bir sonraki eğitim süreci şekillenmiştir. Çalışmada toplanan veriler içerik analazi tekniği ile incelenmiştir. Bulgular öğrencileri akran dönütüyle ilgili eğitmenin onlarda bu konuyla ilgili farklı algılar yarattığını göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimler: İkinci Dilde Yazna, Akran Dönütü, Öğretmen Dönütü.

* *Corresponding Author*: Instructor Eda Duruk, PhD, Pamukkale University, School of Foreign Languages, Denizli/Turkey. Email: durukeda@gmail.com

Introduction

Peer feedback which is commonly used in second language (L2) writing classrooms is an effective activity which provides opportunities for writing teachers to help their students get more feedback on their papers as well as give students practice with a range of skills important in the development of language and writing ability, such as meaningful interaction with peers, a greater exposure to ideas, and new perspectives on the writing process (Hansen & Liu, 2005). Therefore, lots of current studies support the idea that peer feedback is effective for a variety of reasons when used correctly, especially when students are trained on how to give and use feedback (Paulus, 1999; Min, 2006). Teachers can use it as a way to present writing skills to students. They can create a student-centered classroom with learners capable of critically evaluating their own written work (Braine, 2003).

Considering such kind of classrooms, it is important to note that learning to give effective peer feedback can lead to the creation of better self-editors. In other words, students who are able to look at their friends' papers and accurately diagnose areas which they need to improve and revise can also do so for their own papers (Rollinson, 2005).

Nystrand (1989) pointed out that peer feedback includes careful planning on the teacher's part and that students must be shown how to respond to writing in a peer context. Huff and Kline (1987) underlined the importance of providing students with appropriate peer feedback skills, such as giving and receiving criticism, articulating ideas about positive and negative qualities of writing, and recognizing different stages of the drafting process. Benesch (1984) proposed that before peer work on writing can begin, teachers need to ascertain students' writing proficiency level, feedback skills, and collaborative work experience to be able to determine appropriate learning goals and effective peer response strategies. She also suggested that teachers provide models of constructive feedback in their responses to students' writing. Baker, McQuade, Sommers, & Tratner (1989) noted that peer feedback should involve reading and writing as the primary activities. They stressed the peer response sheet as a tool to facilitate effective peer feedback. According to them, this sheet allows students time to contemplate and formulate appropriate feedback in writing before getting involved in a discussion with the author. The sheet usually consists of a number of specific questions that students should answer about their peer's essay before discussing it, or the sheet might present a list of areas that should be investigated by the reader before a response is made to the peer's writing.

In conclusion, lots of different current studies confirm the importance of peer feedback from different point of views (Min, 2006; Rollinson, 2005; Hansen & Liu, 2005; Braine, 2003; Paulus, 1999). It is true that peer feedback is a necessary component for a student-centered classroom and it makes students more conscious during the process of writing. Thus, the focus of the present study is also on peer feedback.

The researcher is concerned about the perceptions of students in her classroom towards peer feedback in writing. Her classroom consists of 25 students, all of whom are from the department of Medicine. At the beginning of the first semester, they were placed to the upper-intermediate level and they have been exposed to writing course 5 hours a week.

The researcher noticed that by the time the students started their spring semester and she was assigned as their new writing instructor, she started to take for granted that they already know how to be effective peer feedback giver-receiver and that they appreciate peer feedback as much as teacher feedback. Once she assigned them a topic to write an essay and asked them to give peer feedback in

the classroom the following week, she realized that they do not take it as a serious process. She thought that it could be because they do not know how to be effective feedback givers and receivers.

However, later on she learned that during the first semester their previous instructor resorted more to emphasizing teacher feedback than to emphasizing peer feedback. What is more, until they graduated from high school, they had been exposed to traditional Turkish education system, in which teachers were seen as the source of knowledge and students trust them without so much questioning. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to train the students on peer feedback and check if their perceptions towards it have changed.

