6-24-2015

Getting on the Same Page: The Hermeneutics of Peer Feedback in Composition Classrooms

Mellisa Huffman

Mellisa Huffman_____
Candidate

English_____
Department

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

Michelle Hall Kells, Chairperson_____

Charles Paine_____

Pisarn Bee Chamcharatsri_____

Melissa Axelrod_____

GETTING ON THE SAME PAGE: THE HERMENEUTICS OF PEER FEEDBACK

IN COMPOSITION CLASSROOMS

BY

MELLISA HUFFMAN

B.A., English, Angelo State University, 2000
M.A., English, Angelo State University, 2005

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

English

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

May 8, 2015

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my best friend and partner, Jonathan Thompson. You not only supported me financially throughout graduate school but, more importantly, you gave me much-needed moral support. You helped me remain strong, grounded, and focused throughout graduate school. I also dedicate this work to my parents, Glenn and Twyla Huffman, who financially supported me, but who also instilled in me the work ethic needed to complete this work. Jon, Mom, and Dad, I am eternally grateful for your love and support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank Dr. Michelle Hall Kells for her continual support, encouragement, and guidance throughout my graduate career. She provided invaluable feedback that helped form, develop, and revise the dissertation's topic and direction. I am undoubtedly a better scholar and writer as a result of taking coursework with her and collaborating with her throughout the dissertation-writing process.

I would also like to thank the other dissertation committee members for their unique contributions to my scholarship. Dr. Charles Paine's rhetorical genre theory course deepened my interest in and exploration of peer feedback as a genre. I feel extremely fortunate to have worked with such a kind and supportive mentor and brilliant scholar over the past six years. Bee Chamcharatsri guided my research in working with non-native English speakers in peer feedback contexts, and Melissa Axelrod offered very useful resources for conceptualizing sociolinguistic aspects of peer feedback. All the committee members generously gave of their time to meet with me and offer support when necessary throughout the entire process. Many thanks to all of you.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge Anna Knutson, Dr. Dan Cryer, Dr. Lindsey Ives, Dr. Greg Evans Haley, and Dr. Tiffany Bourelle for their help in completing this project. Dan, Lindsey, and Anna gave me feedback on various iterations of dissertation chapters, attended related conference sessions, and served as sounding boards for many of my ideas. Greg's scholarship offered background knowledge and sources for conceptualizing philosophical hermeneutics, and Tiffany recommended scholarship for defining virtual medium and mode. Thanks, everyone!

GETTING ON THE SAME PAGE: THE HERMENEUTICS OF PEER FEEDBACK
IN COMPOSITION CLASSROOMS

by

Mellisa Huffman

BACHELORS OF ARTS, LITERATURE
MASTERS OF ARTS, LITERATURE

DOCTORATE OF PHILOSOPHY, ENGLISH

ABSTRACT

This dissertation reconceptualizes print-based and virtual peer feedback (peer review, peer editing, and peer response) within composition classrooms as hermeneutic or interpretive acts. Grounding peer feedback within philosophical hermeneutics explains why empirical research and anecdotal evidence illustrate contradictions regarding peer feedback's benefits to students. Students' interpretations of what is happening/supposed to happen within peer feedback contexts impacts their performances in these contexts, and these interpretations occur through complex interplays of rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual interpretive fields. Enacting a hermeneutic pedagogy, which consists of engaging students in a series of scaffolded preparatory and reflective activities, collaborating with students in determining and adapting peer feedback protocol, and tailoring peer feedback protocol and mode to the classroom context, better accounts for the complex frames of reference students use to interpret and participate in peer feedback and allows students greater agency in enacting it. The dissertation culminates with practical guides for adopting and adapting a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy in both mainstream and second-language writing courses conducted in face-to-face and virtual classroom settings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1: Reading Theoretical Base Maps, Surveying Scholarly Landscapes: The Need for a Hermeneutic Peer Feedback Guide

This dissertation reconceptualizes the pedagogical practice of print-based and computer-mediated peer feedback within both mainstream and second-language writing (L2) courses as hermeneutic or interpretive acts. I argue enacting a hermeneutic pedagogy, which entails instructors adapting peer review protocol and mode to classroom context, engaging students in a series of scaffolded preparatory and reflective activities, and collaborating with students in determining and adapting peer feedback protocol, better accounts for the complex frames of reference students use to interpret and participate in these genres. Although the various subfields of Composition Studies (rhetorical, multilingual writing, second-language writing, and multimodal composition) scholarship suggest an array of options for instructors to help diverse groups of students engage in peer feedback, these "guidebooks" are spread across various media such as teaching handbooks, academic journals, book chapters, and websites that are generally not in conversation with one another. In other words, there is no guide or text that synthesizes this scholarship and provides a principled approach to cultivating opportunities/conditions that enhance students' authority and agency within various peer feedback configurations. This dissertation reinvigorates peer feedback pedagogy by synthesizing best practices for coordinating peer feedback within face-to-face and virtual classroom settings and by suggesting how instructors might use these strategies to take a more collaborative, recursive, tailored approach to peer feedback, or to enact a hermeneutic pedagogy.

I use the term "peer feedback" throughout this dissertation as a general term that encompasses three distinct classroom practices referenced within rhetorical and Composition Studies publications and scholarly conversations:

Peer Review: This term is most frequently used within composition scholarship and refers to the act of students responding to Higher Order Concerns, for example, topic, focus, organization, use of evidence, and methodology (Armstrong and Paulson 400);

Peer Response: This activity primarily focuses on students giving "audience-based" or reader response feedback. Readers treat drafts as "works in progress" and respond as "sympathetic readers" (401);

Peer Editing: This activity involves Low Order Concerns: "proofreading, or fixing mechanical, grammatical, or word-level problems" (402).

Postsecondary composition instructors have used collaborative pedagogies such as peer review, peer response, and peer editing over the past forty years within mainstream and L2 composition classrooms as modes of not only valuing the knowledge and literacy practices students bring to the classroom but also as a means of encouraging students to learn rhetorical strategies from one another. Composition scholarship associates the following pedagogical benefits of peer feedback: it emphasizes the socially constructed nature of knowledge, it helps students learn diverse ways of thinking and writing, it helps them engage in a writing process, and it helps them improve the overall quality of their writing. Additionally, peer feedback scholarship within the twenty-first century has begun focusing on how new media technologies enhance and challenge the ways instructors assign and students engage in peer feedback (Kennedy and Rebecca Moore 37). For example, new writing instructor training guides published over the past decade or so suggest how the use of text messaging, instant messaging, video conferencing, document sharing, blogs, photo sharing, and social tagging enables instructors to enhance collaborative learning among students (Kennedy and Rebecca Moore; Bamberg; Brooke; Hawisher and Selfe).

Although peer feedback undoubtedly can achieve these purported pedagogical goals, students do not always enjoy the intended benefits. As I illustrate further down in this chapter, literature reviews within mainstream composition and L2 scholarship provide conflicting data

regarding peer feedback's pedagogical benefits. Any composition instructor who assigns peer feedback will admit that sometimes peer feedback works successfully, and sometimes it does not.

My own experiences teaching composition within developmental, mainstream, and technical and professional writing classroom with culturally diverse groups of students over the past ten years have made it apparent to me that in some cases students enjoy the associated pedagogical benefits of peer feedback, but in other cases they do not. Prior to having students respond to one another's writing for the first time and before giving them my peer feedback sales pitch, I ask students to compile a list of peer feedback pros and cons so that we can discuss these as a class and find ways to capitalize on the benefits and minimize the challenges. This exercise helps me discover their conceptions of peer feedback so that I can use their experiences to start a conversation about peer feedback. What always amazes me about this activity is the range of experiences students bring to peer feedback. Some state they have done it frequently prior to my class and feel confident giving and using peer comments, and some report getting peer feedback has helped them improve as writers, depending on whom they are grouped with and the nature of the writing assignment. However, other students report that, as a result of their lack of experience with peer feedback or their perceived poor writing abilities, they see little benefit to responding to each other's writing. For example, when we discussed their responses to this exercise in a Developmental English course I taught several years ago, a student candidly questioned, "Why are you having *us* review each other's writing. Isn't it kinda like the blind leading the blind?" Or even, worse, some students report extremely negative previous experiences with peer feedback, or feel alienated or ignored because they are non-native English speakers. Two examples come to mind. In a mainstream composition class I taught a few years ago, a student told me that in

high school some of her peers had ridiculed and laughed at her draft in front of the entire class, so she was terrified the first class period they engaged in peer feedback. Additionally, when I taught a course on English grammar a few years ago, I frequently placed students in groups to discuss their responses to homework exercises. One day after class, a student from South Korea (one of the brightest students in the class) asked to be moved to a different group because the other native English speakers in her group were not giving her a chance to speak, and when they did, they told her she was wrong, even though her responses were correct. This frustrated and annoyed me because I knew the other students in the group were simply dismissing her as the "foreign" student who did not speak clear English and therefore must not know what she was talking about, which was, of course, not the case. International students often have a better grasp of English grammar than native English speakers, and this student clearly did. I quickly realized I should have better prepared the students to work in groups.

These anecdotes illustrate that when members of peer response groups have vastly or even slightly different conceptions of the writing task, skills and genre knowledge (both print-based and digital) for responding to it, styles of interpersonal communication, composition processes, and opinions regarding the final product, the acts of engaging in the spoken and written genres associated with peer feedback can be quit challenging and often debilitating.

Moreover, there exist "digital divides" among students because they do not have equal access to the same types of technologies nor the support and instruction needed to successfully use these technologies prior to entering the composition classroom (Brooke 183-184). And it's becoming increasingly clear that even within more affluent educational systems, the use of technology is an "add-on" instead of a mode to help students use technologies in rhetorically

savvy ways or to critically evaluate how new media positions producers and consumers of information (Hicks and Turner).

Peer feedback contexts represent cultural contact zones, or "social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power," in which instructors and students often find themselves accidental tourists without a guide for navigating these culturally and linguistically diverse spaces (Pratt 34). Students' previous experiences with peer feedback, genre knowledge of what is supposed to happen within the associated written and spoken genres, language backgrounds, and the medium and mode in which peer feedback takes place influence how they interpret and participate in peer feedback. Considering the complex nature of peer feedback, this dissertation questions, how do composition scholarship and writing instructor training materials suggest instructors and students engage the heterogeneous interpretations and literacy resources students bring to the peer feedback contact zone? What sorts of guides or roadmaps do current composition scholarship and composition instructor handbooks provide writing program administrators, writing instructors, and ultimately students to navigate the peer feedback contact zones within traditional as well as computer-mediated settings?

Theories represent conceptual base maps: "maps on which information may be placed for purposes of comparison or geographical correlation. . .[They] are used in the construction of other types of maps by the addition of particular data" ("Map, Base," *World Atlas*). Disciplinary experts and insiders draft base maps to orient our teaching, to navigate classroom spaces, and to create a base for constructing new road maps. This chapter points to the need to deviate from these base maps and redraw a hermeneutic map of peer feedback, one that responds to the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual frames or mental regions that impact one's

interpretation and performance in peer feedback and therefore better guides instructors and students through the cultural contact zones of peer feedback. To make the argument that such a redrawing needs to occur, this chapter maps the historical pedagogical uses of peer feedback within composition instruction, traces theoretical mental base maps that have historically been used to conceptualize peer feedback in the field of Composition Studies, and surveys the current scholarly conversations surrounding peer feedback in mainstream and second-language writing classrooms.

Mapping A Brief History of Peer Feedback in the Composition Classroom

Collaborative writing has been a pedagogical commonplace in both mainstream and second-language writing courses since at least the mid-1980s (Gere; Kennedy and Moore Howard; Roskelly; Cho et al; Berg, "Trained Peer Response"). It had become so widely accepted among Composition scholars by1984 that the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) Commission on Composition issued a position statement in *College English* endorsing collaborative pedagogies (NCTE Commission on Composition). Even though NCTE officially endorsed collaborative learning and writing in the composition classroom in 1984, the use of peer feedback as part of rhetorical instruction is not a recent practice. Historical evidence shows that ancient Greek and Roman rhetorical instruction included peer feedback, and Anne Ruggles Gere's history of writing groups provides compelling evidence that peer feedback has been present in various iterations throughout the history of writing instruction within United States higher educational contexts.

There is historical evidence that peer feedback was a pedagogical approach employed in ancient Greek and Roman rhetorical instruction. The elder group of sophists "were the first to offer systematic instruction in the arts of speaking and writing in the West" (Jarratt xv), and they

traveled among various Ancient Greece city-states offering rhetorical instruction to young men who could afford their specialized and personal instruction. Jarratt explains that "their effectiveness in teaching this *techne* derived in part from their experiences of different cultures" (xv); because of these experiences, they espoused the social epistemic view of knowledge and reflected it in their rhetorical instruction. Although certainly not all the sophists employed the same teaching methods, no matter which methods they used, their underlying ideology assumed that language was incapable of depicting objective reality, and because of this, human knowledge was imperfect and disallowed access to transcendental truths. Thus, sense perception and the immediate were all one could know. Effective use of rhetoric, then, involved a speaker selecting the appropriate rhetorical devices in order to persuade an audience in a particular context; they taught students to tailor language to the *kairotic* moment, to adapt an argument to suit a specific place and time, and to consider "the local *nomoi:* community-specific customs and laws" (11). Moreover, the elder sophists resisted the notion of foundational truth and "focused attention on the process of group decision-making in historically and geographically specific contexts" (xx).

Sophists such as Protagoras and Gorgias incorporated teaching strategies that reflected this ideology. They required their students to analyze multiple perspectives of an issue and practice composing compelling arguments that supported various perspectives so that they were prepared to tailor an argument to the situation at hand. The prominent sophist Protagoras incorporated peer feedback into his pedagogical schema. He often used "the verbal exchange of a small discussion groups" in order for students to debate topics and respond to one another's rhetorical productions (Schiappa 163). Additionally, Isocrates' educational system also influenced the spread of the triviuum (grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric) in rhetorical education;

his students studied these three subjects and composed and rehearsed various genres of speeches. He too had students discuss and evaluate their rhetorical productions in groups so "that they would have comments coming from him" as well as peers (Murphy 32).

This tradition was then appropriated by ancient Roman rhetorical pedagogues. Murphy states the Roman school system consisted of "a seven-step process of Imitation, with writing or the analysis of written texts being coupled to oral performance by the students before master and peers in the classroom. What today would be called peer criticism is an integral part of the scheme" (55). By publically critiquing and evaluating one another, students strengthened each other's arguments (55). About peer feedback, Quintilian stated, "Shall a pupil, if he commits faults in declaiming, be corrected before the rest, and will it no be more serviceable to him to correct the speech of another? Indubitably" (qtd in Murphy 61).

We don't really see much mention of the use of peer feedback within academic rhetorical instruction again until the nineteenth century. For example, James Murphy's *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Modern America* is devoid of any reference to the pedagogical use of peer feedback between his discussion of ancient Greek and Roman rhetorical instruction and twentieth century writing instruction in the U.S. classroom. Anne Ruggles Gere's *Writing Groups: History, Theory, and Implications*, however, provides evidence that institutions of higher education within the U.S. used school-sponsored writing groups as a pedagogical tool since at least the late 1800s. For example, Yale offered a senior composition class that consisted of "discussion and criticism of specimen themes," and historical records show that specific composition courses at both the University of Pennsylvania and John's Hopkins University required students to read and respond to each other's written compositions before or in class (16). In 1901, MIT created a course in which 50 percent of students' grades were based on

critique of peers' writing, and Middlebury College instated a "laboratory" where students read and critiqued each other's writing (16). Gere further notes that scholars published numerous articles on peer feedback prior to its renewed popularity and prominence in the 1960s, and a notable one in 1919 argued the following about writing groups: they "increase motivation, foster critical thinking, enhance positive attitudes, and develop audience awareness" (18). According to Gere, writing groups within educational contexts "persisted without flourishing for the first five decades of [the twentieth] century" (28).

Tracing Theoretical Peer Feedback Base Maps

Postsecondary writing instructors began more widely adopting peer feedback after the 1966 Dartmouth Conference in which American and British English educators met to discuss educational reform, and these reforms helped draft the mental base maps compositions currently use to ground the practice of assigning peer feedback. Until the 1960s, most writing instruction within the U.S. employed current-traditional pedagogy, a pedagogy that assumed language was a conduit for expressing knowledge about an objective external reality to a universal audience (but really just the writing instructor) (Gere 28). The pedagogy assumed writing was a "decontextualized skill that can be taught in isolation from the production of meaning" (Zamel 103). Unclear writing, then, resulted from poor grammar (of the Standard American Edited English dialect), word choice, and organization. Thus, current-traditionalists largely ignored the rhetorical canon of invention and focused primarily on teaching decontextualized modes of writing and arrangement, paragraphing, and grammatical correctness.

British educators during this period were moving away from more prescriptive methods of writing instruction and focusing more on students' "personal and linguistic development"; their pedagogy valued "tentativeness" and inquiry rather than "precise formulation of language"

in student writing, and the writing process was emphasized rather than the written final product (28). British educators influenced a paradigm shift within American composition instruction, and several strains of composition theory began promoting the use of writing groups for various purposes informed by different and often conflicting philosophical assumptions. (28).

Expressionist pedagogues were some of the first, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, to rediscover and endorse peer feedback in the writing classroom. Burnham and Powell explain that an expressive pedagogy assigns "the highest value to the writer's imaginative, psychological, social, and spiritual development and how that development influences individual consciousness and social behavior" (113). This pedagogy was in reaction to the then pervasive composition pedagogies that employed current-traditional rhetoric, which expressionists argued encouraged students to produce inauthentic, canned prose that aligned with what students thought the instructor wanted. Expressivist curriculum required students to compose in creative writing genres (personal narratives, poems) and engage in writing groups or "helping circles" as forums "where writers could learn to hear their own language better" (Berlin 263; Gere 29; Moran and Ballif xiv-xv); these "small-group dialogic collaborative response" were useful for authors to dialogue with readers in order to sort of clear away the underbrush and discover their authentic voices and revise their writing accordingly (Burnham and Powell113). However, critics argued expressivist writing pedagogy's focus on the writer uncovering innate, subjective truths "ignores how writing works in the world, hides the social nature of language, and offers a false notion of a 'private' self" (Faigley 531).