Previous Studies conducted on Peer Feedback

Several studies conducted so far investigated peer feedback under different aspects such as research on training and research on peer and teacher feedback, and so on. Thus, each of them will be discussed separately.

Research on peer and teacher feedback

Connor and Asenavage (1994) examined the impact of peer and teacher feedback on eight ESL students. The students were from different countries in a university in the USA. The researchers found that teacher feedback had a much more significant effect than peer feedback because peer feedback was found to contribute only 5% resulting in changes.

Zhang (1995), cited in the previous sections, employed a controversial study of ESL students at two universities in the USA. He found that 94% of students preferred teacher feedback to peer feedback. Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, & Huang (1998) investigated student attitudes to teacher and peer feedback. Similar to the findings of Zhang (1995), they found that 93% of their EFL students in Hong Kong and Taiwan said they would like to receive peer feedback as one kind of feedback. Paulus (1999) investigated the impact of peer and teacher feedback on 11 ESL students. The students were on an intensive English language course at a public university in the USA. He found that peer feedback accounted for 13.9% of all changes and teacher feedback for 34.3%. Therefore, he concluded that teacher feedback was more likely to have an impact than peer feedback with 87% of teacher comments resulting in some change compared to 51% of peer feedback. Tsui and Ng's (2000) study of Hong Kong secondary schools and Hu's (2005) study of Chinese students studying English in Singapore also revealed that students welcomed peer feedback.

As can be seen, peer and teacher feedback are investigated from different perspectives. However, there is not enough research in Turkish context which have analyzed students' perceptions towards peer feedback after a training process. Thus, the present study aims to investigate preparatory students' perceptions towards peer feedback.

Research on training

One of the important aspects of peer feedback to writing and its implementation in the ESL classroom concerns the role of training. It covers the preparation of students for participation in the peer feedback activity. Responding to writing is a skill for which most students generally do not have enough experience. Thus, the fact that they will be able to effectively read and respond to someone else's writing, constructively react to a response to their own writing from a peer, and, based on the peer feedback activity, successfully revise their texts is questionable. As Zhang (1995) suggests, if we expect our students to skillfully participate in peer response and perform appropriate revisions of their

texts, it is important to consider that they need to be given the opportunity to learn how. Several studies therefore conducted to examine the effect of training on students.

Among these studies, Stanley (1992) performed a long lasted training in peer evaluation to students in an ESL freshman composition class. Her training included familiarizing students with the genre of their classmates' writing and introducing techniques of effective communication. She selected a conversational analysis approach to categorizing the evaluators' responses and found that the coached groups made substantially more responses and more types of responses than the uncoached groups. The analysis of the drafts also revealed more revisions in response to peer evaluation in the coached groups than in the uncoached groups.

Zhu (1995) used a small group conference approach to training L1 peer responders in university freshman composition classes. There was an experimental and a control group. They watched a demonstration video to learn certain basic concepts about peer feedback. The experimental group, in addition, met with the instructors in groups of three, three times during the semester. The following phases were included in each teacher–student conference; a read aloud by a volunteer student of his/her essay with peers reading along, and a discussion of the essay and suggestions for revision. During the discussion session, the instructors asked feedback givers to critically comment on the merits and shortcomings of the essay and to provide specific suggestions. They also showed tactics writers could employ to elicit feedback and seek clarifications from their responders. In the end Zhu (1995) found that such peer feedback training had a significant effect on both the quantity and quality of feedback.

Berg (1999) employed a quasi-experimental study to examine how trained peer feedback shapes ESL college/graduate students' revisions and revision quality. The experimental group got different kinds of peer feedback training activities ranging from 5 to 45 min each. The control group received no instruction in how to conduct peer feedback. A comparison of the first and revised drafts written by both groups revealed that the trained feedback group made significantly more meaning changes than the untrained group, and the quality of revisions made by the trained feedback group was significantly better than that of the untrained group, regardless of students' L2 language proficiency. Therefore, Berg (1999) concluded that trained peer feedback resulted in positive impact on ESL students' revision types and quality.