Around the same time in the 1960s, "New Rhetoric" compositionists introduced (or, technically, reintroduced) pedagogical paradigms in response to the arhetorical instruction associated with the current-traditional approach to writing instruction. These scholars ushered in

new interest in studying, appropriating, and teaching the classical rhetorical canons and emphasizing that language use is a means of constructing truth in context: "the message arises out of the interaction of the writer, language, reality, and the audience" (Moran and Ballif xvii-xx; Berlin 266). Writing instructors influenced by this theoretical camp began to use peer feedback in their classrooms to help students engage in invention and revision strategies, learn and share rhetorical strategies, and gain a better sense of reader response. Various sub strands of "New Rhetoric" pedagogy, cognitive and social epistemic rhetoric, used peer feedback for achieving different pedagogical goals that aligned with their respective theoretical frames.

Cognitive rhetoricians during the late 1970s and 1980s turned to research in psychology and neuroscience to understand how individual writers cognitively make rhetorical decisions and introduced the use of empirical methods to study writing practices (Faigley 532). Using think-aloud protocol research, they compared the cognitive processes of expert and novice writers and found that expert writers employ a recursive process that consists of continually analyzing their purposes and audiences as they simultaneously draw on long term memory to plan, establish goals and sub-goals, draft, and edit. Drawing on developmental psychologist Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive development, they concluded immature writers are often "arrested in the egocentric stage" and therefore have trouble imagining an audience for their writing. Ineffective writers, then, lacked the cognitive abilities to do these things (Faigley 533). The resulting pedagogy foregrounds teaching writing as process and encourages students to engage in a series of planning, drafting, revising, and editing activities throughout the composition process. Activities such as peer review facilitate the writing process and help immature writers address audience concerns. For these theorists, the point of collaboration is to facilitate the individual's writing process, not underscore how communities create knowledge. Social epistemic rhetoricians took

issue with the cognitivist view arguing that conceptualizing learning and language use in terms of the individual's mental processes overlooks the social contexts in which discourses are constructed and used. Ineffective writing does not stem from immaturity or students lacking sophisticated cognitive processes but because they are being asked to write in academic discourses and contexts with which they are unfamiliar (Bizzell "Cognition, Convention, and Certainty").

Proponents of the social epistemic view of rhetoric in particular espouse collaborative writing pedagogies because, like the sophists, they argue the aim of writing is not to clearly convey an external objective reality, but to use language to arrive at temporarily agreed upon contextual truths, a process that continually revises one's conception of self and reality. This theory is the most commonly employed theoretical framework for grounding collaborative pedagogies. Kenneth Bruffee's 1984 landmark essay "Collaborative Learning and 'The Conversation of Mankind'" is the most widely cited piece of scholarship that elaborates this theory. His argument is essentially that thought is internalized "social conversation"; thus, all thought is essentially collaborative (549); no external objective reality exists; instead, we think and interpret reality with the ideologies and language practices available to us through our social affiliations. Even one's conception of self is constructed through the discourse communities with which one affiliates and is exposed to. Based on this social epistemic view of knowledge construction, he argues that writing constitutes internalized thought externalized and "made social again" (550). Learning to better exchange ideas with others improves one's knowledge construction and understanding within academic discourse communities (549-550). John Trimbur modified Bruffee's argument by adding that the key to emphasizing the socially constructed nature of knowledge to students is to encourage them to account for and allow

conflict and dissensus within collaborative activities. They may not arrive at a consensus

through their exchanges, but they begin to recognize "the inexhaustibility of difference" and

perhaps realize that a range of truths are possible within any given situation (615). The

pedagogical goal for collaborative learning groups according to the social epistemic view, then,

is to help students develop a common language for discussing course material, to negotiate

common as well as alternative understandings of this material, and to initiate them into the larger

academic discourse community relevant to the course. Because students are members of a

number of extracurricular "knowledge communities" prior to entering the classroom,

collaborative learning helps them pool their respective knowledge bases in order to understand

the "normal discourse" spoken by the academic community represented in the course they are

taking (Bruffee 553). Moreover, if students are learning from their peers, collaborative learning

and writing dispels the "hierarchical view of knowledge," the notion that "learning can occur

only when a designated 'knower' imparts wisdom to those less well informed" (Gere 73).

Collaborative learning and writing essentially decentralizes the classroom and values the

knowledge and experiences students bring to the classroom.

However, the social epistemic view fails to account for how individual interpretations can

influence successful and effective participation within groups. The underlying assumption is that

groups of students constitute "like-minded peers," but students' interpretations of what is

happening and how to participate are influenced by their previous experiences with spoken and

written peer feedback genres, their available rhetorical and linguistic strategies for engaging in

both the genre of peer feedback and the genre in which the writing assignment being discussed is

written, and their culturally informed notions of appropriate behavior for engaging in peer

feedback. Moreover, social constructionist pedagogies focus on teaching students genres and

epistemologies sanctioned by specific academic discourse communities, but simply immersing students into collaborative activities within the composition classroom does not necessarily teach them the specific epistemologies, discourses, and literacies of the professional and academic cultures they will eventually enter. The social epistemic view also assumes conventions employed by successful writers within a discourse community epitomize effective writing that students should replicate in every communication within a given genre (Kent 164).

Even though all of these theoretical base maps certainly have contributed to ways writing instructors conceptualize and enact effective writing pedagogy, whether peer feedback focuses on helping authors locate their authentic voices, engaging students in writing processes, or emphasizing the socially constructed nature of knowledge, or a combination of these, these base maps fail to adequately account for the complex nature of the peer feedback process. Writing classrooms are clearly becoming more culturally and linguistically diverse, so it is important to account for and adjust to the multiple interpretations and rhetorical strategies students bring to bear on this activity. Instructors have been using collaborative learning and writing since ancient Greek rhetorical instruction, but we must ask ourselves how effectively this pedagogy works as our writing classrooms become more linguistically and culturally diverse. Within Greek and Roman rhetorical instruction, classrooms were typically comprised of wealthy, male students (Schiappa 171), and undoubtedly classrooms are more diverse in terms of gender, culture, language, literacy practices, and socioeconomic background than those of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, and even since the mid 1980s when NCTE officially endorsed peer feedback. The current scholarly discourses surrounding peer feedback over the past three decades illustrate that the theoretical mental maps and practical guides for conducting peer feedback leave readers with conflicting road maps.

Surveying Scholarly Discourses: A Literature Review of Peer Feedback

Despite the fact that peer feedback has been widely adopted for various pedagogical purposes over the past forty years in the composition classroom, scholarly conversations among Composition scholars surrounding why instructors assign peer feedback and how to do it persist. The following section surveys the literature regarding print-based peer feedback, meaning peer feedback conducted in face-to-face classes where students bring printed drafts, orally discuss drafts, and write their comments on the draft or a printed worksheet.

Cognitive/Rhetorical Benefits and Hindrances

A commonly cited benefit of peer feedback is that assigning students to read and respond to one another's writing protracts students' writing processes: it perpetuates a recursive writing processes because it encourages students to continually plan, revise, and edit in light of the writing situation prior to the assignment's due date and prevents students from submitting a rough draft (Beach and Friedrich; Trim; MIT Tech, "Instructor Guide"; Reid). Moreover, responding to peers' writing builds students' (both L1 and L2 writers) critical, analytical, evaluative, and problem solving skills (Lui and Hansen; Gere). Essentially, peer feedback exposes students to alternative means of interpreting the rhetorical situation (audience, purpose, genre) outlined in the writing prompt, which may encourage them to revise their interpretations of the prompt and the concomitant rhetorical strategies they deploy in responding to it, and at the very least, peer response can help students double check that they have appropriately understood and responded to the instructor's writing prompt (Wirtz).

Additionally, peer feedback helps students learn and share rhetorical strategies for composing the genre in which the assignment is written (i.e., introductory and closing strategies, organization, use of evidence, etc.), which helps them make more effective revision and editing

choices (Corbett; Leki; Tsui and Ng; Wirtz; Reid; Gere; Trim; Paton; Moore; O'Neil; Brammer and Rees). Peer feedback also allows students to get a clearer sense of how a reader or real audience understands and responds to their writing and can thereby clarify or improve areas that are unclear or inaccurate (Wirtz; Trim; Gere; Leki; Artemeva and Logie; Paton; Tsui and Ng; MIT Tech; Salahub; Reid; Lui and Hansen).

Empirical studies of both L1 and L2 writers that solicited student feedback found that significant numbers of students value their peers' comments because they reported they incorporated both substantive and surface level suggestions into their final drafts and, as a result, improved their final products (Tang and Tithecott; Mendonca and Johnson; Nelson and Murphy; Connor and Asenavage; Hedgcock and Lefkowitz). Lui and Hansen found that L2 students, even those who had mixed opinions about completing peer response, thought it helped them revise their papers. Zhang surveyed international students at U.S. colleges and universities, and although 94% said they preferred teacher feedback over peers, 61% claimed they valued peer feedback over self-evaluation. Brammer and Rees reported 1/3 of its survey respondents (all U.S., L1 undergraduate writers) found peer response useful, and a significant number of participants believe their peers give them more specific and useful feedback than their instructors (26; 77).

However, students do not enjoy these cognitive and rhetorical benefits in all cases. Students bring very different conceptions of why and how to complete it, and because of this, in some cases, they offer one another vague, unproductive, or even counterproductive or inaccurate comments (Cahill; Edington; Shea; Paton; Ferris; Beach and Friedrich). Tang and Tithecott's study of peer review among L2 writers indicated that the L2 students in their study "had problems conceptualizing peer review" (28). In other studies, students themselves report that

they and their peers lack adequate previous experience or the genre knowledge to engage in critical reading and reviewing in order to provide specific, useful, or helpful comments (Vatalaro; Shea; Edgington; Byland; Ferris; Artemeva and Logie). Some ultimately feel unqualified to respond to peers' writing (Allaei and Connor). And students who have been previously trained to see peer response as "error hunting" only comment on Lower Order Concerns or more objective grammatical rules and provide only vague comments regarding Higher Order Concerns (Wirtz; Brammer and Rees). For these reasons, "they don't see peers' opinions as legitimate" (Paton). Even worse, the converse can happen, students believe their peers' work is so good that they appropriate it completely by plagiarizing it (Shea).

Moreover, if students are writing in an unfamiliar genre or commenting on an unfamiliar topic, their comments on one another's drafts are often less helpful (Lui and Hansen 21). Mangelsdorf's study of L2 writers found that 77% of the participations did not trust their peers to give them useful feedback because they lacked the background knowledge about the paper topic under review and lacked the level of writing expertise possessed by the instructor (Mangelsdorf). Allaei and Connor also point out that in mixed L1/L2 classes, students may possess different levels of the L2 language, rhetorical strategies for creating their own texts and evaluating their peers' texts, and misaligned views on acceptable writing topics and audience conceptions (24).

Because of the aforementioned reasons, lack of or conflicting genre knowledge (with peer feedback and the targeted written genre) and poor quality responses, students report they distrust peers' comments and often fail to incorporate them into their final drafts (Edington; Corbett, "Peer Pressure, Peer Power"; Brammer and Rees). Anecdotal and empirical studies reported students prefer teachers' comments over their peers (Artemeva and Logie; Vatalaro), and distrust their peers because they are often not the indented audience for the piece of writing

being analyzed (Artemeva and Logie). Cohen and Cavalcanti's interviews with L2 writers showed that students prefer teacher feedback because peer feedback often does not align with teacher feedback. Even though some empirical research indicates students, when trained, provide feedback equal to or better than the instructor, other studies indicate students prefer teacher feedback over peers because teacher feedback encourages students to revise Higher Order Concerns more often than when using peer feedback (Connor and Asenavage; Paulus).

Linguistic Benefits and Hindrances

Second-language writing scholars also identify elements of peer feedback that afford a number of linguistic benefits to L2 students. Peer response helps them learn metalanguage knowledge, practice conversing and writing in the L2, and locate the appropriate terms for expressing their ideas (Liu and Hansen). However, L2 writers who believe they have "a better grasp of language" consider themselves more adept at reviewing their peers' papers and are less likely to take suggestions from peers they perceive to have a weaker grasp of the L2 language in which the papers are written (Lui and Hansen 20). In addition, some students feel they are unqualified to comment on others' writing because of their own perceived English language deficiencies (Allaei and Connor; Ruecker). Finally, when students have trouble understanding a foreign accent, the oral exchanges diminish peer feedback's usefulness (Liu and Hansen).

Table 1: Summary of Cognitive/Rhetorical/Linguistic Benefits and Hindrances

Benefits	Hindrances
• It encourages students to engage in a writing process (Beach and Friedrich; Trim; MIT Tech, "Instructor Guide"; Reid). • It builds students' critical, analytical, evaluative, and problem solving skills (Lui and Hansen; Gere). • It helps students double check their understanding of the writing prompt (Wirtz). • Students learn rhetorical strategies from one another (Corbett; Leki; Tsui and Ng; Wirtz; Reid; Gere; Trim; Paton; Moore; O'Neil; Brammer and Rees). • Students get a better sense of a reader's response (Wirtz; Trim; Gere; Leki; Artemeva and Logie; Paton; Tsui and Ng; MIT Tech; Salahub; Reid; Lui and Hansen). • Students discover effective ways to revise and edit their drafts (Tang and Tithecott; Mendonca and Johnson; Nelson and Murphy; Connor and Asenavage; Hedgcock and Lefkowitz). • Students claim peers often provide better quality feedback than instructor (Zhang; Brammer and Rees). • Students learn metalanguage knowledge (Liu and Hansen). • L2 writers/speakers practice their L2 conversation and writing skills (Liu and Hansen).	• Students complain they do not understand why and how to do peer feedback (Cahill; Edington; Shea; Paton; Ferris; Beach and Friedrich; Tang and Tithecott). • Students feel unqualified to comment on each other's writing (Vatalaro; Shea; Edgington; Byland; Ferris; Artemeva and Logie; Allaei and Connor). • Students have conflicting views on effective rhetorical strategies (Wirtz; Brammer and Rees; Paton). • Peer feedback often only focuses on sentence-level editing (Wirtz; Brammer and Rees). • Students distrust peers' knowledge and thus fail to incorporate their suggestions (Paton; Mangelsdorf; Edington; Corbett, "Peer Pressure, Peer Power"; Brammer and Rees). • Some students plagiarize their peers' ideas/wording (Shea). • Students prefer teacher feedback over peer feedback (Artemeva and Logie; Vatalaro; Connor and Asenavage; Paulus). • Students with stronger L2 writing and speaking skills may distrust peers with weaker skills (Lui and Hansen). • Students who perceive their L2 skills as weak may feel unqualified to comment on their peers' writing (Allaei and Connor; Ruecker). • L2 students often relegate comments to Lower Order Concerns (Liu and Hansen). • Foreign accents can be difficult to understand (Liu and Hansen).

Social Benefits and Hindrances

The social benefits associated with peer response identified in published scholarship fall within several subcategories. First, numerous scholars argue peer feedback activities help students collaboratively learn and construct knowledge; students learn to negotiate content knowledge and share effective rhetorical strategies (Bruffee; Trim; Wirtz; Tsui and Ng). Additionally, collaborative learning and knowledge construction mimics how knowledge is constructed and reviewed within academic disciplines, so it introduces students to this professional process (Bruffe; Corbett; Leki). However, critics argue collaborative learning is not the pedagogical panacea Bruffee and others claim it to be, as writing courses could not possibly verse students in enacting abnormal discourse for other academic communities because college students are themselves in the process of learning disciplinary discourses and often do not possess the knowledge/experience to challenge or modify accepted disciplinary discourses (Stewart). Smith also questions whether collaborative learning approaches provide students strategies to collaborate in other contexts or offer them tools for improving their writing. In fact instead of collaborative pedagogies encouraging the inclusion and consideration of divergent perspectives, it can encourage, as Johnson puts it, Orwellean "group think," or the pressure to conform to dominant classroom discourses.

Another commonly cited social benefit of using peer feedback in the composition classroom is that it provides students with a number of interpersonal skills. The practice teaches them to "listen respectfully, to voice opinions openly, offer advice tactfully, and to negotiate between different points of view" (Paton 291); establish friendships and bonds with their classmates (Liu and Hansen 15); and form a "feeling of solidarity" with fellow writers (Gere 125). However, multiple scholars also challenge the notion that peer feedback facilitates students

forming bonds and developing interpersonal skills. Different expectations for polite behavior when responding to each other's writing among both L1 and L2 writers can diminish its benefits. Fernsten argues the purported benefits widely promoted by experssivist, cognitive , and social constructionist pedagogies fail to realize that "issues of cultural difference. . .[often silence] some voices" (34). She explains, "One's perception of peer response and participation in [peer response] are complex and tremendously socially and culturally layered" (Fernsten 34). When writers perceive their language abilities differ substantially from their peers or they feel they are "socially or culturally distanced from their responding peers, the process can be nightmarish" (38).

For instance, students may find peers' comments are too harsh or offensive and therefore are less likely to listen to them and incorporate their suggestions (Leki; Ferris), or in some cases certain students dominate the response session by offering overwhelmingly detailed criticism (Edgingtion). Allaei and Connor's research within writing courses consisting of L1 and L2 students illustrates how students' oral interactions are influenced by each interlocutor's conception of conversational practices and politeness strategies. For example, speakers from New York are more apt to interrupt others during conversation than native Californians. Thus, they argue, students in a culturally diverse classroom may encounter communicative static as they interact because of misunderstood or conflicting conversational strategies. Additionally, within writing groups comprised of native and non-native speakers of English, non-native speakers often take fewer turns speaking, are interrupted more frequently than native speakers, and can misunderstand or misapply peer feedback (Zhu). Ferris also posits that ". . .the personae expressed by students [among L2 writers as well L1/L2] during peer review could have substantially positive or negative effects on their outcomes and students' attitudes about the

value of peer review" (84). Lui and Hansen show that within L2 composition courses, even though students are motivated to participate within group discussions, they may be reluctant to because "[t]heir own social identities and their perceptions of what is appropriate behavior in a group in their home cultures often serve as reminders before they take chances to speak up" (91). If comments are not phrased in a "socioculturally appropriate way," a speaker's comments are misunderstood and thereby the writer and reviewer may experience tension and communicative static (Lui and Hansen 71).

Carson, Carson, and Nelson found that students who come from collectivist cultures may value group cohesion over helping an individual writer improve his/her draft, so their comments are often only complimentary. In their study of peer response among Chinese and Spanish students, Chinese students were reluctant to initiate comments, and when they did, they hedged them in ways that would avoid overt conflict. Nelson and Murphy contend that "social dynamics hindered [peer review's] effectiveness and . . .students' attitudes about [the] process" (77). In fact, they noted that L2 students often fail to incorporate peers' suggestions when they are perceived as "defensive in nature" (77). The Chinese students were more concerned with group cohesion and therefore resisted making negative comments because of the perceived rift in the group it could create. The Spanish students preferred direct, specific constructive comments (even if they are negative) about their drafts, but the Chinese students preferred reviewers to use more hedging techniques (Lui and Hansen 19-20).

Finally, an additional social benefit results from the "liberatory" nature of peer feedback pedagogy. Collaborative learning and writing among students contradicts the "hierarchical view of knowledge" or Paulo Freire's banking model of education, the notion that "learning can occur only when a designated 'knower' imparts wisdom to those less well informed" (Gere 73). Social

constructionist pedagogy decentralizes the classroom and values the knowledge and experiences students bring to the classroom. These supposed liberatory benefits of peer feedback are also contested. Beverly Moss reminds us that even though teachers assign writing groups in order to empower students to become more thoughtful and engaged writers, group members continually "negotiate the power dynamics that inevitably exist within these groups" (3). Not all students will see their peers as their equals. Diverse classroom populations can "evince distances among students as well as between students and teachers," rendering some students feeling uncomfortable sharing and therefore truly collaborating with others (43). Leverenz's study on collaborative learning in a multicultural classroom and Rehling's on gender-mixed groups in the technical writing classroom illustrate how cultural and gender differences can actually impede the group's ability to collaboratively create knowledge. Minority group members often side with more influential, dominant members, or certain members perpetuate cultural or gender stereotypes (regarding others and/or themselves) and therefore assume roles that align with these expectations. Furthermore, Smith questions whether collaborative approaches revolutionize classroom dynamics because despite the fact that students are reviewing one another's writing, the teacher assigns the grade and therefore still remains metaphorically at the center of the classroom. Peer feedback fails to alter the inherent hierarchical classroom structure.

Table 2: Summary of Social Benefits and Hindrances

Benefits	Hindrances
• Collaboration reinforces the socially constructed nature of knowledge and writing (Bruffee; Trim; Wirtz; Tsui and Ng). • Students learn and share alternative perspectives and rhetorical strategies (Bruffee; Trim; Wirtz; Tsui and Ng). • Collaboration mimics how knowledge is created within academic and professional communities(Bruffe; Corbett; Leki). • Peer feedback teaches interpersonal communication skills (Paton). • It builds a sense of classroom community/student solidarity (Liu and Hasen; Gere). • It decenters the classroom (liberatory pedagogy) (Gere).	• Peer feedback fails to teach students the socially constructed nature of knowledge (Stewart; Smith). • Peer feedback can stifle individuality (Smith). • Conflicting or misunderstood notions of politeness and conversational style impedes effective peer response (Fernsten; Leki; Ferris; Carson, Carson, and Nelson; Liu and Hansen; Allaei and Connor; Zhu). • Peer feedback does not overcome power dynamics or liberate students (Moss; Leverenz; Rehling; Smith).

The scholarly discourses surrounding peer feedback clearly illustrate that in some cases under certain conditions, peer feedback fulfills its intended pedagogical goals, but in other cases, it does not. This literature survey illustrates a base map with contradictory signs and symbols, one that sends mixed signals to program administrators and writing instructors. Reconceptualizing peer feedback in terms of hermeneutics explains why such contradictions exist.

Outlining General Regions of a Hermeneutic Map

The word hermeneutics is named after the Greek mythical figure Hermes who occupied liminal or "in-between" spaces. Hermes operated within both the heavenly and earthly realms when shuttling messages from the gods to humans and guiding humans between earth and Hades; he was outfitted with a helmet that rendered him invisible thereby making him seen and

unseen. He was the god of travelers, wayfarers, thieves, and traders, essentially the patron saint of individuals who occupied social boundaries or who crossed cultural or geographical boundaries (Guthrie; Palmer). His association with delivering messages and boundary crossing earned him the title of the god of artful communication; unlike Hercules who was distinct for his physical prowess, Hermes was famous for his "mental skill or cunning" (Brown 7). We find the interconnectedness of communication, border crossing, and liminality in the definition of philosophical hermeneutics because it focuses on the processes by which knowledge is acquired, the in-between spaces, the border between objectivity and subjectivity, the spaces where individuals dialectically construct meaning in a situation.

Philosophical or ontological hermeneutics is "a general philosophy of human existence, which holds that interpreting is not so much what human beings or some class of human beings do, but rather what all human beings are, namely, interpreters" (Crusisus 5). Interpretation is not a mode of knowing but rather a mode of human interpretation; humans live "with, on, of, against, their own interpretations of the world and . . .themselves" (Garagalza 3). Interpretation is neither entirely objective nor subjective but occurs through "an intersubjectivity attained within a communally shared and lived language" (Crusius 5). Hermeneutics considers the complex frames of reference or interpretive fields individuals use to interpret what is happening/supposed to happen and how to participate within the world around them. The hermeneutic features discussed below help us outline some general regions of a peer feedback hermeneutic map.

First, individuals interrupt their senses of being in time and place through a matrix of "established social practices and institutions, prevailing interpretations of what has been, is, and can be," and those interpretations cannot ever be apart from our "society, language, or history" (Crusius 20). Our notions of reality, identity, and others are interpreted through social, cultural,

and contextual discursive paradigms available to us. Students' interpretations of what is

happening/supposed to happen in peer feedback contexts are influenced by the cultural, social,

and linguistic paradigms that prime their means of reading and participating in peer feedback.

Students obviously come to the classroom with diverse cultural, social, and linguistic interpretive

frames, so they bring a range of interpretations to peer feedback contexts. As the literature

review indicates, cultural, social, rhetorical, and/or linguistic interpretive dimensions can at once

enhance and hinder the peer feedback process.

Second, one's interpretations lead to understanding that is formed synchronically and

diachronically: it is synchronic "in that any particular act of understanding is a structure of

language at a particular moment in time"; "[it] is diachronic because once it is situated by

interpretation, it goes beyond the particular interpretation and forms the historical tradition

moving language through time" (Hyde and Smith 353). The combined synchronic and diachronic

interpretations influence how one interprets and therefore understands symbols and texts. As we

are introduced to new texts and situations, we understands them through our previous stores of

linguistic knowledge, but in the acts of interpreting and digesting them, we simultaneously add to

or modifies our repertoires and therefore ways of understanding, framing, and articulating them.

Third, individuals construct meaning collaboratively in context. The philosophical

hermeneutic conception of language assumes that signifiers have no transcendental meaning but

are ascribed meaning by collaboration among encoders and decoders in a given context.

Language is inherently collaborative because it only becomes language when in use (Kent 11).

Speakers/Writers and listeners/reader dialectically construct knowledge. Even though

interlocutors operate from a "degree of shared preunderstandings" (or communication would be

impossible), within this dialogue, within each unique context, something new between the two

interlocutors emerges. This dialogue simultaneously moves interlocutors backwards, so to speak, because the dialogue draws from their "preunderstandings," but the dialogue simultaneously moves them forward toward new understandings or agreements in contexts, "or at least toward recognition of exactly what [the speakers] disagree about and why" (39). Crucius argues this dialogic "fuses" speakers'/listeners' writers'/readers' interpretive horizons as they reach for consensus or "a new sharing of [contextual and historical] truth" (39). They broaden their horizons by gaining the insights of the dialogic other's insights, and "truth is whatever emerges from the dialogue, wherever [they] come to rest [at the time]" (39). Students, then, interpret what is happening in each new peer feedback situation through their accumulated experiences with it, and each new experience adds to their knowledge of how to conceptualize and participate within peer feedback situations. Moreover, students dialectically construct meaning within peer feedback situations. They are not simply collaboratively creating knowledge as the social epistemic view holds, but they are collaboratively constructing what it is they're actually doing/supposed to do. The literature review also pointed to the fact that students bring different levels and types of experiences producing the written genres being discussed in peer feedback sessions and rhetorical strategies for participating within the peer feedback session itself, so the peer feedback process can be hindered when students bring mismatched preunderstandings of what can and should occur during peer feedback.

Finally, our interpretations and understandings influence our available means of participating within a conversational or written exchange. Our interpretations of the writing or speaking task (subject matter, purpose, genre, audience, and context) influence our selections of available rhetorical strategies. Or as Crucius puts it, "our preunderstandings –our mostly inarticulate experience with writing [. . .]---prescructure more conscious interpretations of the

task at hand and largely determines what we find to say" (54). Hermeneutics and rhetoric both focus on "*phronesis*, or practical judgment, which deals with issues where certainty cannot be achieved" (Crucius 59). Thus, universally effective rhetorical production cannot be codified or reduced to convenient rules of thumb; thus, human interaction is essentially "guesswork" (16). We can never be entirely sure of the ideal thing to say or write in every situation, nor can we be sure the message will be interpreted as we intended. This does not mean that we cannot, through experience, get pretty good at producing effective guesses within given contexts, though. The more familiar we are with spoken and written genres, the more likely we are to make effective rhetorical choices or interpret them as intended (Kent 167-168). Students are essentially guessing at which rhetorical strategies to deploy within the spoken and written peer feedback genres because each new feedback session provides different affordances and constraints, but being mentored by a more experienced guide and learning strategies from one another can enhance their abilities to participate in and adapt to future sessions.

Engaging in peer feedback is, to say the least, complex, and the mental base maps available to administrators and instructors do not chart these liminal regions in which interpretation occurs nor does the scholarship provide clear guides for adapting to peer feedback's interpretive nature. So, how do we account for and adapt to diverse groups of students' multiple interpretive frames? How do writing instructors get students on the same page, so to speak? By employing a hermeneutic peer feedback. Its general features are as follows. First, instructors should resist thinking a monolithic, ideal strategy for assigning peer feedback exists. What works in one class with one population of students or even across class periods with the same population of students may not suit another. Second, instructors should scaffold peer feedback-related activities: take students through a series of prepare, enact, modify, and reflect

activities, and these activities should attend to the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual interpretive fields. Contextual factors include classroom context, medium and mode, and grouping configurations. Third, instructors should adapt the selected peer feedback method and/or mode if/when necessary. Finally, instructors should collaborate with students to determine the best method for responding to their peers' drafts. The rules and protocol for enacting peer feedback should arise from the population of students using it. The remainder of this dissertation sets out to contour regions of the hermeneutic map, develop and rationalize a hermeneutic pedagogy, and provide principled but adaptable guides for enacting a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy within both face-to-face and virtual spaces.

Structure and Organization of Dissertation

"Chapter 2: Tracing Rhetorical, Cultural, Linguistic, and Contextual Interpretive Fields: Constructing A Hermeneutic Peer Feedback Pedagogy" constructs a more detailed interpretive map for conceptualizing peer feedback and enacting a hermeneutic pedagogy by providing more nuance and detail to the peer feedback regions discussed in Chapter 1. The map includes four distinct but overlapping interpretive fields: rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual. I elaborate these regions by synthesizing relevant concepts from various disciplinary fields: rhetorical genre theory, sociolinguistics, second-language writing pedagogy, and organic writing assessment. The map serves to ground the general tenets of a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy. I also use these principles to frame my questions for the handbook analyses in Chapter 3 and to inform the interactive peer feedback gamebooks detailed in Chapters 4 and 5.

"Chapter 3: Searching for a Hermeneutic Peer Feedback Pedagogical Guide: An Analysis of Writing Instructor Handbooks" researches how writing instructors are trained to coordinate

peer feedback as manifested in commonly-used TA training handbooks. The chapter provides a discourse analysis of widely-recommended writing instructor guides in order to determine how these guides instruct readers to account for the interpretive frames (genre/rhetorical knowledge, cultural influences, language background, and contextual factors) when training students, coordinating peer feedback sessions, and adapting peer feedback protocol. The analysis of the selected corpus of materials illustrates that these handbooks do not offer instructors clearly detailed guidebooks to enacting a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy. All of the units analyzed recommend scaffolded prepare, enact, and reflect systems, and these systems offer some useful strategies for training students, enacting peer feedback, and having students reflect on their peer feedback experiences. However, Chapter 3 concludes that the handbooks do not offer an adequate menu of preparatory/planning strategies for helping instructors coordinate peer feedback with culturally and linguistically heterogeneous groups of students in either print-based or virtual modes.

"Chapter 4: Choose Your Own Adventure: A Gamebook for Conducting Peer Feedback in Print-Based Modes" outlines a customizable peer feedback gamebook that attends to the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual interpretive frames and offers instructors a larger menu of strategies for tailoring print-based peer feedback to better suit their students' needs. This chapter synthesizes planning, enacting, and reflective strategies published across mainstream, second-language writing, and new media studies journals, within handbooks, and on institutional websites in ways that assist instructors in implementing a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy using print-based modes in face-to-face classrooms. The plan, enact, and reflect system details multiple strategies at each stage that enable instructors to collaborate with students on peer feedback protocol and adapt protocol and mode to suit classroom context. The menu of items

gives instructors and students options for collaboratively creating their own peer feedback adventure so to speak, akin to how readers interact with a branching path book. The gamebook or choose-your-own adventure genre allows readers to participate in the story and to a certain extent map their own destinies. This chapter first describes various planning, enacting, and reflection strategies or menu items and highlights their distinct benefits and drawbacks; I then include scenarios that explain how readers might select among the options catalogued in order to create their own peer feedback adventure tailored to suit the population of students they are working with.

"Chapter 5: Choose Your Own Virtual Adventure: Constructing a Gamebook for Conducting Peer Feedback in Computer-Mediated Contexts" outlines a hermeneutic peer feedback approach to using new media technology within face-to-face writing classes, hybrid courses, and completely online courses so that instructors and students might collaboratively construct a tailored virtual peer feedback gamebook. I argue it is critical to consider how virtual mode impacts the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic interpretive fields. The asynchronous or synchronous technology selected for peer feedback and the classroom setting (face-to-face, hybrid, or entirely online) shapes how students interpret what is happening/supposed to happen within peer feedback activities, and it can limit or enable the rhetorical strategies students employ to participate in peer feedback as well as how or if they use feedback data to make revisions and edits to their papers. Moreover, students' educational and socioecomomic backgrounds contribute to their exposure to and knowledge of computer technology and therefore their abilities to successfully use the selected technology. Virtual peer feedback, as with print-based, needs to be situated within a larger plan, enact, and reflect system, and these activities need to be adapted to suit the classroom context and virtual mode. Furthermore,

instructors need to collaborate with students throughout the plan, enact, and reflect stages in order to determine the most suitable mode for training and enactment modes within the classroom setting. This chapter's subsections provide a menu of plan, enact, and reflect strategies for instructors to choose from in order to construct a virtual peer feedback gamebook within face-to-face and entirely online courses.

Chapter 2: Tracing Rhetorical, Cultural, Linguistic, and Contextual Interpretive Fields:
Constructing A Hermeneutic Peer Feedback Pedagogy

Chapter 1 argues an individual's interpretation of a given situation occurs through a complex interplay between rhetoric, culture, language, and context, and it provides a general outline or a sketch of the hermeneutics of peer feedback. This chapter further emphasizes the hermeneutic nature of peer feedback by explaining how these fields of interpretation influence one's performance in peer feedback. It contours distinct but overlapping rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual interpretive regions that influence one's participation within peer feedback[1]. To more clearly chart these regions, I synthesize relevant theories from rhetorical genre theory, sociolinguistics, second-language writing instruction, and organic writing assessment. This more detailed hermeneutic map serves as the bases for developing a pedagogy based on these fields of interpretation, or what I term a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy.

Drawing Rhetorical and Cultural Fields

My own experiences working with students illustrate they often bring misaligned conceptions of why they are being asked to review one another's drafts, how to do it politely and effectively, and how to use peer comments in revising and editing their drafts. As I mentioned in Chapter 1, at the beginning of the semester prior to having students respond to each other's drafts, students and I discuss peer feedback's benefits and hindrances, and I record their responses on the chalk board as we talk. I have noticed that each time I do this exercise, without any prompting from me, their responses fall into the same rhetorical, cognitive, and social benefits and hindrances reflected in Chapter 1's literature review. For example, my students identify a number of rhetorical benefits: some claim they get a better sense of a reader's

---

[1] There are undoubtedly other interpretive fields that influence an individual's interpretation and performance within a situation, but mapping all them would be impossible. For the sake of narrowing my argument, the dissertation focuses on the four interpretive fields discussed in this chapter.

perception of their writing, they realize mistakes they had overlooked, readers can offer more effective ways of phrasing their ideas or new or interesting angles they author hadn't considered, and they are exposed to different ways of responding to the writing assignment. However, the same students tell me that in some sessions, peers lack terminology or writing skills/experience to identify/articulate what is and isn't working in a draft. Peers provide vague responses on the review sheets such as "yes," "no," "good," or "needs revision," even though the questions are phrased to elicit substantive responses. Or they often comment that sections are "good" that clearly are not; and some comments actually make the quality of the writing worse. Several of my students also admit they feel uncomfortable providing negative feedback because they do not feel qualified to, as they consider themselves novice writers. Thus, many students lack the knowledge and skills for providing effective/useful feedback. Some even openly admit that they place such little value on their peers' feedback that they don't read them at all or that they merely skim their peers' comments. They claim they'd rather seek my feedback or get help from a writing center tutor. These responses illustrate that students do not enter the classroom with a typified response to the peer feedback written and spoken genres.

Rhetorical genre theory explains that students' previous background knowledge of a paper's topic, genre in which the paper is written, and conceptions of how to participate in the written and spoken genres that construct peer feedback influence how they interpret and perform in peer feedback genre ceremonials. For recurring social situations, communities construct a series of texts or genres that perform various functions within a particular social situation. Freadman describes genres as "games" that occur within the contexts of larger culturally and socially situated "ceremonials," and these are comprised of subgenres (both written and spoken) that determine the "rules of play for the exchange of texts" within these ceremonials (qtd in

Bawarshi and Reiff, *Genre: History, Theory, Research* 84). Furthermore, communities establish either explicitly or tacitly normalized rules and rhetorical strategies for participating within a spoken or written genre; they represent shortcuts for users because they can base their genre performances on "experience and assumptions that. . .have worked before in a given situation" (68); speakers/writers familiar with community sanctioned genres do not have to figure out what's going on and how to communicate within them every time they find themselves participating in the same genre; these strategies become normalized and tacit (Bawarshi 211). Freadman explains that for one to become a skilled player within these situated ceremonial genre sets, s/he must learn the ways "genres play off of each other in coordinated sequential ways" (Bawarshi and Reiff, *Genre: History, Theory, Research* 85). Speakers and writers learn to perform and "play off of the typified strategies embodied in the genre, including the sense of timing and opportunity" (85).