Min (2005) employed a classroom study in which she trained 18 responders in a sophomore EFL writing class. She identified the following four characteristics of comments reported to facilitate students' revisions; clarifying writers' intentions, identifying problems, explaining the nature of problems, and making specific suggestions. Thus, she used them as guidelines during in-class training. She also used Zhu's (1995) conference method to meet with each responder twice to provide individual assistance. Subsequent text analyses of the written comments performed by feedback givers post peer review training revealed that feedback givers could produce significantly more comments containing two or three aforementioned characteristics and were able to produce more relevant and specific comments on global issues.

In summary, lots of researchers have underlined the importance of training on peer feedback (Min, 2005; Berg, 1999; Zhang, 1995; Zhu, 1995; Stanley, 1992). Some of them pointed out the conversational approach and a small group conference approach to training L1 peer responders, while others employed different kinds of peer feedback training activities with the help of checklists. In the present study, each training phase will be determined based on the reflections the students have written.

Therefore, keeping these in mind, the research questions sought to be answered in the present study are formulated as follows:

1. What are preparatory students' perceptions towards peer feedback before training them?

2. What are preparatory students' perceptions towards peer feedback after training them?

Dependent variable of the study is students' perceptions towards peer feedback. Independent variable is the training sessions students received.

Methodology

Participants

The participants of the study were 25 students, all of whom were from the department of Medicine. They were chosen as participants depending on convenience sampling, they are selected because of their convenient accessibility and proximity to the researcher and they were readily available. They were attending to a preparatory programme of a state university in Turkey. At the beginning of the first term, a placement test was applied to all preparatory school students in which 4 skills were included. Depending on this test, they were placed to the same language proficiency level which is upper-intermediate. Although they also took a writing course during the previous (first) term, they had no prior experience with peer feedback. Considering the ethical perspective, the consent form of the participants was taken before the study. The participants were from the same proficiency level, but there were some differences among their writing proficiency levels. The writing scores participants took from a midterm exam revealed that all participants had scores ranging from 76 to 91.

Setting

They were taking writing course 5 hours per week. This course was based on the process approach. Thus, there were various activities such as pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing, etc. The first step of writing is prewriting. This step includes brainstorming, gathering information, thinking, planning, and listing. The purpose of drafting step is to just get the information in writing and form a sequenced list in paragraph format. Step three is revising, in which the students rereads the draft and finds areas that should be fixed. The fourth step is editing. After doing all the steps, the students finally have a completed writing.

Intervention

At the beginning of the semester the researcher made some observations and wrote reflection. After working with an expert from the field to diagnose a problem and develop data collection strategies, she decided to find out more about the students' reluctance towards peer feedback. She thought that they might have negative attitudes towards peer feedback. Therefore, the researcher elicited their opinions, and based on the findings she decided to include training and planned the initial step of training. Then, she revised the training each time she implemented it based on the feedback received.

The intervention implemented in the class was developed on the basis of the reflections examined after the practice of each training phase. The researcher anticipated that this process would contribute to the students' understanding of giving-receiving feedback.

Data Collection

In phenomenological studies, the experiences and perceptions of individuals from their own perspectives are sought to be brought to the fore. Keeping in line with this aim, the researcher used two different sources of data to help her "see" whether students' perceptions towards peer feedback changed based on the training they received.