These community genre norms and sanctioned strategies influence the individual's conceptions of what is happening/supposed to happen in a situation and which rhetorical strategies are appropriate for deployment. Crucius points out that, "we cannot just look; we are always looking for something, something made significant by the explicit and tacit rules of the game, for what counts within some particular inquiry or context" (16). Even though genres give individuals mental and rhetorical shortcuts for conceptualizing what is happening or what should happen in a given context, individuals do not conceptualize genres and their associated typified responses in exactly the same ways, nor do they possess the same rhetorical abilities for participating in genres. One's background and procedural knowledge of a given genre influence one's available rhetorical strategies for conceptualizing and engaging in them. The background knowledge consists of "both content knowledge and knowledge of shared assumptions, including

knowledge of kairos, having to do with rhetorical timing and opportunity" (Bawarshi and Reiff 80).

One gains background knowledge through his/her cultural and social group affiliations. An individual's cultural influences stem from his or her national cultural membership: shared national boundaries, government, and laws. However, numerous cultural groups exist within a national cultural, and one's identifications with these cultures also influence his/her interpretation of and participation in interactions with others. I am using a very broad definition of culture here:

> "a learned system of meanings that fosters a particular sense of shared identity-hood and community-hood among its group members. It is a complex frame of reference that consists of a pattern of traditions, beliefs, values, norms, symbols, and meanings that are shared to varying degrees by interacting members of an identity group." (Ting-Toomey and Takai qtd in Oetzel 4).

This definition includes co-cultures, or various smaller cultural groups that exist within a national culture: religious cultures, gender cultures, corporate cultures, professional cultures, disciplinary cultures, ethnic cultures, regional cultures, and generational cultures. Majority culture is a cultural group that "has control over information within the society and can shape cultural messages and perpetuate values, beliefs, and traditions through their control of social institutions" (e.g., government, education, military, mass media, banking) (Sadri and Flammia 41). Subjective culture "is an individual's interpretation of the beliefs, values, and norms associated with a culture" (Triandis qtd in Oetzel 7). Cultural (both national and co-cultural) influences have a profound impact on how students' conceive of and participate in peer feedback. Freadman argues, "how we negotiate various genres within a system of genres

depends on . . . our uptake knowledge—our ideologically-informed, learned, and remembered knowledge of when, why, where, and how to take up a genre in relation to other genres within a system of activity" (92).

Peer feedback is a genre subset within the writing classroom genre system, and it is comprised of both the written genre under review as well as the spoken and written genres of the feedback session: the verbal exchanges among participants as they discuss papers and their written critiques/responses either on drafts or on a peer feedback worksheet. This genre subset is situated within larger institutional, educational, and classroom systems comprised of various ceremonials and rules of play. Classroom activity systems are infused with cultural and ideological values such as academic disciplinary modes of inquiry and epistemologies, programmatic learning outcomes, and the individual instructor's teaching philosophy. The practice of using peer feedback genres as pedagogical modes, as I discuss in Chapter 1, reflects ideological assumptions: students can and do learn writing skills from each other, critiquing a peers' writing is of value to the reader and writer, engaging in processes of writing leads to more effective writing, and students learn the rhetorical nature of effective writing by discussing writing with their peers.

Students do not bring a typified response to these genres, nor do all students possess the same mental shortcuts or rhetorical skills for participating in them. When they enter the classroom context on the first day or so, the feedback ceremonials and moves have not yet become normalized, nor do all students possess mental shortcuts that allow them to improvize/adapt rhetorical strategies that "play off each other in coordinated sequential ways" (Bawarshi 211). They are essentially cultural outsiders to peer feedback genres who bring varying conceptions of what peer feedback is and how to participate in it. The language and

genre moves that construct peer feedback have been established by rhetorical and composition theory insiders, and the language and epistemologies embedded in the paper topics about which they write are suffused with academic, professional, or civic communities' ideologies and values. In order to successfully engage in the spoken genres, students need some grasp of peer feedback ceremonials and the rules of play in order to improvise and adapt these moves across contexts. Some requisite genre knowledge is necessary: rhetorical awareness of the situation surrounding the draft under review (its intended audience, purpose, genre), metalanguage for appropriately and effectively commenting on drafts (strategies for pointing to specific parts of the paper being discussed and for offering specific revision/editing suggestions), and conversational moves for respectfully and appropriately giving criticism. In order to successfully participate in the written genres that comprise peer feedback, in addition to possessing the aforementioned metalangauge and conversational moves, students must also have some facility with the disciplinary discourses and epistemologies associated with their papers' topics, and if papers are discussed within virtual spaces (email, discussion boards, IM conversations, web conferencing, online peer review systems), students must not only possess the digital literacy skills to use these technologies but also rhetorical strategies for interacting within these spaces. As the literature review in Chapter 1 illustrates, all of these factors make naviagating peer feedback contexts complicated and influence why sometimes sessions are successful and sometimes they are not.

Students' previous experiences with peer feedback prime the ways they conceptualize and participate within written and spoken peer feedback genres. Those educated in teacher-centered educational systems may find it difficult to engage in classroom activities influenced by Western ideologies and student-centered learning. For example, some non-Western educational systems do not encourage students to question authority, rely on classmates for answers, or to

critique classmates' writing. Thus, students educated within these systems may find learning from their peers through activities such as group work and peer response entirely new concepts to them (Matsuda and Hammill 269). But even students who are educated in Western educational systems may find completing peer feedback difficult because these students have engaged in different levels of training and experience with peer feedback. Some students have no conception of it because they have no background experience with it. Research shows that numerous scholars themselves, Composition and otherwise, report they were not trained to respond to their peers' writing, so they failed to adequately do it, saw little purpose in doing it, and then subsequently failed to train their students to effectively do it (MIT Tech TV, "Guide for Instructors"; Cahill; Paton). Students report the same things. Many are not taught in K-12 how to respond to peers' writing (Byland). Even those who have been trained, have received different types and levels of training. Some conceptualize peer feedback as only an error hunting exercise, while others bring a larger store of rhetorical strategies to the situation in terms of giving specific comments on higher order concerns, pointing to specific places in the paper, offering specific editing suggestions, phrasing criticism in polite and useful ways, etc.

Furthermore, the commonly-assigned written genres students compose and discuss within the context of peer feedback (i.e., the essay, the annotated bibliography, the research paper) are situated within larger U.S. academic activity systems. In learning to write these pieces of discourse, students become acculturated to academically-sanctioned modes of inquiry, the associated rhetorical moves available to writers, and citation systems. However, students bring different background knowledge of and assumptions regarding the genre in which the paper is written and content knowledge of the written piece being discussed. For example, rhetorical instruction in Korea and Japan places more emphasis on the reader connecting ideas rather than

the writer overtly making them (Leki 441; Edlund and Griswold 323), favors inductive versus deductive reasoning, and teaches different genres than those taught in the U.S. (i.e., Korean schools do not teach the essay) (Leki 441). Plus, the notion that writers should take a critical stance to texts or an original or authentic point of view about an issue reflects Western values (Leki 440-441).

Moreover, one's affiliation with or lack of affiliation with co-cultures that construct, distribute, and gate keep the genres assigned in the classroom influences his/her ability to effectively produce and innovate those genres and thereby critique peers' rhetorical productions of these genres. For example, if a class is assigned to create video blogs (vlogs) as part of a course project, students with affiliations to online communities that consume and produce vlogs bring different interpretations and responses to the assignments and thereby critique peers' vlogs differently than students who lack those associated discourse community affiliations. The same could be said when students respond in any genre (a lab report, a literary analysis, a grant proposal, etc.). Plus, citation system conventions are infused with disciplinary values. For example, when students are required to cite sources in the American Psychological Association system, this system values currency of research because the year of publication is placed early in the citation. Requiring students to properly attribute their ideas within a citation system reflects Western values that are not practiced universally (Leki 440-441). However, even students educated within Western educational systems are not yet fully versed in academic disciplinary discourses and therefore may find citing in a specific citation system foreign.

In addition, students' cultural affiliations also influence their notions of how to interact politely within written and spoken peer feedback genres. In our discussions regarding the pros and cons of giving and using peer feedback, my students identify the inherent face-threatening

nature of peer feedback and the difficulty of finding appropriate ways of framing criticism. They report that it is weird to tell relative strangers what is wrong with their writing, but even if they do get to know their classmates prior to commenting on each other's papers, they claim it is often difficult for some classmates not to assume a more teacherly, directive tone or to find polite, helpful ways to critique a peer's paper. Moreover, allowing peers to read and review their writing can be intimidating and make them feel vulnerable, and accepting and using negative criticism from a classmate they do not get along with can be particularly difficult.

Brown, Levenson, and Gumperz's concept of "face" helps explain this. Each student attempts to maintain "face," or "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself [or herself]," and effective communication hinges on preserving both interlocutors' sense of "face." No "faceless" communication exists. Certain cultures use positive politeness strategies, while others prefer negative politeness strategies. Cultures that favor positive face value the desire to gain the approval of others, 'the positive consistent self-image or 'personality' claimed by interactants" (277). Positive face-saving strategies involve moves to achieve solidarity through offers of friendship, the use of compliments, and informal language: speakers treat others as friends and allies, do not impose on them, and strive to maintain others' sense of face. Cultures that favor negative face desire to be "unimpeded by others in one's actions, the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction. . .freedom to action and freedom from imposition" (277). Negative face-saving strategies include deference, apologizing, indirectness, and formality of language use: members adopt strategies so as to avoid any threats to the face others are presenting to them. Even within cultures that speak the same language, these politeness strategies can differ among social in-groups, and when outsiders fail to properly

respond to group politeness strategies, "exasperation, incompetence, aggression and so on may be unintentionally signaled" (33).

Politeness strategies are instantiated in students' conversational styles of interacting with one another throughout the peer feedback process. Linguist Deborah Tannen defines conversational style as "the function of paralinguistic and prosodic features, or contextualization cues, to maintain thematic cohesion and signal how conversational contributions are intended" (251). The style one uses to convey a message "signals what 'speech activity' or frame. . .is being engaged in (joking, lecturing, arguing, etc.,), the perceived relationship between the interlocutors, and how the message is intended to be received" (251). Features such as appropriate turn taking, use of interruptions, methods of giving praise and hedging criticism, use of back channeling, and use of silence contribute to a speaker's overall conversational style within a given context. Paralinguistic categories may consist of non-verbal communication such as regulators, or gestures (facial expressions, hand signals, eye contact, body position, silence), that help "manage the flow of verbal communication" and adaptors, which are largely unconscious expressions of the emotional state of an individual (tapping feet, scratching, rubbing eyes) (Sadri and Flammia 163-64). One's repertoire of available conversational styles, interpretation of conversational genres or frames, and ability to effectively participate within a given context is influenced by his/her social and cultural affiliations. Tannen explains that misunderstandings can occur when speakers from different cultural backgrounds interact:

> "[I]n a heterogeneous society, in which people come into contact with
> others from more or less different backgrounds, the automatic use of
> different conversational styles leads everyone far astray. Speakers are
> judging others and being judged by their ways of talking. If those ways

reflect different habits and expectations, then people are frequently

misjudging others and being misjudged and misunderstood."

(*Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends*).

One's expectations for polite behavior and communication style are not just influenced by national cultural influences but also co-cultural influences, "ethnic, religious, or class backgrounds, or even just being male or female" influence or our conversational styles (Tannen, *That's Not What I Meant*, Preface). An individual's idiosyncratic style repertoire results from an amalgam of styles s/he has learned over time through various interactions with others (*Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends*). Slight differences in conversational styles between speakers "result in individually minor but cumulatively overwhelming misunderstandings and disappointments" (Tannen, *That's Not What I Meant*, Preface). Thus, differing politeness expectations occur not only among students from other national cultures, but within national cultures. The research cited in Chapter 1's literature review showed that giving and getting feedback is inherently face-threatening, and students' conflicting or misunderstood notions of politeness and conversational styles can hinder the social and ultimately the rhetorical benefits of students sharing and responding to writing.

Drawing the Linguistic Field

Students' native language backgrounds also influence their interpretations of and participation within peer feedback written and spoken genres. Differences in native language background impact how students understand what peers are saying, how they read one another's texts, and the types of syntactical, lexical, and grammatical revision and editing suggestions they offer one another within feedback genres. Correct usage is context-specific, so it is not necessary for students to speak standard varieties of English to effectively participate within peer feedback.

Spoken peer feedback genres are typically informal in nature, and it is therefore socially acceptable to use non-standard varieties, and for many written contexts, using non-standard varieties is more appropriate. However, a certain level of fluency in Standard Edited American English is expected for academic and professional written discourses within the United States. And the literature review included in Chapter 1 indicates that students' perceived differences in abilities to encode and decode the language targeted in the writing assignment under review influenced whether they took their peers' revision and editing suggestions under consideration.

Students do not fall within binary native language/second language background categories; there is much variation among students who self-identify as L1 and L2 writers. Many students who identify as L1 students or who would be identified as "mainstream English-speaking students" may speak non-standard dialects of English (e.g., African American Vernacular English or Appalachian English) (Valdés 31). L2 writers bring a range of speaking and writing abilities to our classrooms, and their language practices are influenced by the circumstances under which they learned English and the contexts in which they have either chosen to or have been forced to speak and write in English. Elective and circumstantial bilinguals learn English under different circumstances and for different practical and educational purposes. They typically elect to learn a second or additional language through formal training such as foreign language courses. This second language is typically not spoken "within the communities they live and work," and elective bilinguals' first language is the prestigious and influential language within the communities they spend most of their time (37). Elective bilinguals are also termed "additive bilinguals" because they have elected to enhance "their overall linguistic competence in contexts" where their first language is still the dominant language used (37).

Many elective bilinguals are also eye learners of English: they have primarily learned

English through their eyes or by studying written forms of English, e.g., "studying vocabulary,"

"verb forms," and "language rules" (Reid 79). They typically have strong reading skills and have

profound knowledge of English grammar and terminology. Many eye learners are international

student writers who are well-educated and have elected to attend institutions of higher education

in the United States and have thus learned English through foreign language courses in their home

countries. In contrast to ear learners, eye learners, because of their lack of practice speaking or

listening to English, are less proficient at speaking English and translating spoken English. They

are also less familiar with U.S. cultural references, slang, and popular cultural than ear learners;

thus, entering U.S. higher education courses presents more of a culture shock to eye learners than

to ear learners (79-80). Eye learners can also display distinct non-standard features:

- Use of false cognates
- Transfer of syntax from native language (80).

However, variation among elective bilinguals' and eye learners' experiences and training

exists. Some have had formal foreign language course training in English, and their parents

chose to immigrate to the United States. Moreover, some international students' native languages

do not have a written form, or some international students have immigrated to the U.S. because

they did not succeed "in their own educational systems, and/or whose study of both their first

language and English has been limited" (80).

On the other hand, circumstantial bilinguals and ear learners learn English under different

circumstances and for different purposes than elective bilinguals or eye learners. Circumstantial

bilinguals must acquire a second language "to survive. . .Their first language does not suffice to

carry out all of their communicative needs" (37). Circumstances such as immigration, conquest,

or shifting borders have forced circumstantial bilinguals to acquire a degree of proficiency in

another national language or the dominant language used (37-38). Even circumstantial bilinguals'

language proficiency can differ widely depending on "generational level, age, occupation,

opportunity for contact with speakers of English, and exposure to English media" (41).

Moreover, many circumstantial bilinguals are also ear learners, meaning they have

learned English primarily through immersion into an English-speaking culture (such as the U.S.)

and have thus primarily participated in spoken modes of discourse "through oral trial and error":

"they listened, took in oral language (from teachers, T.V., grocery clerks, friends, peers), and

subconsciously began to form vocabulary, grammar, and syntax rules . . ." (Reid 77).

Furthermore, these students have graduated or been educated in U.S. high schools and

most likely participated in various ESL "pullout programs" throughout their academic careers.

They have also been acculturated to various aspects of U.S. culture: current events, slang, pop

culture, and U.S. cultural reference (77). Because they acquired language primarily through

spoken modes, they display varying degrees of reading and writing skills. Reid notes ear learners'

written production of English may contain some or all of the following:

- Phonetic spellings of English terms
- Self-developed language "rules" that may be incorrectly applied
- Verb tense errors
- Incorrect use of vocabulary
- Use of informal or idiomatic expressions
- Incorrect use of idiomatic expressions
- Idiosyncratic capitalization (as a result of self-developed language "rules") (77).

But again, not all ear learners evidence the same second language writing features. In

determining students' language backgrounds, it is important not to inaccurately label L2 writers

by placing them into static categories or assigning them fixed labels because these labels "are

relational categories that are always context specific, multiple, and in constant flux," and "these

identities embody myriad meanings depending on contextual factors, such as whether English is the socially dominant language" (Harklau107).

The unique circumstances under which each second-language writer has acquired English influences how s/he interacts with peers and the types of revision and editing suggestions available to them. For example, Ruecker's research that studied peer feedback sessions among native and non-native English speakers found that the non-native speakers reported they felt unqualified to comment on native speakers' writing (99). He explains that this feeling often silences non-native speakers within peer feedback sessions. Thus, peer feedback instruction and practice must emphasize to students the situated nature of "correct" usage and that the purpose of peer feedback is not merely error hunting based on an objective language standard but to respond to various dimensions, Higher Order Concerns as well as Lower Order Concerns, in terms of the piece of writing's context.

Drawing the Contextual /Logistical Field

The final dimension or field included in the peer feedback hermeneutic map is the contextual /logistic field. It accounts for how the peer feedback medium, mode, and group configurations impact students' interpretations and performances within peer feedback.

Mode/Medium

The medium and mode used to exchange drafts, discuss drafts, and give feedback impacts the rhetorical, social, and linguistic fields of interpretation as well. I define medium as the "tools and materials resources used to produce and disseminate texts" such as computers and human voices (Lauer 24). Mode constitutes the "ways of representing information, or the semiotic channels we use to compose a text" such as "words, sounds, still and moving images, animation,

and color" (Lauer 24). Both print-based, face-to-face peer feedback and computer-mediated peer feedback using asynchronous modes constitute multimodal peer feedback.

Face-to-Face, Print-Based Peer Feedback

Peer feedback that takes place in a traditional classroom through the use of oral exchanges, printed drafts, and peer feedback worksheets are what I define as face-to-face, print-based peer feedback. Conducting peer feedback in these media and modes impacts the rhetorical strategies students deploy and the conversational styles they select. The immediate, face-to-face interaction enables students to read drafts aloud, ask follow-up questions, clarify responses, read paralinguistic cues, and physically point to areas in the paper under discussion. L2 writing scholars have found that many second-language writers prefer getting oral feedback over computer-mediated modes so they can have immediate interaction with peers (Tuzi; Liu and Sadler). Face-to-face, oral feedback, simply put, is more personal than using virtual media and modes. Within the face-to-face sessions, students can also mark on, underline, or highlight areas in a draft. However, if peer feedback only takes place face-to-face in class, students have less time to read and comment on drafts and less space to make comments. The limited space on the worksheet and class time can hinder how thoroughly students respond to one another's drafts, or the rhetorical field. For example, students often claim teachers fail to provide them enough time in or outside of class to complete it (Ferris; Lynn). L2 scholars have also found that second-language writers who require more time to read and respond to drafts find completing these activities outside of class gives them extra time to translate texts and responses. Moreover, handwriting (one's own and peers') can be difficult to read when students revisit the review sheet and their drafts in order to incorporate peers' suggestions. And as mentioned above and in Chapter 1's literature review, face-to-face exchanges can be face-threatening. Students are

reluctant to give negative feedback in person, and conflicting notions of politeness and conversational styles can create communicative static among students.

Table 3: Summary of Benefits and Hindrances to Face-to-Face, Print-Based Peer Feedback

Benefits	Hindrances
• Students receive immediate feedback. • Students can clarify their responses. • Face-to-face conversation allows students to pick up on paralinguistic cues. • Students can use writing implements to mark specific areas in drafts.	• The session affords students less time to read and respond than virtual modes (Ferris; Lynn). • Peer feedback worksheets allow less space for elaborate comments. • Handwriting can be difficult to read. • Offering negative feedback is inherently face threatening.

Virtual Peer Feedback

Kastman Breuch's study on virtual peer review (VPR) distinguishes the fundamental differences between the practices of VPR and traditional face-to-face peer reviews. She explains that VPR carries the same "pedagogical assumptions" as peer review conducted within face-to-face settings (i.e., encourages a writing process, facilitates deeper learning, and emphasizes the social nature of writing), but VPR significantly changes how these activities are practiced: it "is conducted differently in terms of space, time, and interaction" in the selected virtual environment Schendel, Neal, and Hartley accurately point out that "Collaboration and online discourse are both technologies. . .[W]hen we engage in online collaboration, we are engaging in two technologies simultaneously" (201).

There are a variety of technological tools for fulfilling these purposes; some allow users to interact asynchronously and others synchronously. Asynchronous virtual modes include word processing tools for composing digital drafts and giving feedback using commenting tools. Other asynchronous tools include peer review functions within Course Management systems or email

exchanges, which facilitate exchanging drafts, inserting comments, highlighting items, changing font color, etc. A third asynchronous technology is online peer review systems accessed independently outside of the institutional online course management system, and most require a paid subscription. There are two of these products currently on the market, Eli Review and MyReviewers, that allow users distinct advantages and disadvantages, but essentially how they work is the entire peer feedback process is completed and graded through the online interface. The instructor creates the peer feedback questions and establishes due dates for students to post drafts and responses. The instructor can choose between questions that rate dimensions of the paper in terms of relevant criteria, Likert scale questions, or open-ended questions. Students also have the option of writing comments in dialogue boxes that explain their numerical ratings of the selected dimensions. The instructor can organize double blind reviews or place students in identified groups. Students submit drafts, rate and respond to one another, rate peers' feedback in terms of perceived usefulness, and generate revision plans based on feedback reports generated within the system. Once these tasks are completed, the system assigns students an aggregate grade for the reviews based on inter-rater reliability of the ratings of peers' papers and peers' evaluations of their reviews.

Synchronous virtual modes include web conferencing technologies that allow users, depending on the technology, to textually (through IM chats), audibly or audiovisually (through web conferencing technology) discuss drafts in real time.

These a/synchronous tools can be used in a sort of hybrid virtual/face-to-face configuration in which students upload or email digital drafts outside of face-to-face classroom and discuss them in person. For example, the asynchronous tools can also be used to complement synchronous discussions within computer-networked classrooms. Authors can upload or email

drafts outside of class, reviewers can download, read and comment on drafts in class or prior to class, and authors and reviewers can then orally discuss reviewer comments in class. Thus, these asynchronous and synchronous tools allow for a range of completely virtual or virtual/face-to-face possibilities.

Empirical research indicates that, overall, students find both asynchronous and synchronous more interesting and engaging than face-to-face, print-based feedback (Melkun; Garrison). However, because these modes seem more engaging on the surface, they may not be fulfilling the supposed pedagogical benefits. Instructors' and students' conceptions of the associated pedagogical benefits often misalign. Although teachers may think using technology is more engaging and facilitates better quality feedback, students may simply see it as an interesting gadget that enables them to finish more quickly but not necessarily more effectively. The technology can serve as a distraction, as a way of getting students off task (Hawisher and Selfe).

Asynchronous Virtual Modes

Asynchronous virtual modes significantly shape the quality and quantity of students' exchanges. Commentary can be longer because the reviewer is not constrained by the length of the printed sheet, and comments are easier to read (Breuch; Strenski, O'Dwyer-Feagin, and Singer; Rubin). Honeycutt's research found that students ranked asynchronous modes more favorably than chat modes because these tools prevented them from engaging in off-topic conversations and instead focusing discussion on the written piece. Hewett's study of oral versus asynchronous computer-mediated written modes found that asynchronous modes tend to encourage students to discuss specific areas in the paper and strategies for revision and editing, and students are more likely to incorporate peers' suggestions when specific feedback is given

(266-267). Rubin also found that students thought asynchronous modes are more effective than print-based modes because the software allowed them to insert their comments in relevant places in the draft and avoid off-topic discussion, and Bradley's research of U.S. and Swedish students' use of Wikis to give and get feedback found this medium encouraged them to tailor their comments in rhetorically and culturally appropriate ways, which helped them reflect on the rhetorical situation surrounding the peer feedback session. Her study also showed that students who were initially unsure how to give effective and specific feedback learned these strategies from peers who posted more thoughtful and detailed suggestions.

Additionally, completing peer feedback in virtual time allows students more time to read and respond than in face-to-face courses, which helps them make more thoughtful and useful comments (Trim; Tanacito; Crank; Chang; Olson-Horswill; Liu and Hansen; Strenski, O'Dwyer-Feagin, and Singer; Ferris; Bradley). Bradley's study of U.S. and Swedish students giving and receiving feedback on technical documents through asynchronous modes found that the temporal and spatial distances also allowed students more time to select culturally appropriate ways to hedge criticism (91), and Matsuda and Hamill identify the extra time afforded students in virtual exchanges can especially benefit L2 writers who need more time to translate. The time-saving aspect is also especially attractive to instructors in other disciplines who use peer feedback in their courses.

Unlike print-based modes, virtual asynchronous systems create an archive of the comments so students do not need to rely on their memories or on keeping up with handwritten comments (Liu and Hansen; Tanacito; DiGiovannie and Nagaswani; Olson-Horswill; Volz and Saterbak; Wardle). Archived material can be useful for instructors to reference in selecting peer feedback models and in redirecting students in their writing and in conducting peer feedback

(Anson et al; Strenski et al). Teachers can also moderate asynchronous virtual modes and intervene when students make inappropriate or inflammatory comments (Anson et al).

Hindrances specific to asynchronous modes include the time to coordinate and use the selected technologies (Melkun). The lag time between postings and response can inhibit immediate interaction and slows draft/comment clarification (Ferris; Trim). Plus, the asynchronous format, which separates students in time and space, often allows students to shirk the peer feedback requirements: in some cases authors fail to post their drafts or reviewers fail to respond. Guardardo and Shi's research showed that some L2 writers "shied away" from responding to requests for clarification and elaboration due to the time and effort required for doing so. Additionally, waiting for required responses via asynchronous modes can cause students to feel a sense of "uncertainty and anxiety" (Liu and Hansen 88). Finally, asynchronous modes can blur the lines between author/editor if students are simply incorporating one another's comments wholesale (Anson et al).

Plus, technical malfunctions, the literacy skills required to use the software, and gaining access to the software can hinder the peer feedback process, issues that would not impact face-to-face, print-based peer feedback (Shea; Rubin; Trim; Liu and Hansen; and Honeycutt). Students bring varying levels of comfort and ease with technology, and not all students will have equal access to peer feedback technologies (Taylor). Furthermore, if students are not properly prepared to coordinate peer feedback in virtual spaces, the post/send, read, respond protocol may confuse them and thereby diminish the session's effectiveness.

Synchronous Virtual Modes

Studies also reveal advantages unique to using synchronous IM or video conferencing tools to give peer feedback. Audio/visual chats systems allow students not only to discuss

writing in real time but also share documents and Internet resources and immediately play with the text (Melkun; Liu and Hansen). However, synchronous modes are not without their issues. Performance issues such as typing speeds may diminish the efficacy of synchronous chats (Liu and Hansen). Instead of synchronous chat modes being more engaging and providing authors with useful feedback, the mode can be chaotic, and students may engage in off-topic socializing rather than focusing on the reviewing one another's writing (Liu and Hansen; Sirc and Reynolds; Honeycutt). Plus, these modes can require more effort in terms of time and usability, which can influence students to make less reflective/meaningful comments (Liu and Hansen; Neuwrith qtd in Honeycutt 28). And synchronous chat modes can be logistically difficult or impossible for students taking online courses who are in different time zones or who have conflicting schedules.

Ultimately, the medium and mode in which peer feedback takes place influences how students participate and their perceptions of its efficacy. Several empirical studies conducted within L2 writing scholarship analyzed students' attitudes regarding using both face-to-face and computer-mediated modes. Students reported different benefits from each mode, and many expressed mixed opinions about giving feedback through synchronous and asynchronous modes (Braine; Digiovannie and Nagaswami; Liu and Sadler; Ho and Savignon). Thus, it isn't a matter of locating the ideal medium and mode for all classrooms but selecting the appropriate medium/ mode to suit the peer feedback activity and classroom context.

Table 4: Summary of Benefits and Hindrances to Using Virtual Peer Feedback Modes

Benefits	Hindrances
- The mode/medium itself enhances student involvement/interest (Melkun; Garrison). - VPR facilitates the acts of making and reading comments (Breuch; Strenski, O'Dwyer-Feagin, and Singer; Rubin).	- Teacher's/Students' conceptions of educational benefits associated with technology misalign (Hawisher and Selfe). - Coordinating peer feedback in a/synchronous modes requires more time and effort (Melkun).

- VPR creates an archived record of feedback (Liu and Hansen; Tanacito; DiGiovannie and Nagaswani; Olson-Horswill; Volz and Saterbak; Wardle).

- VPR provides reviewers more time to comment and thereby offer more developed and polite responses (Trim; Tanacito; Crank; Chang; Olson-Horswill; Liu and Hansen; Strenski, O'Dwyer-Feagin, and Singer; Ferris; Bradley; Matsuda and Hammil).

- Virtual modes provide an attractive alternative to faculty across the disciplines because it consumes less class time.

- Instructors can use asynchronous/synchronous modes to help absent students make up peer feedback outside of class (Anson et al; Strenski et al).

- Asynchronous modes help students make longer comments, stay on task, and insert comments in specific areas of a draft (Hewett; Rubin; Bradley).

- Asynchronous modes can help students teach and learn strategies for giving elaborated and useful revision/editing suggestions (Hewett; Honeycutt).

- Asynchronous modes allow instructors to more easily bring peers' feedback into conversation with his/her feedback. (Anson et al; Strenski et al).

- The instructor can moderate comments and control student access using asynchronous modes, which discourages vague, inflammatory, or offensive comments (Anson et al).

- Synchronous modes allow immediate, two-way exchanges and for writers/reviewers to immediately play with text (Melkun; Liu and Hansen).

- Students and the instructors may encounter difficulties using and/or accessing technology (Shea; Rubin; Trim; Liu and Hansen; and Honeycutt).

- Within asynchronous modes, unclear comments cannot be immediately explained or clarified, as in face-to-face settings (Ferris; Trim).

- The lag in post and response can create uncertainty/anxiety (Liu and Hansen).

- Authors/Reviewers may fail to post, read, or follow-up (Guardardo and Shi).

- The lines between author/reviewer can become blurred (Anson et al).

- Typing speed can inhibit synchronous IM exchanges (Liu and Hansent).

- Synchronous exchanges can be chaotic/allow students to get off topic if a protocol for discussion is not predetermined (Liu and Hansen; Sirc and Reynolds; Honeycutt).

- Synchronous modes require more time and effort, which can influence students to make less reflective/meaningful comments (Liu and Hansen; Neuwrith qtd in Honeycutt 28).

- Synchronous modes can be difficult to coordinate (different time zones/with conflicting schedules).

Group Configurations

In addition to the media and mode in which drafts are produced and shared and peer feedback is conducted, the size and configuration of peer feedback groups impact the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic interpretive fields. In some cases, instructors allow students to form their own groups, but in others, instructors randomly or purposefully group students. Moreover, instructors may choose to keep peer feedback groups stable throughout the semester or frequently alter group configurations.

Student-Selected Groups

Allowing students to select group members can provide social and rhetorical benefits because students typically choose to group with individuals they like or trust and avoid having to interact with classmates they don't get along with or, in their opinions, do not offer useful feedback. Within these self-selected groups, students are, then, more open to hearing what their classmates say about their drafts (Melkun 132). The disadvantages of allowing students to choose their own groups may hinder the social and rhetorical benefits associated with peer feedback, however. Students often select friends or those with whom they share the same "world view" and therefore may be reluctant to criticize their friends' writing, or the writer may fail to get diverse perspectives or specific feedback on their writing (132). It's true that in many cases, though, when students are given the option of selecting their groups, they don't know anyone in the class or they feel indifferent about groupings, so they simply choose students in their general classroom vicinity. This setup is essentially no different than instructors randomly grouping students.

Teacher-Selected

Teacher-selected groups can also benefit and hinder students' peer feedback performance. If instructors randomly group students, it saves both students and teachers time because there's little planning or decision making involved. This can also be done at the beginning of the semester before the teacher is familiar with students' peer feedback experiences and writing abilities. However, students can encounter the same issues noted when students group themselves: groups can be dysfunctional and feedback quality is reduced.

Purposefully grouping students on a relevant set of criteria can either enhance or hinder the rhetorical and social benefits of peer feedback as well. As noted above, students bring different rhetorical strategies for critiquing Higher Order Concerns and Lower Order Concerns within the paper under review, based on their cultural affiliations and language backgrounds. Mixing groups in terms of language background, gender, and/or writing ability can benefit students because the instructor can break up classroom cliques and allow them to get a range of feedback from peers with possible different world views (Ferris 170; Liu and Hansen 61; Corbett "Theory and Process"). However, in deliberately grouping students in terms of race, gender, or ability, students may figure out the grouping scheme and feel the teacher has inaccurately or stereotypically grouped them (Paton).

Grouping students according to their majors or paper topics resolves the problem of the reviewer not having enough content knowledge to understand and respond to the paper. In these configurations, the author receives more specific and useful comments (Liu and Hansen; Ferris; Arndt). However, Mendonca and Johnson also point out that a disciplinary outsider can serve as a more authentic reader if the writer is addressing a lay audience because s/he can point to information that needs additional glossing or is unclearly written.

Stable vs Fluid Groups

The advantage of placing students in the same peer feedback groups for the same writing sequence or even the entire semester is that students get the opportunity to know one another and establish a sense of community, which typically helps students build trust (Ferris 170). Of course, if students within stable groups have poor chemistry and individual members have frequent conflicts, the effectiveness of peer feedback can be significantly diminished.

Placing students in new or different groups for each peer feedback session can also benefit students because they get a wider variety of perspectives about their writing and avoid being wrangled with dysfunctional members the entire semester. However, fluid group members do not have the extended time to build community as those in stable groups do; thus, fluid group members have not built the same level of trust, which can diminish the purported rhetorical and social benefits of peer feedback.

Number of Members Per Group

Considering how many students to place in peer feedback groups impacts these activities' efficacy as well. The number of members in a group impacts the amount of time group members have to complete activities, the types of social interactions that are possible, and the opportunities for learning and sharing rhetorical strategies. Much of the Composition literature (regarding mainstream and L2 classrooms) suggests placing students in groups of 2-5. Paton suggests creating groups of no more than 3 because larger groups of students take longer to complete the activities, and with groups of less than 3, students only get feedback from one classmate. Beaudin et al suggest between 3 and 5 members, but note that the teacher should modify the groups based on length of the paper being reviewed. L2 scholars also argue that 3 members is the ideal number because groups with more than 3 are less efficient and take longer

to give feedback, which can diminish the quality and specificity of the peer feedback (Liu and Hansen 62). Larger group sizes can hamper group cohesion and incidentally or intentionally marginalize certain members (63). Ferris argues that L2 writing instructors should place students in groups of 3 because placing them in pairs can make some students feel uncomfortable, particularly if a student's cultural background frowns interacting with classmates of the opposite sex (Ferris). However, Mangesldorf's research shows that because L2 writers often need more time to read and respond to another's drafts, pairing them is the best method.

Mapping a Hermeneutic Peer Feedback Pedagagoy

If it isn't already apparent, peer feedback is a complex activity that consists of more than "like-minded" peers socially constructing knowledge, as social constructionists suggest. The distinct but interconnected rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields influence students' conception of what peer feedback genres are and how to participate in them. Figure 1 depicts a map that synthesizes the previous sections and visually illustrates the distinct but overlapping nature of these interpretive fields.

In light of the complex, interpretive nature of peer feedback, the question then becomes, how might writing instructors plan and coordinate peer feedback sessions in ways that consider the complex nature of interpretation and performance? Chapter 1 suggests some general tenets for enacting a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy:

- Instructors should collaborate with students to determine the best method(s) for enacting peer feedback. The rules and protocol for completing should arise from the population of students using it.

- Instructors should scaffold peer feedback-related activities: take students through a series of prepare, enact, modify, and reflect activities.

- Instructors should resist thinking a monolithic, ideal strategy for assigning peer feedback exists. What works in one class or even in one peer feedback session with one population of students may not suit another. Instructors should adapt peer feedback based on the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields.

Figure 1: Interpretive Fields Map

Cultural
- Educational background
- Literacy and language background
- Previous rhetorical instruction
- Politeness expectations
- Conversational styles

Linguistic
- Abilities to produce code targeted in writing assignment
- Abilities to comment on drafts and communicate with peers
- Conversational styles

Rhetorical
- Rhetorical awareness of situation surrounding draft under review (its intended audience, purpose, genre, medium)
- Rhetorical strategies for composing the assigned piece
- Rhetorical strategies for appropriately and specifically commenting on drafts (spoken and written media)
  - Metalanguage
  - Politeness expectations
  - Conversational styles

Contextual/Logistical
- Medium
- Mode
- Group Formations

Peer Feedback Session

This chapter section explains how these guidelines consider and adapt to the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields outlined in the previous section. This hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy represents a principled guide that considers the complex interplay between interpretive fields and can be adapted to suit classroom contexts within both face-to-face and virtual spaces.