Firstly, semi-structured interviews were applied at the beginning and at the end of the study to elicit and gain in-depth insights regarding students' perceptions of peer feedback. As Creswell (1994) indicates such kind of an interview not only gives the opportunity to give ones opinions or beliefs about a subject but also makes it possible for the researchers to ask some other follow-up questions or to make explanations. Thus, the justification for the use of this technique is that the present study seeks to reflect students perceptions on peer feedback and such kind of an interview can enable participants to talk about their perceptions in detail. As for the formulation of the questions, they were formulated by the researcher and an expert from the field working as the other rater in the present study. The researcher who is also the instructor of the class has her PhD in English Language Teaching department and conducted several qualitative studies. As discussed in the previous section, depending on the observations and reflection of the researcher, they came together and diagnosed a problem which became the ground of the questions formed. The semi-structured interview questions were formulated as follows:

1. What is "feedback" for you? How should be the process of feedback?
2. Which of the feedback types is the most effective one? Teacher feedback, peer feedback, or both?
3. How should be the teacher feedback? Which aspects are important?
4. How should be the peer feedback? Which aspects are important?
5. Do you think that giving feedback is beneficial for you?

The interviews were conducted on a voluntary basis depending on the date, place and time the participants wanted between the dates of 7th April 2014 - 10th May 2014. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. Finally, reflections of students after each feedback session were analyzed to design the next training session. The materials and instruction used for the training phase will be discussed in the procedure. The timeline was given below in Table 1.

Table 1.
The Timeline of the Study

April, 2014	Working on the baseline data gathered by means of my systematic reflection. Working with another teacher to diagnose a problem and developing data collection strategies.
April, 2014	Making semi-structured interview to collect data on students' perceptions about feedback. Searching journals for literature. Having professional reading.
April-May, 2014	Implementing intervention. Going through the first training phase. Making students give feedback. Asking students write reflection.
May, 2014	After examining the reflections, implementing the second training phase. Making students give feedback. Asking students write reflection.
May, 2014	Depending on the reflections, applying the final training phase. Making students give feedback. Applying the previous semi-structured interview questions to collect data on students' perceptions about feedback.

Data Analysis

After applying semi-structured interview questions, content analysis technique was used to analyze the data. All data were analyzed manually. First, all data were transcribed. While extracting the themes from the data the research questions were taken into account. It is in this context that the data gathered from the semi-structured interviews were put to the files and one more copy was obtained for the independent-expert from the field making the content analysis and coding the data to the themes as the researcher does separately.

After the analysis, the researcher and the expert came together. Each theme formed from the data was examined and a consensus was reached. Finally, the researcher moved to the next step including the discussion of the findings. Depending on the themes coded, the researcher made frequency counts, and interpreted them within percentages. While discussing them, the most attractive opinions of the participants were chosen and they were directly quoted to support the findings. While making use of quotations participants were given different names. A sample to show the coding process for the themes was given below in Table 2.

Table 2.
A Sample for the Theme Analysis

Question number	Theme	Code	Related quotation
3	Detailed	Content	Feedback should include content analysis to generate new ideas
		Grammar	It should give us the understanding of common grammatical mistakes

Procedure and Training on Peer Feedback

Similar to the nature of action research which is based on classroom experience, the training is also based on recommendations in the peer feedback literature mentioned earlier in the present study. The particular training program used for this study was developed over the course of several weeks (see timeline above). Before the beginning of the first training session, the following steps were considered to be employed in the classroom (Adapted from Berg, 1999); comfortable classroom atmosphere and trust among students was emphasized orally in the classroom. Benefits of having peers, as opposed to just teachers, respond to one's writing were discussed. Through a class discussion, the students concluded that all authors, student as well as professional, ask others to read their work, and that doing so is an indication of a smart writer. Students and the teacher gave feedback as a class to an unknown ESL student's paragraph. Those activities served for awareness raising.

After those activities, the teacher moved on to the first training sessions. The following steps were followed:

1. The first training session covered practicing how to use the general peer help worksheet and correction symbols provided in the text book.

2. The topic of the week was classification essay and when it was covered, the students were expected to bring their first drafts of the given assignment.

3. When they brought their first draft, the teacher practiced the first training session with the class. She explained the general peer help worksheet and correction symbols, and gave a sample of a student's essay to the class. She allowed them 15 minutes to analyze the paragraph, and then they altogether went through the essay.