Principle 1: Collaboratively Determine Peer Feedback Protocol

The first principle of a hermeneutic pedagogy states that the instructor should create opportunities to collaborate with students and students with each other in order to determine rules and protocol for completing peer feedback. The rules and protocol should arise from the population of students using them. As I illustrate at the beginning of this chapter, peer feedback genres are academic and educational genres infused with comitant values; they are comprised of classroom ceremonials with normalized rules and modifiable rhetorical strategies for participating in them, but students are typically not the group or community that explicitly or tactitly normalizes the rules and rhetorical strategies for participating in peer feedback genres. But why couldn't they be? Students bring different conceptions of what peer feedback is and how to do it, but that doesn't mean students are blank slates, that they have absolutely no conception of the genres that comprise peer feedback sessions. Even though students possess conflicted opinions regarding peer feedback's effectiveness, I have never heard a student say there are no benefits to peer feedback or that it is not worth spending the time and energy to do it. In fact, many of my students are interested in enhancing peer feedback's benefits as they have suggested useful strategies for improving how we do peer feedback in the classroom. In student-teacher conferences and after they submit a writing assignment, I ask students to talk about their peer feedback experiences and suggest ways we might improve how we do this activity, if

necessary. Over the years, they have given me excellent ideas for creating greater student buy-in, training them how to do it, modifying questions on the worksheets, and coordinating peer feedback activities so that they have more time for giving each other more developed and useful comments. Creating this dialogue with students in each course has fundamentally changed the ways I conduct and modify peer feedback. The first semester I garnered student feedback and then told the class we were modifying how we enacted peer feedback based on their suggestions, I noticed a distinct shift in students' attitudes towards me and the class in general. They realized I valued what they had to say and that they had some agency in determining how classroom activities designed for their benefit were executed. The peer feedback sessions became more effective, and students felt more comfortable asking questions in class and discussing their writing with me outside of class.

As stated in Chapter 1, philosophical hermeneutics contends that individuals construct meaning collaboratively in context. Dialogue between speakers/writers and readers/listeners fuses and broadens their respective interpretive fields as they attempt to reach concensus within each new context. Communal ceremonials, rules, and available rhetorical strategies should be formed organically with each new classroom of students. In order for students to see peer feedback genres as classroom ceremonials with normalized rules and modifiable rhetorical strategies, some acculturation needs to occur; students need methods of conceptualizing genre norms and expectations as well as strategies for adapting and innovating the rules of play. Even though genres are stable enough to provide participants mental shortcuts, writer/speakers adapt them to suit each new context (Devit qtd in Bawarshi and Reiff 151), or each new writing assignment and related peer feedback session offers writers different affordances and constraints.

An effective means of facilitating diverse groups of students in articulating these items is to adopt what Bob Broad refers to as dynamic criteria mapping. Broad created this qualitative approach to organically assess writing programs. He suggests writing program administrators include various stakeholders (students, writing instructors from various disciplines, members of local workplace communities) within a programmatic assessment to determine what these individuals value about selected student writing samples; writing program administrators then record these stakeholders' impressions of what worked and what did not within the samples; and finally, the administrators use these responses to modify student learning outcomes and writing pedagogy in ways that reflect these values. Thus, the values, expectations, and strategies for effective writing arise from the population directly involved in the teaching, production, and consumption of written discourse. In Broad's scheme, the administrator(s) conducting the assessment performs discourse analyses of their conversations, codes the discussions, places salient comments into distinct categories, and creates a map of criteria categories representing what the assessors valued (Broad). This same concept of collaborative, site-based, context-specific assessment could be adapted to determine how specific populations of students within a given classroom context interpret peer feedback and to discover their own strategies for participating within them. The teacher's job is to provide oppoturnies and engage students in activities that faciliate their collaboratively creating the classroom ceremonials and norms, to help strategies become normalized but adaptable to suit the writing context. The instructor, as the member of the community more versed in peer feedback genres and rhetorical strategies, can collaborate with students and students with each other, to generate the ceremonials and rules of play. This approach accounts for and values the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual interpretive frames students bring to peer feedback genres but also helps them learn new

strategies from the instructor and from each other. So, the peer feedback writing heuristic arises from the population of students directly involved in peer feedback sessions.

Principle 2: Engage Students in Preparatory, Enact, Reflect Activities

To collaboratively generate classroom ceremonials, normalize rules, and tease out available rhetorical strategies, instructors should first prepare and train students to engage in peer feedback; encourage students to use the strategies they learned within the preparatory stage when they complete peer feedback; have students reflect on their experiences; and then using the instructor's observations of student groups (their interactions and quality of feedback commentary), the instructor's analyses of students' final drafts, and student feedback data, the instructor can then decide how or if students need continued training how to modify peer feedback protocol.

Preparing/Training Students

In order to determine students' conceptions of and previous experiences with peer feedback and to better align their conceptions and facilitate their learning and sharing the rules and rhetorical strategies for participating in peer feedback genres, instructors should coordinate activities that teach students why they're engaging in peer feedback and how to do it. Instructors can faciliate the class normalizing and stablizing the genre somewhat through what Janet Giltrow calls a "meta-genre" of peer feedback. She explains, communities often teach "and stabilize uptake" through "meta-genres" (qtd in Bawarshi and Reiff 94). They offer speakers/writers "background knowledge and guidance in how to produce and negotiate genres within systems and sets of genres" (94). Meta-genres serve to normalize genre knowledge and strategies, but they can also encourage users to crystallize their genre knowledge and carry over this knowledge to other contexts in which those genre moves are ineffective or inappropriate. Meta-genres can

serve to hamper one's ability to situate and innovate genre strategies. For example, if a student received ineffective or inadequate instruction on how to complete peer feedback, s/he may transfer those habits to other peer feedback contexts. Thus, it is important for writing instructors to use meta-genres through preparatory exercises that not only offer students best practices but tease out students' background knowledge so the class can capitalize on the effective strategies and avoid the ineffective ones.

Artemeva and Logie studied engineering students' use of peer feedback and found that those who were trained became better at doing it as the semester progressed as they provided more specific and useful feedback. Brammer and Rees' large scale research that surveyed L1 writers about their attitudes toward peer feedback also found that students reported peers gave them more useful and specific feedback than their teachers, but only when the reviewer had been adequately trained (26). Lui and Hansen found that within L2 composition classrooms, if students are trained, guided, and supported in the practice, even the "weaker" writers respond to classmates' writing more effectively (Lui and Hansen 22), and Min's study comparing groups of EFL students who had been trained to give and incorporate peer feedback with those who had not found that the trained group gave better quality feedback and incorporated more of their peers' suggestions in ways that improved the quality of their final drafts. Moreover, L2 writers who are trained give better quality comments and suggest more "meaning changes" (Berg 230). L2 writers coached in giving peer feedback are also more likely to value and use their peers' feedback (Ferris 77). Finally, Rothschild and Klingenberg trained L2 students to apply a rubric to evaluate peers' writing and found the trained students came closer to matching the instructors' evaluations of the essays than untrained students.

Additionally, preparing students to respond to one another's writing by helping them get to know one another and making them aware of the importance of taking a polite rhetorical stance can make students more "conscientious and considerate" (Johnson and Roen 31). When students are taught to use politeness strategies and use "facilitative language," these activities can enhance cooperation and therefore increase the potential of better quality review sessions and suggestion implementation (Mangelsdorf and Schlumberger; Nelson and Murphy; Tang and Tithecott).

The table below notes that in order to consider students' respective rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic fields of interpretation, the preparatory activities should help tease out and draw on the conceptions and strategies students bring to peer feedback genres, introduce them to new and effective ones, and facilitate students and instructors collaboratively norming classroom ceremonials and strategies.

Table 5: How Training Strategies Should Consider Interpretive Fields

Rhetorical/Cultural Fields	- Training should tease out the rhetorical strategies for written and spoken peer feedback genres students bring to the peer feedback session - Training should consider students' previous rhetorical instruction. - Training should teach students rhetorical strategies for composing the assigned piece, strategies for specifically commenting on drafts - Training should find out students' politeness expectations for engaging in written and spoken peer feedback genres and - Training should help align and norm politeness/conversational style expectations.
Linguistic Field	- Training should consider and adapt to students' abilities to produce code targeted in writing assignment. - Training should consider and adapt to students' abilities to comment on drafts and communicate with peers.
Contextual Field	Instructor and students can determine best mode and group configuration based on the planning and reflection strategies.

Enacting Peer Feedback

Students then practice the ceremonials and strategies they've learned through the preparatory activities by engaging in peer feedback sessions. Once students have conducted relevant preparatory exercise(s) that emphasize the purpose and benefits of peer feedback, in/effective ways of giving /receiving it, and im/polite ways of doing it, the class should discuss the logistics for completing peer feedback and determine some protocol and norms for completing it. Liu and Hansen point out that to better acquaint students with the process, create student buy-in, and tailor it to each classroom of students and to each assignment, instructors should collaboratively "establish norms and rules early on" but allow students the space/opportunity "to revise their rules as they become more acquainted [and more adept] at the process" (69-70).

Preferred mode and protocol will be contingent on students' rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. Clearly, for some of these items, the instructor nor the students have options. For example, the instructor or students themselves may not have access to certain peer feedback technologies or the time to learn to use them, or the course schedule may not allow for extended periods between posting and responding to drafts. The instructor can determine the extent to which s/he wants to garner student feedback. Initially the instructor can establish protocol based on his/her observations and student feedback during the training stage, which is still collaborative because it is based on dialogue among the teacher and students. After the first and subsequent peer feedback sessions, the instructor can modify protocol and logistics and determine if additional training in some aspect is needed based on his/her continued observations and on student reflections and feedback.

Reflecting on Peer Feedback

Third, the instructor needs to garner feedback from students about their experiences through reflective activities. It's critical that instructors engage students in meta-discourse on what they learned about strategies for enacting it, how they used or why they did not use their peers' feedback, what worked well in terms of the process, and how the process might be improved. This dialogue along with students' written reviews of each other's work, and final drafts will help instructors gauge how effectively students are engaging in and using peer feedback and provide further training or adjust the ways students enact it if necessary. Henry and Ledbetter's study provides empirical research that shows students can improve their peer feedback skills over the course of a semester if modeling is coupled with reflection (11). Vatalaro's anecdotal evidence showed that when he enlisted his students to co-create and modify peer feedback protocol, they felt valued and had a greater sense of agency, gave more effective and specific feedback, generated more creative and effective methods than he alone could have, began to authentically enjoy and value peer feedback, and established a fun, community-based class (27-28).

The instructor should also combine his/her observations with student reflection feedback to assess how peer feedback may need to be adapted or where further training is necessary. Observing groups working together and analyzing the types of responses students are giving one another and how they are/not implementing them in final drafts help the instructor determine how to adapt training or peer feedback protocol.

This series of activities provides a means of scaffolding peer feedback genres so that students more effectively learn strategies from the instructor as well as each other. Lev Vygotsky's theory of "zone of proximal" argues that learning occurs when an individual is

grouped with "capable peers" or with someone who is more knowledgeable about a particular topic; the learner, through dialectic learning, gradually builds, enhances and modifies his/her knowledge of the topic/concept. In order for learning to occur, though, there must be some experiential overlap between interlocutors; there must be a zone of overlap in order for learners to relate to the topic and gradually enhance their knowledge. If the knowledge gap between what individuals already know and what they are trying to learn is too expansive, the learner will have a difficult time understanding and therefore fail to gain new knowledge. Thus, instead of introducing too much new knowledge all it once, it is best to scaffold information so that learners can be gradually introduced and have time to process information in smaller increments.

Principle 3: Adapt Peer Feedback Based on Instructor Observation and Student Feedback

The final concept in my hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy states that the instructor should adapt peer feedback protocol based on student feedback and on his or her observations of how students are performing during the feedback sessions and how or if they are incorporating feedback into their final drafts. First, it is important for the instructor to observe (in face-to-face, print-based configurations as well as in virtual exchanges) if students are responding as respectful readers and not the teacher, if all members of the group are being included, and if students are using metalanguage and providing specific suggestions to help peers revise their drafts. Moreover, the instructor needs to notice if students are reading and considering peers' comments by reading their reflections of peers' comments and examining how or if final drafts reflect peers' suggestions. However, instructors also need to triangulate what s/he is observing within peer feedback sessions, student reflections, and final drafts by discussing the peer feedback sessions with students. Opening classroom dialogue regarding the peer feedback sessions' usefulness helps the instructor determine if students need further training and how rules

and protocol need to be adapted to better connect with rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields of interpretation. The adaption may consist of further rhetorical training, for example, on how to give specific feedback or incorporate suggestions, or it may consist of training students how to more politely interact with one another or regrouping students. In their reflections, students may note things like they ran out of time, couldn't read a peers' handwriting, etc. Thus, altering the medium or mode would be more beneficial to students. In order to adapt peer feedback protocol, the instructor needs a store of available pedagogical strategies for training/continued training students to address specific issues noted in their reflections and in the instructor's observations of groups.

The interpretive fields and hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy fundamentals elaborated in this chapter do not offer writing instructors or students a variety of detailed, adaptable practical classroom strategies for enacting a hermeneutic pedagogy: activities for training students, methods for enacting peer feedback within face-to-face, print-based and virtual settings, reflection activities, and methods that encourage teachers and students to collaboratively construct peer feedback norms and protocol. What resources does the field of Composition Studies provide instructors and subsequently students for accounting for and adapting to the interpretive nature of peer feedback in the composition classroom? To answer this question, Chapter 3 analyzes widely-used and endorsed writing instructor training handbooks.

Chapter 3: Searching for a Hermeneutic Peer Feedback Pedagogical Guide: An Analysis of Writing Instructor Handbooks

Writing instructors' preparedness to help students conceptualize and participate in peer feedback genres begins with the type of training they receive in either a teaching assistant practicum or a graduate seminar in Composition Studies. Within these courses, professors typically assign writing instructor handbooks or guides. This chapter questions, what training resources in the field of Composition Studies are available for writing program administrators and writing instructors to help instructors and students account for and adapt to the interpretive nature of peer feedback? To find the answer to this question, I analyzed writing instructor handbooks authored and widely-endorsed by Composition scholars to determine the current mainstream methods for training writing instructors to coordinate peer feedback in their classrooms. My analysis of the selected corpus illustrates that these handbooks do not offer instructors clearly detailed guidebooks to enacting a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy. The texts analyzed recommend scaffolded prepare, enact, and reflect systems, and these systems offer some useful strategies for training students, enacting peer feedback, and having students reflect on their peer feedback experiences. However, overall, the handbooks do not offer an adequate menu of preparatory/planning strategies for helping instructors coordinate peer feedback with culturally and linguistically heterogeneous groups of students using print-based as well as virtual modes. Moreover, certain handbook passages are unclear about how to enact some of the recommended strategies and how these strategies consider specific interpretive fields or how to emphasize interpretive differences to students, particularly the linguistic and contextual fields. The guides are also unclear how to use student reflection data and teacher observations to adapt training methods and enactment modes in ways that better consider the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic interpretive fields. Additionally, the passages in which the handbooks discuss new

media technologies to coordinate peer feedback are not clearly brought into conversation with the plan, enact, reflect systems for implementing peer feedback in face-to-face, print-based modes. The guides are unclear exactly how/why instructors might use virtual modes to *adapt* to specific rhetorical, cultural, or linguistic interpretive fields.

I am not claiming that the analyzed handbooks provide no useful strategies for conducting peer feedback in the composition classroom. As I illustrate below, many of them do. Some of the guides are more useful for enacting certain dimensions of a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy than others, but even if instructors read all the information about peer feedback included in the selected corpus, they would not have a clear roadmap for enacting a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy.

My interactions with writing instructors in a variety of contexts have shown me the need for effective methods of engaging culturally and linguistically diverse groups of students in peer feedback. While serving as the University of New Mexico's Assistant Director of Core Writing, I trained graduate teaching assistants through orientation sessions, a requisite TA practicum, and classroom observations. In discussions on assigning peer feedback within the TA practicum and within in-service sessions, I engaged participants in the same preparatory exercise I use with students enrolled in my writing courses. We discussed the instructors' previous experiences with giving and receiving feedback from peers, and I recorded their responses on the white board at the front of the room. After the instructors and I completed this discussion, I lowered the projection screen and projected a Word file with student responses to the same exercise over the top of the white board where I had recorded the instructors' response. What was fascinating to the instructors is that their responses were nearly identical to student responses. Instructors identified the same rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic benefits and hindrances that students do.

Instructors, like students, interpret peer feedback's pedagogical purposes and means of enacting it through their previous peer feedback training and experiences giving and receiving peer comments when they were students themselves, their pedagogical training in conceptualizing and enacting peer feedback in their classrooms, and their practical experience (or lack of experience) assigning peer feedback in the composition classroom. Initially, new instructors rely on their personal experiences with peer feedback and the theory and methods learned and shared during TA training, and these personal experiences and TA training methods vary widely. In planning orientation sessions and the teaching practicum, I used widely-endorsed instructor guides and key pieces of scholarship to help new instructors conceptualize peer feedback and assign it in their classrooms, and although these were useful to the new teachers, the instructors I mentored still frequently asked me for tips to help students see the value and purpose of doing peer feedback, to help students more effectively and specifically respond to one another's writing, and means of making the practice useful for both native speakers of English as well as non-native speakers. I'd hear instructors say things like, "Yeah, that worked in my first class but totally fell apart in the next one."

Empirical research also indicates that Graduate Teaching Assistants question the purported benefits of peer feedback. A 2011 study published in the *Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators* researched graduate teaching assistants' (GTAs) perceptions of and attitudes toward the use of peer feedback as a pedagogical tool within a large writing program. The findings showed a mismatch between their perceptions and attitudes and the purported benefits of peer feedback reflected in Composition Studies literature. The GTAs agreed that using peer feedback creates a more "democratic space" in the classroom because students are learning from one another instead of just the instructor, and it helps students

consider audience concerns when revising their writing, but the GTAs ultimately considered peer feedback counterproductive because it is time-consuming and in some cases it "challenges their authority" (Bedford and O'Sullivan 11).