4. Next, she gave the submitted papers of the students to each other in order to give feedback till the next lesson. The teacher also asked students to write reflection on the process they went through.

The analysis of the students' reflections formed the second training session:

1. Most of the students wrote that they needed a deeper analysis of each paragraph written by them. Depending on these responses, second checklist was adapted from the relevant research discussed in the literature review.

2. The topic of the week was comparison & contrast essay and when it was covered, the students were expected to bring their first drafts of the given assignment.

3. When they brought their first draft, again the teacher practiced the second training session with the class. The teacher, again, used a sample of a student's essay for the training. She explained each step one by one, and gave them 15 minutes to analyze the sample essay. Then, they altogether gave feedback to the paper.

4. Afterwards, she gave the submitted papers of the students to each other in order to give feedback till the next lesson. The teacher also asked students to write reflection on the process they went through.

Similar to the previous one, the reflections of the students was the basis of the last training session:

1. The topic of the week was cause & effect essay, and when it was covered the students were expected to bring their first drafts of the given assignment.

2. When they brought their first draft, again the teacher practiced the last training session with the class.

3. She shared a previously written essay with the class and formed groups of two. She wrote the questions which will also be used in oral feedback session on the board, and allowed students 15 minutes to talk about the questions.

4. Then, she gave the submitted papers of the students to each other in order to give oral feedback during the same lesson. The teacher formed groups of two, allowed students enough time to read their partners' papers, and then made them give oral feedback.

5. Finally, the researcher applied the previous questionnaire to check if students' perceptions about feedback have changed after all the training process they went through.

Results and Discussion

The first research question was “What are preparatory students’ perceptions towards peer feedback before training them?” While talking about the responses of the participants, pseudonyms were used. Firstly, semi-structured interviews were applied at the beginning of the study. Analysis of students’ responses to five questions resulted in the themes shown below in Table 3.

Table 3.
Percentage of Each Theme Regarding Students' Perceptions on Peer Feedback Before Training Them

1.	**What is "feedback" for you? How should be the process of feddback?**								
Themes	punctuation	language use	strengths	careful	educated	objective	accurate		
Percentage	13%	25%	10%	12%	12%	7%	19%		
2.	**Which of the feedback types is the most effective one?**								
Themes	teacher	peer	both						
Percentage	48%	20%	32%						
3.	**How should be the teacher feedback?**								
Themes	detailed	unbiased	open the alternatives	faciliate learning	stimılate our reasoning	show mistake	report strengths	comprehensible	correct mistakes
Percentage	9%	12%	8%	15%	9%	12%	4%	8%	22%
4.	**How should be the peer feedback?**								
Themes	correct mistakes	teach sth to giver and receiver	seen a serious	comprehensible	show mistake	unbiased	not artifical		
Percentage	38%	7%	5%	10%	19%	10%	12%		
5.	**Do you think that giving feedback is beneficial for you?**								
Themes	yes	no	sometimes						
Percentage	28%	32%	40%						

The results of the first question provided in Table 3 showed that language use (25%) and accurateness (19%) are the most important aspects of feedback. To illustrate, as Mehmet indicated *"The most necessary part of feedback is about grammar"* which is directly related to language use. To add more to this theme, Ayşe mentioned that *"vocabulary and grammar together form the prior aspect"*, again supporting "language use". For the second theme- accurateness, Caner claimed that *"feedback should be correct"* and Aysun said *"It should directly show the accurate use of vocabulary"*. The results revealed that punctuation (13%) is the subsequent important aspect which should not be skipped while giving feedback. For instance, as Oya indicated;

"punctuation is one of the difficulties I face with, so I need feedback about this".

It is interesting that many students think feedback should be educated (12%) which necessitates training that the researcher planned in advance. The most striking quotation is from Damla;

"Feedback can't be something that we do accidentally. We should be taught how to do it, we should be informed about the steps in giving feedback".

That was interesting because the researcher realized that there are some students who imply the importance of training for feedback by talking about the steps in it.

As for the results of the second question, it can be seen that most students (48%) prefer teacher feedback. For example, Turgut indicated;

"In a second language we are not as proficient as our teachers, so I don't trust my friends as I do my teacher. I certainly prefer Teacher feedback".

Özge noted;

"My teacher is knowledgeable in her field and she has lots of experience, so I would say teacher feedback".

These quotations show the tendency to respect more to teachers than to peers while giving feedback. On the other hand, although few in number, some students prefer peer feedback on its own (20%). As Burak mentioned;

"I prefer feedback from my friends because in this way I gain more awareness concerning the process of feedback and this, in turn, improves my own writing".

The results of the third question showed that correcting mistakes (22%) and facilitating learning (15%) are the most important aspects of teacher feedback. For the former one, Özlem discussed that

"If it is my teacher who is giving feedback to my writing, then it should correct my mistakes instead of just highlighting them".

Hülya also mentioned;

"In most of the cases we are unaware of the mistakes we make, so our teachers should make us conscious about them by explicitly explaining them".

These two quotations support that some students think correcting mistakes is of great importance in feedback. For the latter one, as Ali indicated;

"Teacher feedback should make us learn something new. For example, when we don't know how to support an idea or what signal words to use, the teacher should inform us so that we can do it in the following writing sessions".

Thus, he means that feedback should trigger learning.

The results revealed that being unbiased (12%) and showing mistakes (12%) are the subsequent important aspects. Concerning being unbiased, Ömer mentioned that

"While the teacher is giving feedback, she shouldn't pay attention or even look at the name of the student who has written the paper because sometimes teachers can be influenced from the names".

Ayla also indicated*;*

"When a teacher is giving feedback I think that they correct more if the writer is a student who is not so much active in the classroom".

Thus, it can be seen that some of the students are worried about being subjective from the part of the teacher.

The results of the fourth question revealed that most students (38%) think peer feedback should correct mistakes. That finding is similar to the third question in that students also believed teachers should correct mistakes. As Funda claimed;

"In my opinion, peer feedback can be beneficial for us because we can show each other our mistakes and correct them easily".

It is also interesting that a limited number of students had the assumption that peer feedback should not be artificial (12%). Çağla said that

"I give feedback to my friends as I have to do. I don't think that ıt would be helpful because we do it in an artificial way without exactly diagnosing the parts requiring feedback".

Therefore, it is implied by the student that peer feedback shouldn't be artificial.

The analysis of the fifth question showed that most students (40%) are not so much sure about the benefits of peer feedback for feedback givers. The previous quotation from Çağla supports this point of view. Moreover, as Kemal indicated;

"I have some doubts for giving feedback. I don't feel very confident about writing in English. If I don't believe in myself, then how am I supposed to be helpful as a feedback giver?"

It is also important to note that students refusing the benefits (32%) are slightly more than the ones accepting it (28%).

The second research question was "What are preparatory students' perceptions towards peer feedback after training them?" After the first training session, the students were expected to write reflections. The analysis of them revealed that most of them (n: 16; 64%) were unsatisfied with first training session because it was not detailed enough (see Procedures for the training session). Some of them (n: 10; 40%) noted that it did not so much foster the quality of their essays, and some (n: 11; 44%) added that a more comprehensive way of responding to each other's papers would be more beneficial. Thus, the researcher adapted a more comprehensible checklist, and included it in the second training session (see Procedures for the training session).

Similar to the first one, the students wrote reflections which were once more analyzed to conduct the last training session. That time more positive comments from students (n: 19; 76%) were obtained. However, there was one thing suggested in some students' (n: 5; 20%) papers. They discussed that only giving written feedback is boring and they added that it is sometimes tedious. By considering these in mind, the researcher conducted the last training session (see Procedures for the training session). When it was over, the researcher applied the previous semi-structured interview questions once more to the students to investigate whether the training sessions changed students' perceptions on peer feedback. The analysis of students' responses to five questions resulted in the themes shown below in Table 4.