Experienced writing instructors also bring a range of experiences assigning peer feedback and using methods that consider the cultural, rhetorical, and contextual fields of interpretations, and many continue to question how to make peer feedback more useful to a wider variety of students. Instructors trained to work with second-language writers or who have taught English as a second language abroad may be more attuned to how the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic interpretive fields impact writing instruction, but some report being at a loss for how to effectively coordinate peer feedback with populations of second-language writers. For example, after presenting my research on peer feedback at a job interview recently, a second-language writing specialist in the audience asked me how to better engage her L2 writers in peer feedback because what she was doing just didn't seem to work with her students. Lynn Belcher's survey of more experienced writing instructors published in 2000 also shows conflicted instructor attitudes about using peer feedback in the writing classroom. Instructors reported peer response does not fulfill the following pedagogical benefits: facilitate students in enacting a process approach to writing or help students better understand how to specifically revise their writing. The ironic thing about Belcher's findings is that despite citing these failures, 97% of the responders said they would suggest new composition instructors use it in their classrooms because it offers other benefits: students become more critical readers, they get a sense of audience perception of their writing, and they gather alternative strategies for responding to the writing assignment (107-110).

The efficacy of peer feedback and strategies for conducting it also continues to be part of informal discussions among writing program administrators. Between 2000 and 2013, subscribers to the Council of Writing Program Administrators listserv[2] engaged in approximately ten separate conversations regarding peer feedback (on average, about one a year), and they fell into one or more of the following categories: whether peer feedback perpetuates "group think," if it is effective, how to conduct and assess it (training, sequencing, crediting students), which media (handbooks, videos) are best for training students to do it, and how to use computer-mediated methods. As recently as August 2014, listserv participants discussed the topic of "teaching revision." One prominent scholar accurately pointed out that, "We can't just put them [students] into some small groups and expect effective response and revision."

Considering the ubiquity and variety of new media tools for teaching writing and the increased culturally and linguistically heterogeneous makeup of the composition classroom, it is important that writing instructors have resources for conceptualizing the interpretative nature of peer feedback and adapting to it accordingly. If writing instructors are not adequately trained to account for the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields of interpretation either in their rhetorical instruction as students themselves, in a TA practicum, or an in-service training session, they find themselves accidental tour guides in the cultural contact zones of peer feedback. Writing instructor training and professional development needs to emphasize how the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields of interpretation influence student participation in peer feedback contexts. So, what sorts of peer feedback field guides are available to writing program administrators and new writing instructors for doing this? What

---

[2] According to a post by one of its moderators, Barry Maid, WPA-L had approximately 3355 subscribers as of March 2012. WPA-L states it "is an international e-mail discussion list intended primarily for individuals who are involved in writing program administration at universities, colleges, or community colleges. Faculty or students interested in program administration are welcome to join" (Council of Writing Program Administrators). Moreover, a number of renowned rhetoric and composition scholars subscribe to and actively participate in this listserv.

strategies do these guides offer instructors for enacting a hermeneutic pedagogy and considering the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual frames of reference students bring to peer feedback?

To find the answer to these questions, I analyzed and coded conversations that occurred among the Council of Writing Program Administrators listerv subscribers between 2000 and 2014 regarding text selections for TA practica and composition theory courses. As a subscriber myself, I noticed that approximately every year, someone poses a question like: "I'm teaching a TA practicum (or a composition theory course) next semester. What texts do you all recommend I use?" I mined the archived listserve conversations for queries of this nature that occurred between 2000-2013 to compile a list of the top ten suggested texts. Moreover, some listserv subscribers shared syllabi from which text titles were mined. Recommendations included anthologies of key theories and issues in the field of Composition as well as new instructor guides. Because I was looking for how writing instructors are not only trained to conceptualize but also enact peer feedback in the classroom, I narrowed my units of analysis to the teaching guides because they offer a mixture of peer feedback theory and practice. I eliminated the anthologies because they include general theories rather than guides to enacting peer feedback. Table 6 lists the texts I analyzed in order of the number of endorsements they received.

Table 6: Handbook Units of Analysis

	Authors and Title	No. of Endorsements
1.	Tate, Gary, Amy Rupiper, Taggart, Kurt Schick, and H. Brooke Hessler. *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford UP, 2014. Print.	24
2.	Glenn, Cheryl and Melissa Goldthwaite. *The St. Martin's Guide to Teaching Writing*. 7th ed. Boston, Bedford/St. Martins, 2014. Print.	17
3.	Lindemann, Erika. *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*. 4th ed. New York, Oxford UP, 2001. Print.	17
4.	Clark, Irene. *Concepts in Composition: Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing*. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge, 2012. Print	13

A weakness in this methodology is that the units analyzed do not entirely account for all the means by which TAs are trained to conduct peer feedback. TA practica instructors also commonly assign supplemental readings not included in the handbooks, give lectures and facilitate classroom discussions on a range of teaching topics, and require new instructors to conduct their own research on relevant topics of interest to them. New teachers are also observed in the classroom, and in many cases the more experienced observer will suggest effective teaching strategies. Moreover, new instructors learn feedback strategies from their colleagues or through in-service activities. Therefore, students enrolled in teaching practica and composition theory courses can and do learn peer feedback strategies through these other avenues. However, for the sake of narrowing the data for this chapter, I examine these four guides because distinguished scholars and teachers in the field of Composition Studies consider them to be representative of key theories and effective practical teaching strategies in the field. Essentially, these handbooks are informed by cutting edge research and synthesize best practices in the field of Composition Studies. Thus, these texts serve as a representative sample of writing instructor training methods.

Handbook Analysis Research Questions

To determine if or how these training materials provide clear guidebooks or tourist maps for instructors to enact a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy, I asked the following questions in my analyses of each selected handbook:

Question 1: What strategies do the selected handbooks offer for instructors to adopt a hermenetuic pedagogy within ***face-to-face classrooms using print-based modes***?

- **Question 1a:** What methods are recommended within the handbooks for helping instructors scaffold print-based peer feedback-related activities: take students through a series of prepare, enact, modify, and reflect activities? How do the recommended strategies consider the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields?

- **Question 1b:** Do the handbooks offer alternatives/methods for adapting print-based peer feedback based on student feedback/instructor observations that better consider and adapt to the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields?

- **Question 1c:** What strategies are recommended for helping instructors collaborate with students to determine the best method for responding to their print-based peers' drafts, the rules and protocol for completing peer feedback?

Question 2: What strategies do the selected handbooks offer for instructors to adopt a hermenetuic pedagogy within ***hybrid (face-to-face/virtual) and completely online classrooms using computer-mediated technologies***?

- **Question 2a:** What methods are recommended within the handbooks for helping instructors scaffold peer feedback-related activities: take students through a series of prepare, enact, modify, and reflect activities within virtual modes? How do the recommended strategies consider the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields?

- **Question 2b:** Do the handbooks offer methods for adapting virtual peer feedback based on student feedback/instructor observations that better consider and adapt to the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields?

- **Question 2c:** What strategies are recommended for helping instructors collaborate with students to determine the best method for responding to their peers' drafts, the rules and protocol for completing peer feedback within virtual environments?

Suggested Preparatory/Training Methods for Print-Based Peer Feedback

Three of the handbooks[3] offer some useful methods of preparing and training students how to effectively use metalanguage to discuss specific parts drafts that need editing/revision, and a few methods of hedging negative criticism, but overall, the handbooks do not offer an adequate menu of strategies that consider culturally and linguistically heterogeneous groups of students. Only one of the guides emphasizes the importance of initially determining students' educational backgrounds, experiences with peer feedback, and native language backgrounds prior to selecting training methods and coordinating peer feedback sessions. It is also unclear exactly how to coordinate some of the recommended strategies and how they consider specific interpretive fields or how to emphasize interpretive differences to students, particularly the linguistic field. *Concepts in Composition* cites Lindeman's handbook and Bishop's article (anthologized in the *St. Martin's Guide*) for recommended parts of its recommended plan, enact, and reflect systems, so this handbook did not offer any unique strategies for coordinating print-based peer feedback; thus, I excluded distinct discussion of it in my analysis. The section below explains the recommended methods within both *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers* and the *St. Martin's Guide* and analyzes their usefulness for considering and adapting to the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields.

---

[3] *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies* discusses group work, peer feedback, and co-authored projects in a chapter entitled "Collaborative Writing: Digital to Print" by Krista Kennedy and Rebecca Moore Howard, but the handbook does not include a distinct section detailing tools for coordinating peer feedback. The chapter concludes that by the end of the twenty-first century, the field of Composition Studies had largely agreed upon the collaborative nature of writing, and therefore the scholarship surrounding peer feedback has recently waned. The authors urge readers to consult Karen Spear's *Sharing Writing: Peer Response in English Classes* published in 1988, which they claim contains tried and true peer feedback practices still widely used today. Thus, the implication is that these pedagogical strategies have become so standardized and ubiquitous that it is not necessary to elaborate further in the guide.

Assigning Pre-Peer Feedback Low-Stakes Writing

Bishop's prepare, enact, reflect system is the only one that emphasizes the importance of determining or teasing out students' conceptions and available strategies for engaging in peer feedback genres prior to training students to do to enact it. Bishop recommends that at the beginning of the semester, instructors assign students to produce one or more of the following:

- written descriptions of what students feel can be accomplished in writing groups,
- written descriptions of students' writing process,
- written apprehension test, and
- Pre essay samples (Bishop 317).

Assigning this type of writing prior to coordinating peer feedback is useful for determining students' interpretations of and their potential abilities to effectively participate in written and spoken peer feedback genres, to find out which media/modes students prefer to give and get feedback, and to determine their language backgrounds, but Bishop does not explain how the data from these writing assignments might be used to select or adapt training methods or methods of enacting peer feedback in ways that consider rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual interpretive fields. Instead, she recommends instructors assign these low-stakes writing assignments in order to assess students' progress over the semester. She recommends using the data from these pieces to compare to data from each student's writing and group folder responses (discussed below) at the end of the semester to determine if their abilities to work in groups and writing skills have improved.

Assigning Low-Stakes Group Tasks

A second preparatory activity endorsed in both handbooks involves having students practice working in groups on low-stakes class activities prior to the feedback session. Glenn and Goldwaite explain, "Assigning tasks to small groups early in the term show students what kinds of activities might be useful, gives groups a shared set of goals and objectives, and builds

camaraderie" (73). These activities account for the social/cultural regions of interpretation because they give students a chance to get to know each other and learn one another's expectations for politeness expectations and conversational styles as well as some of their rhetorical training; however, neither Lindemann nor Glenn and Goldwaite specify exactly how to foreground these dimensions to students. The assumption is that if students practice working together, they will somehow learn to do it well.

<div align="center">

Assigning Individual Group Roles

</div>

Bishop provides a more developed rationale for assigning low-stakes assignments prior to asking students to engage in peer feedback. She claims, "students need to develop a group identity and participate in a new writing community," (314) and because of the diverse perspectives and genre knowledge student bring to peer feedback groups, each group "take[s] different lengths of time to form a community" (315). Thus, a certain extent of community acculturation needs to occur before students engage in peer feedback genres. In order for students to understand how they need to participate in a group, the instructor should distribute a list of roles and responsibilities and let group members decide which they'd like to be responsible for fulfilling. Bishop states, "each role needs to be clearly defined (historian, monitor, etc.)"; however, Bishop does not clearly define what these roles are for guidebook readers. To help groups practice responding, Bishop recommends students practice responding to assigned content or course-relevant questions and/or creating their own (316). When students self-select roles and generate their own questions, they have some agency in learning and creating classroom community norms, rules, and expectations, a method which accounts for the rhetorical and cultural dimensions of interpretation.

Role Playing and "So On"

Bishop lists other training methods such as "role playing," "reviewing sample essays," and "so on" (314). Her article, though, does not specify how to orchestrate these activities or what they train students to do/understand, nor does Bishop elaborate on "and so on."

Instructor-Modeled Peer Feedback

In addition to assigning low-stakes group assignments, the handbooks recommend engaging students in peer feedback training sessions of one type or another. Lindemann's scheme (and Bamberg's scheme in *Concepts in Composition*, which cites Lindemann) involves the teacher illustrating "the kinds of issues [the instructor wants] discussed and the talk [the instructor] wants to hear," by modeling how to give feedback to a sample student paper in front of the class just prior to the first peer feedback workshop (206). To model how to converse about their writing, Lindemann suggests the instructor "write some conversation starters on the board" (206).

Clearly the instructor-modeled approach considers the rhetorical and cultural fields of interpretation because modeling metalanguage and conversational strategies for participating within the written and spoken peer feedback genres, but if we analyze Lindemann's discourse here, we find the implication is that the instructor can serve to control the discourse, to suggest that his/her way of conversing and giving suggestions is the norm because the discussion is centered around students emulating kinds of discussions and "talk the instructor wants to hear" (206). This method does not allow students to discuss their expectations for engaging in peer feedback, to model giving and getting feedback, or to discuss their expectations for polite behavior. The assumption here is that the instructor's discourse should be the model. Liu and Hansen's as well as Dana Ferris's scholarship on coordinating peer feedback among L2 writers

note that because collaborative pedagogies such as peer feedback may be completely foreign to students not education within a U.S. system, they may find peer feedback completely foreign, so it is important for instructions to give explicit instructions at the beginning of the semester. Thus, Lindemann's method may be particularly useful for classrooms with a significant number of L2 writers, but Lindemann does not mention this fact or highlight this training method as particularly helpful to L2 writers. The guidebook, then, offers an unclear road map for adequately considering the cultural and linguistic fields within face-to-face contexts.

Whole Class-Modeled Peer Feedback

Glenn and Goldwaite as well as Bamberg endorse the whole class workshop as a means of teaching students effective rhetorical strategies for conceptualizing and participating within spoken and written peer feedback genres, and this method more effectively includes students' voices and opinions within the training phase of peer feedback. In this configuration, students read a sample student paper outside of class and compose a note to the author pointing out the text's strengths and weaknesses and specific recommendations for improvement. Then, in class, the writer or a class member reads the sample text aloud. Responders are then prompted to ask questions that give them additional context for the piece: How long have you been working on it? What are your concerns? Do you already have plans for revision? Responders then share their written responses to the sample paper. The writer takes notes on what classmates say, asks further questions, and provides clarification. The instructor then discusses his/her feedback, noting strengths, weaknesses, and recommending revisions and placing these comments in dialogue with students' responses (71-72). This method allows instructors to model how to use metalanguage and give specific recommendations for revision. Furthermore, coupling positive with negative feedback offers students hedging strategies, and because most of the session

focuses on students' feedback, students too are able to share and learn effective strategies they bring to peer feedback genres. Glenn and Goldwaite acknowledge that not all students will participate equally in the whole class workshop, for example students, who fail to offer written or spoken comments, but all students in the class benefit by "witnessing the writer getting feedback" (71-71). Thus, even shier students or students who are not quite sure how to respond can learn some effective strategies for giving and getting peer feedback.

Grouping Students

A critical contextual factor that, according to all of the handbooks, should be considered in preparing and training students to engage in peer feedback is grouping students. In fact, the first order of business in Lindemann's system consists of strategically grouping students so they can capitalize on diverse interpretations and avoid potential face-threatening or exclusive practices. She recommends instructors "divide the class into heterogeneous groups (in terms of age, gender, race, and writing ability) of five to seven members" (Lindemann 205). Glenn and Goldwaite also suggest instructors create groups of four students mixed in terms of "writing ability, race, age, personality, and gender," (74). The heterogeneous grouping method ostensibly allows for a stronger pool of rhetorical and cultural perspectives to inform the peer feedback sessions thereby increasing the odds of students learning and sharing strategies. In addition, both "weaker" and "stronger" writers benefit because weaker writers can "witness the behaviors of stronger writers," and all group members get ideas for responding to the writing prompt (Glenn and Goldwaite 74). Lindemann further rationalizes the 5-7 member grouping configuration claiming smaller groups can create social rifts between group members and create potentially face-threatening situations: "groups smaller than five sometimes mean that one student must arbitrate disagreements; groups larger than seven often develop cliques"

(Lindemann 205). Bishop recommends a more contextual and fluid approach to grouping students. She states that pairing students is more appropriate in some cases due to the complexity of the assigned task in pairs. These pairs can then be combined into groups of four or five, and the group combinations should represent a mixture of "gender and age" (314).

Bishop's grouping strategy may better help the instructor form heterogeneous groups based on students' perceived abilities to work in a group setting. She urges instructors to have students "rate themselves on criteria like ability to lead, to help, to take risks, and so on, and groups may be balanced with a member strong in each area" (314). This method encourages students to self-identify related skills and contribute to a more collaborative grouping method. Bishop does not include a survey with specific questions or rating scales, so it is not entirely clear what she means by "ability to lead, to help, to take risks, and so on" (314).

Glenn and Goldwaite as well as Bishop cite both rhetorical/cultural benefits and hindrances to maintaining stable groups or rotating group members throughout the semester. Keeping students in stable groups gives them more time to create a "stronger sense of solidarity and community," and allowing groups to create a group name helps them "identify as a community" (Bishop 315). However, Glenn and Goldwaite and Bishop note that rotating group members can enable students to learn and share strategies and perspectives with a greater number of classmates as well as "revitalize" groups (Glenn and Goldwaite 73; Bishop 315).

Lindemann's and Glenn and Goldwaite's heterogeneous grouping method seems to account for diverse interpretations and practices for engaging in peer feedback, but the authors do not explain the criteria for determining these static demographic categories. Differences among individuals emerge in context, so simply using demographic categories to sort students will not ensure the groups are diverse. Plus, this grouping scheme fails to consider how students'

native language backgrounds might impact successful groupings. Bishop's survey-based

grouping method does not include a survey with specific questions or rating scales, so it is not

entirely clear what she means by "ability to lead, to help, to take risks, and so on."