The results of the first question provided in Table 4 showed that accurate (21%) and educated (18%) feedback are the most important aspects. To support the former theme, Burak claimed that

"Giving feedback is a serious process and it should be correct all the time so that students can trust it".

Canan also mentioned;

"If feedback directs me incorrectly, I can start to question the things that I do right each time, which would affect me in a negative way".

The results revealed that talking about strengths (17%) is the subsequent important aspect which should not be skipped while giving feedback. As Çiğdem indicates;

"I think feedback doesn't only mean talking about mistakes because it demotivates me if it is done in that way. Therefore, I think that it should also show me what I do best, show me my success".

It can be understood that strengths should be also taken into consideration while giving feedback.

Table 4.
Percentage of Each Theme Regarding Students' Perceptions on Peer Feedback After Training Them

1.	**What is "feedback" for you? How should be the process of feddback?**						
Themes	difficult to give	language use	strengths	careful	educated	fosters	accurate
Percentage	8%	13%	17%	14%	18%	8%	21%
2.	**Which of the feedback types is the most effective one?**						
Themes	teacher	peer	both				
Percentage	36%	28%	36%				
3.	**How should be the teacher feedback?**						
Themes	detailed	unbiased	open the alternatives	faciliate learning	stimılate our reasoning	show mistake	Report strengths	correct mistakes
Percentage	12%	6%	11%	18%	6%	18%	8%	21%
4.	**How should be the peer feedback?**						
Themes	correct mistakes	teach sth to giver and receiver	seen a serious	no too long	interactive	unbiased	not artifical	
Percentage	22%	20%	20%	7%	16%	9%	7%	
5.	**Do you think that giving feedback is beneficial for you?**						
Themes	yes	no	sometimes				
Percentage	28%	24%	48%				

The analysis of second question revealed that equal number of students (36%) prefers teacher feedback or the combination of two. It is followed by peer (28%), respectively. Thus when compared to the previous interview, more positive opinions can be seen after training students on giving feedback. Deniz claimed that

"After learning how to give feedback effectively, I now think that peer feedback will be fruitful for me. I can give more helpful feedback and I trust my friends more when I receive feedback".

As can be seen some students have positive attitudes towards feedback after training them.

The results of the third question showed that correcting mistakes (21%), facilitating learning (18%), and showing mistakes (18%) are the most important aspects of teacher feedback. To indicate the importance of error correction, Burak said;

"Teacher is the most experienced and knowledgeable person in the classroom, so she should correct our mistakes while giving feedback".

For the facilitation of learning, Ayla mentioned;

"If it is my teacher who is giving feedback, after each feedback I should learn something new".

Hence, it can be concluded that teacher is seen as the source of learning in feedback.

When it comes to the results of the fourth question, it can be seen that most students (22%) think peer feedback should correct mistakes. As Ali claims;

"We know how to give feedback and I believe that if we want to help each other we should correct our errors".

It is followed by the assumption that peer feedback should teach something to giver and receiver (20%). As Özge indicated;

"Peer feedback is similar to teacher feedback in that it should teach or point out something which students haven't noticed before".

There are some students who think that it should be seen as a serious process (20%). Turgut noted;

"The training sessions taught me that there are lots of things to consider while giving feedback. It is not just looking at the sentences and highlighting grammatical errors".

It can be understood that some students became aware of the feedback process and take it more serious after training them.

The results regarding the fifth and the last question revealed that most students (48%) think peer feedback is sometimes beneficial for feedback givers. It is also important to note that after training session, students refusing the benefits (24%) are fewer than the ones refusing it before training session (32%). To support this Kemal said that

"Beforehand, I thought that students cannot effectively give feedback as we are all from the same proficiency level, but then, our teacher taught us how to give feedback and guided us which made me believe that we can also do that".

It is clear that some students started to have positive attitude towards peer feedback.

Depending on the results, it can be concluded that training students on peer feedback yielded different results about their perceptions on peer feedback. To make further discussion on how students' perceptions changed over time after they received training, it can be pointed out that in the first questionnaire 40% of the students were not so much sure about the benefits of peer feedback for feedback givers, whereas in the second questionnaire 48% of the students feel so. In the former one, 32% of the students regarded giving peer feedback as not beneficial, while in the latter one 24% of the students rejected its benefits. The plausible reasons for such kind of responses can be the fact that peer feedback was perceived as a tool to give more control to students as it allowed them to make active decisions about whether or not to use their peers' comments as opposed to a passive reliance on teachers' feedback. What is more, at the end of the training sessions students' definitions for the concept of feedback slightly changed because two new responses were found; feedback is difficult to give (24%), and it should foster development (24%). Besides, when their responses related to peer feedback were compared, two new definitions arose; peer feedback should be interactive (28%), and it should not be too long (12%). Such kind of an attitude towards peer feedback can be due to the fact that peer feedback was seen to have encouraged a collaborative dialogue in which two-way feedback was formed and meaning was negotiated mutually. As Topping (2000) indicates, while giving peer feedback, students both conduct to their own texts and read the texts written by other students, adopt the role of interested readers and commentators, and help each other in the elaboration of better texts. This collaboration increases a range of social and communication skills, including negotiation skills

and diplomacy, verbal communication skills, giving and accepting criticism, justifying one's position and assessing suggestions objectively. This process can be the reason for the students' new perceptions towards peer feedback to be difficult to give or to foster development.

Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research

This study found that training students on peer feedback changed their perceptions towards it. Furthermore, after the training sessions, new themes emerged from students regarding the process of peer feedback. However, it is important to note that this study was a small scale study and more research is required to confirm its findings. On the other hand, it can be seen that the findings are sufficiently encouraging to implement peer feedback in English writing classrooms in Turkey. From a pedagogical point of view, many other ways of giving peer feedback should be sought to implement in the classroom because peer feedback can take many different forms depending on its purposes. There can be other factors affecting students' perceptions on peer feedback such as the proficiency level of the feedback givers. Further research should be conducted to elucidate these issues.

References

Baker, M., McQuade, D., Sommers, N., & Tratner, M. (1989). *Resources for Teaching Student Writers at Work and in the Company of Other Writers: The Bedford Prizes* (pp. 102-107). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Benesch, S. (1984). *Improving peer response: collaboration between teachers and students.* Urbana, IL. ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Berg, B. C. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 215–241.

Braine, G. (2003). From a teacher-centered to a student-centered approach: A study of peer feedback in Hong Kong writing classes. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 13, 269–288.

Connor, U., & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(3), 257–276.

Creswell, J.W. (1994). Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed approaches. NY: Sage.

Hansen, J., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. *ELT Journal*, 59, 31–38.

Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(3), 321–342.

Huff, R., & Kline, C. R. (1987). *The Contemporary Writing Curriculum: Rehearsing, Composing, and Valuing.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Jacobs, G. M., Curtis, A., Braine, G., & Huang, S.-Y. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 307–317.

Min, H. T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System*, 33(2), 293–308.

Min, H. T. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 118–141.

Nystrand, M. (1989). A social-interactive model of writing. *Written Communication 6, 66-85.*

Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 265–289.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. ELT Journal, 59, 23–30.

Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. Journal of Second Language Writing, 1, 217– 233.

Topping, K. J. (2000). Peer Assisted Learning: A Practical Guide for Teachers. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? Journal of Second Language Writing, 9(2), 147–170.

Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing 4,209-222.*

Zhu, W. (1995). Effects of training for peer response on students' comments and interaction. Written Communication, 1(4), 492–528.

Author
Instructor Eda Duruk, PhD, Pamukkale University,
School of Foreign Languages, Denizli/Turkey.

Contact
email: durukeda@gmail.com
+90 258 296 1546