Table 7: Summary of Print-Based Preparatory/Training Methods Recommended in Handbooks

Method	Interpretive Fields Considered
Pre-Peer Feedback Writing Assignment • written descriptions of what students feel can be accomplished in writing groups. • written descriptions of students' writing process, • written apprehension test, and • Pre essay samples	*The lists below represent potential benefits, but the guide does not identify these as potential benefits. Plus, specific prompts/questions for these written descriptions are not provided.* **Rhetorical/Cultural** • Determines students' writing abilities • Reveals students' previous experiences with peer feedback/if it's previously been part of their writing processes • Reveals students' conceptions of effective/ineffective peer feedback strategies **Linguistic:** • Illustrates students' abilities to write in non-native language **Contextual** • Could show which modes and media students have used to participate in peer feedback • Could ask students to explain the types of group configurations they prefer
Low-stakes group activities • Students assume clearly defined roles within groups (historian, monitor, etc.). • Groups practice responding to set questions or learn to generate their own.	**Rhetorical/Cultural** • Gives students opportunities to get to know one another. • Helps them practice interacting and solving problems collaboratively *The list below represents potential benefits, but the guide does not identify these as potential benefits.* **Rhetorical/Cultural** • Can teach students how to use metalanguage when discussing writing • Can teach students strategies for making specific comments • Can assist students in learning expectations for conversational exchanges

	Linguistic: • Texts do not mention how language background needs to be emphasized.
Teacher-Modeled Feedback ***Whole Class-Modeled Feedback***	**Cultural/Rhetorical** • Students learn metalanguage for discussing writing and for making specific comments • Students learn some hedging strategies. **Linguistic** • Handbooks do not mention how language background needs to be emphasized
Role playing ***Reviewing sample essays*** ***"So on" (not explained)***	*These could be possible benefits, but the training strategies are only listed and not explained to readers.* **Cultural/Rhetorical** • Culturally-informed expectations for politeness/conversational exchanges • Metalanguage • Strategies for making specific comments • Effective conversational styles **Linguistic** • Does not mention how language background needs to be emphasized
Group Formations • 4-5 members • Place students in pairs then combine pairs into groups of 4-5 members • Mix groups in terms of writing abilities, race, age, personality, and gender	**Cultural/Rhetorical** • Mixing allows writers/reviewers to learn and share multiple perspectives and strategies. • Grouping students in terms of static demographic categories does not ensure group diversity. **Linguistic** • Texts do not mention how language background needs to be considered in terms of group size/formation.
Using Surveys to Form Groups • Distribute surveys that allow students to identify their abilities for working in groups prior to grouping students.	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Mixing groups in terms of student-identified strengths allows writers/reviewers to learn and share multiple perspectives and strategies. • Survey questions are not provided, nor does the handbook emphasize the importance of determining students' native language backgrounds.

Stable vs Fluid Groupings	Cultural/Rhetorical • Stable groups can establish expectations and norms for participating in written and spoken peer feedback genres. • Rotating group members can bring new perspectives/reinvigorate groups. Linguistic • Texts do not mention how language background needs to be considered in determining whether to maintain stable groups or rotate group members.

Suggested Methods for Enacting Print-Based Peer Feedback

The handbook's suggested enactment modes attend to the rhetorical and cultural fields but not explicitly to the linguistic field. First, both Lindemann (and Bamberg who cites Lindemann) and Glenn and Goldwaite argue that to account for students' lack of experience with peer feedback, instructors should scaffold peer feedback sessions by gradually making them more complex. For initial workshops, the instructor should "give students explicit instructors for workshop protocol" (Lindemann 206; Glenn and Goldwaite 74) and require them to discuss very few questions. Plus, feedback should be author-focused. Lindemann explains the author should begin the session by explaining the type of feedback s/he would like to get from peers, and peers only respond orally after the author has had the chance to contextualize the piece. Second, to temper negative criticism, responders should begin by explaining what was successful or worked well followed by what needs to be revised/edited and how (206). Glenn and Goldwaite endorse a slightly different author-focused approach: the author reads the draft aloud so s/he can hear how the work sounds. They argue that the author "gains distance" and "hears strengths and weaknesses [s/he]hadn't noticed before" (74). The other group members gain several benefits from this exercise as well: they learn how their peers are responding to the assignment and can compare their responses to the authors, but they also "learn to give the most useful advice" (74).

Since the responders are only supposed to listen, it's unclear exactly how they learn to give advice, though.

Additionally, Glenn and Goldwaite's strategy emphasizes that feedback protocol should be adapted to where students are in their writing processes, and the questions should be tailored to suit the piece of writing under review (Glenn and Goldwaite 74). The response questions need to be tailored to the feedback session's purpose, which might focus on Higher Order Concerns (topic, angle, audience, organization) or Lower Order Concerns, the nature of the read-and-response questions needs to be modified. For example, for early drafts, responders might focus on big picture ideas by identifying "memorable" or particularly effective areas in the paper, discuss the paper's major points, jot down questions as the author reads, summarize what they think the author is saying in the draft, or respond specifically to "the writer's questions"(74). Glenn and Goldwaite also state that in order to provide students more time to revise and to attenuate their writing processes, students need to engage in a number of peer feedback sessions that span across several class periods and that focus on different aspects of the draft (74). Furthermore, subsequent sessions can be adapted so that readers, instead of the author, begin the session by asking the author questions.

These peer feedback enactment methods consider both the rhetorical and cultural interpretive fields of peer feedback. Slowly making sessions more complex over time and limiting initial sessions to oral modes accounts for the fact that students are still learning the spoken and written genres of peer feedback, and they need time to learn appropriate genre moves for these contexts. Students are gradually able to learn effective means of giving and getting feedback, metalanguage, and alternative rhetorical strategies for responding to the assignment prompt. Furthermore, because Lindemann's and Glenn and Goldwaite's author-focused schemes

recommend readers reserve their comments until the writer has spoken and to couple positive

with negative peer feedback, their enactment systems encourage students to resist the urge to

focus on only what does not work well in the draft and to practice hedging negative feedback.

However, Lindemann nor Glenn and Goldwaite discuss how their modes of enacting peer

feedback consider students' native language backgrounds or how to adapt the mode to better suit

L2 writers' needs. The research I cite in Chapters 1 and 2 show that L2 writers prefer getting

feedback through multiple modes and media: written as well as verbal. Relegating discussion to

only a few questions enhances the quality of feedback students can give within a limited amount

of class time, but L2 writers may need extra time to read drafts and record responses.

Table 8: Summary of Print-Based Peer Feedback Enactment Methods Recommended in Handbooks

Enact Methods	Interpretive Field Considered
 • Protocol specified by instructor • Oral, author-focused peer feedback initially • Few questions for initial sessions • Positive comments coupled with negative comments • Modify questions based on where students are at in the writing process • Modify questions to suit each writing assignment	**Rhetorical/Cultural**: • Considers students' lack of previous experiences with peer feedback genres. • Considers that students need time/space to practice what they learned in training sessions • Encourages readers to limit overly negative criticism and hedge negative criticism. **Linguistic**: • Providing explicit instructions, coupling oral with written feedback, and assigning few questions considers the linguistic field, but the handbooks do not mention these practices as modes that consider students' language backgrounds. **Contextual**: • Discusses oral feedback medium with written, print-based responses

Suggested Methods for Reflecting on Print-Based Peer Feedback

The guides offer a variety of peer feedback reflection activities that might assist the

instructor and students in modifying peer feedback protocol. However, the guides are unclear

exactly how to use reflection data in order to adapt peer feedback mode or medium or to engage

students in further training.

Instructors' Post-Model Workshop Responses

Lindemann's guide for orchestrating print-based peer feedback states that after students

have engaged in their first session, "they need opportunities to comment on the usefulness of

various strategies" (197). These reflections engage students in metacognitive practices that help

them think about how the group or the class might modify peer feedback protocol moving

forward, but student reflections also create a dialogue among students as well as among the

students and the instructor, which gives the instructor ideas for further training and protocol

modification. The recommended method of reflection consists of the instructor sharing his/her

observations of the group sessions with the class by pointing out exemplary groups who are

using effective rhetorical strategies for engaging in written and spoken peer feedback genres. For

example, the instructor might point out "how one group solved a disagreement about the

assignment," "ask a student to read a particularly detailed response to a draft," "or praise another

student for encouraging quieter members of the group to speak up" (208). The instructor should

also ask students to share comments they found useful. This reflection method evidently

considers certain aspects of the rhetorical and cultural fields because the teacher points out

effective rhetorical strategies for engaging in peer feedback: use of metalanguage, specific

revision/editing suggestions, and adapting to conversational styles (including quieter students),

and negotiating misaligned conceptions of the assignment. However, this method does not ask

students to reflect on how contextual factors such as mode, medium, or grouping may have

influenced the session's effectiveness. Discussing group configuration in front of the entire class

is undoubtedly face-threatening and should probably be avoided, but the point is, Lindemann's

print-based peer feedback guide does not offer a variety of reflective methods that might be more appropriate for soliciting feedback on group configurations.

Post-Workshop Responses

The *St. Martin's Guide* offers a more robust menu of methods that requires students to reflect on peer feedback throughout the writing process. First, it notes that the author should reflect on how s/he plans to incorporate peers' suggestions in the final drafts. Peer feedback sessions should include reflective elements for the author. The author needs to read reviewers' comments and as a homework assignment, respond to these two questions:

- What are the most effective parts of your paper? Why?
- What are the least effective? Why?

The author revises/edits the draft, submits the review sheets, homework reflections, and all drafts along with the final draft.

Mid-Semester Questionnaires

In addition to having students reflect on how they might use peer feedback in their papers, Glenn and Goldwaite argue it is important for the instructor to "keep loose tabs on each group's work" by distributing student questionnaires after the first couple of feedback sessions. Doing so encourages students to articulate and reflect on what is/is not working well in their groups (78). The responses also help instructors determine if further training is needed or how they might adapt peer feedback protocol (Glenn and Goldwaite 81). Asking students questions such as the following establishes dialogue between groups and the instructor so that the instructor can "modify classroom practices before 'end-of-term' evaluations come back and it's too late to make changes" (81). The recommending questions are as follows:

- What does your writing group do well?
- What has helped you as a writer? What has helped you as a reader?
- Suggest one thing your group could do differently to improve its effectiveness.

- What are you contributing to the group?
- What would you like to do better? (78)

In addition to sharing their reflections with instructor, students should share their responses with group members and generate methods of adjusting/adapting peer feedback protocol. (78). Glenn and Goldwaite also note that questionnaire responses are a good way to determine how/if cultural and linguistic differences may in some way be interfering with successful collaboration. In their questionnaire responses, students might also identify how contextual factors such as mode, medium, or grouping may be influencing the session's effectiveness, although the assigned questions do not identify these dimensions.

Group Folders

Bishop suggests groups maintain a group folder that keeps a log of member attendance and summarizes what groups did/discussed each session. She explains that "self-evaluation on the part of the students and teacher can chronicle success. . .and pinpoint areas for future work and improvement" (316). It's unclear exactly what groups should be recording in terms of "completed work" and how the group should reflect on group norms, expectations and commenting strategies, though.

Informal Interviews in Student Conferences

Glenn and Goldwaite recommend that instructors make use of student conferences "to mediate cultural differences and respond directly to the needs of individuals" (79). They claim asking students questions such as "How is your writing group going?" or "What kinds of classroom activities have been most or least helpful to you in your writing?" gives students opportunities to identify group issues related to cultural/linguistic differences so the instructor can further train students in particular areas/modify group protocol in some way. However, it's unclear how the instructor might use the data to modify training since the only training method

recommended is whole class workshop. Should the instructor continue modeling through this method? What methods do readers have for matching a training method or modifying group protocol to target a specific issue, misunderstanding or interpretive mismatch among students?

Instructor Reflections

Both Bishop and Glenn and Goldwaite reason that student reflections help the instructor determine how well the groups are working and if/how s/he might adapt group protocol/further train students (79). Bishop's peer feedback taxonomy explains that an integral part of monitoring and evaluating student groups is for the instructor should become "a researcher in her own classroom" by planning the course, training groups, and monitoring and evaluating them" (316). She acknowledges the fact that there is no "single right way to ensure groups are working together," so it is important that the instructor monitor groups by observing their interactions and "taking records of groups" through "personal journal, tape recording them, visiting with and participating in groups, and reviewing [group] logs" (316). I find Bishop's use of the term "evaluate" here interesting, though. These strategies seem to be used to evaluate how/if students are learning instead of how the instructor might adapt peer feedback, continue to train students, or hear suggestions from students themselves. Bishop explains that the instructor trains, monitors, and evaluates groups throughout the semester so she can refine her methods "the next semester" (317). Bishop recommends instructors assign the following pre and post written tasks in order to determine what students have learned over the course of a semester so s/he can determine ways to modify group training and such the next semester and not within the semester with students who supply the data:

- Pre and post written descriptions of what students feel can be accomplished in writing groups.
- Pre and post written descriptions of students' writing process,
- Pre and post written apprehension test,
- Pre and post essay samples (317)

Of course, the data collected through pre and post written descriptions could certainly be used for these purposes, but Bishop's guide doesn't suggest instructors use these strategies for these purposes; instead, they are framed as ways to evaluate student learning/growth over the course of a semester to enable the instructor to adapt his/her methods in future classes.

Table 9: Summary of Print-Based Peer Feedback Reflection Methods Recommended in Handbooks

Reflection Method	Interpretive Field Considered
Instructors' Post-Model Workshop Responses • The instructor shares his/her observations of the group sessions with the class by pointing out exemplary groups who are using effective rhetorical strategies for engaging in written and spoken peer feedback genres. • The instructor also asks students to share comments they found useful.	**Rhetorical/Cultural**: • Method emphasizes effective rhetorical strategies for engaging in peer feedback: use of metalanguage, specific revision/editing suggestions, and adapting to conversational styles (including quieter students), and negotiating misaligned conceptions of the assignment. **Linguistic**: • Method does not mention how language background needs to be considered. **Contextual**: • This method does not ask students to reflect on how contextual factors such as mode, medium, or grouping may have influenced the session's effectiveness.
Post-Workshop Responses • The author should reflect on how s/he plans to incorporate peers' suggestions in the final draft.	**Rhetorical**: • Students consider which suggested rhetorical strategies they might include/exclude in their revisions and edits of the final draft.
Mid-semester Questionnaires • The instructor distributes student questionnaires after the first couple of feedback sessions. • In addition to sharing their reflections with instructor, students should share their responses with group members and generate methods of adjusting/adapting peer feedback protocol. (78).	**Rhetorical/Cultural/Linguistic**: • Students reflect on how both oral and written feedback has been useful in giving and receiving rhetorical strategies. • The questionnaire responses are a good way to determine how/if cultural and linguistic differences may in some way be enhancing or interfering with successful collaboration. **Contextual**: • Students might identify how contextual factors such as mode, medium, or grouping may be influencing the session's effectiveness, although the assigned questions do not identify these dimensions.

Group Folders • Groups maintain a group folder that keeps a log of member attendance and summarizes what groups did/discussed each session.	*These could be possible benefits, but the handbook does not identify them directly:* **Rhetorical/Cultural/Linguistic**: • Students reflect on how both oral and written feedback has been useful in giving and receiving rhetorical strategies. • Students might identify how/if cultural and linguistic differences may in some way be enhancing or interfering with successful collaboration. **Contextual**: • Students might identify how contextual factors such as mode, medium, or grouping may be influencing the session's effectiveness.
Informal Interviews in Student Conferences • Instructors informally interview individual students during student conferences "to mediate cultural differences and respond directly to the needs of individuals."	**Rhetorical/Cultural/Linguistic**: • Students might voice how both oral and written feedback has been useful in giving and receiving rhetorical strategies. • Students might identify how/if cultural and linguistic differences may in some way be enhancing or interfering with successful collaboration. **Contextual**: • Students might identify how contextual factors such as mode, medium, or grouping may be influencing the session's effectiveness.
Instructor Reflections • The instructor "takes records of groups" through "personal journal, tape recording them, visiting with and participating in groups, and reviewing [group] logs."	*Guide does not suggest instructors use instructor reflections for these purposes; instead, they are framed as ways to evaluate student learning/growth over the course of a semester to enable the instructor to adapt his/her methods in future courses.*

Suggested Methods for Adapting Print-Based Peer Feedback

Clearly the reflective methods recommended in all of the analyzed texts have a direct

connection to adapting peer feedback protocol, modes, and media because instructors can use the

data from students' reflections as well as his/her own to do so. The guides are unclear exactly how to adapt training/strategies based on certain identified issues, though.

For example, Lindemann's recommended reflections method gives the instructor some insights on how to adapt peer feedback for subsequent sessions. Based on his/her observations of the first session and students' comments, the instructor may need to further engage students in training to adapt the ways peer feedback is enacted. Lindemann suggests that as students begin learning the ceremonials and rules of play within peer feedback genres, they become "more confident" at participating in them, and the instructor can adapt protocol to suit their developing peer feedback knowledge. For subsequent sessions, she claims, "Writers should be less fragile by this time and need to hear and need to hear where and why a draft confuses a reader" (207), and reviewers should at this point be more able to give effective feedback in less face-threatening ways, so the protocol can shift to reader-focused, meaning the reader speaks first, and the writer listens and then asks follow-up questions or clarifies information. She also suggests instructors continue to model "workshop tasks" by offering a list of effective discussion questions (207). However, this scheme does not suggest alternative training methods for better considering specific rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic aspects of the review sessions. Her recommendations for adapting context consist of adding a level of complexity to the oral mode by coupling it with written feedback.

Furthermore, there is also no mention of enhancing feedback quality and performance by mixing print-based and virtual modes (i.e., exchanging and commenting on drafts in virtual spaces and discussing these responses in person). However, Lindemann notes that if group conflicts arise, the instructor should "help students resolve them instead of shuffling members" (205). The method for helping them do this is not elaborated, though.

Glenn and Goldwaite's guide recommends instructors monitor groups, solicit periodic feedback, and use student conferences to determine how/if cultural and linguistic differences, but they state that after some initial whole class workshop training, groups should be adequately prepared to do it throughout the semester: "If you use the whole-class workshops as a training ground for talking constructively about writing, then your students may be able to move directly into peer-response groups without much further preparation" (72). They go on to explain that as the semester progresses, peer feedback norms and protocol will become normalized among students, so "little instruction is needed if students are already used to working in groups: Students who are working well in their groups will respond naturally and in a variety of useful and supportive ways to one another's needs" (73). There seems to be a missing step here between reflective practices and adapting peer feedback. Their guide is unclear how to use the questionnaire data or student responses in conferences to modify training/protocol.

The only slight modification they suggest for training is modifying the whole class workshop by having students discuss a sample piece of writing in groups if "students feel more comfortable in a group setting" (72). But the guide does not explain how instructors might determine if students are uncomfortable using the whole class workshop method for training purposes. This could certainly be teased out in pre-peer feedback written pieces, student questionnaire data, or student conferences, but Glenn and Goldwaite do not connect the student feedback to this modification.

Glenn and Goldwaite's method of enacting peer feedback does recommend that instructors limit the number of questions students need to respond to as students become more adept at responding, and they should adapt questions based on the writing assignment and where students are in the writing process, but, again, they do not suggest how student/teacher reflection

data might help instructors adapt the ways students enact peer feedback in specific ways. The reader is left wondering, what other methods are available that might suit diverse interpretations and means of participation?

In terms of adapting to context, Bishop and Glenn and Goldwaite recommend instructors adapt student groupings periodically for a number of reasons. Glenn and Goldwaite suggest instructors rotate group members about every three weeks (73), and Bishop recommends about every four sessions (315) so that students are exposed to diverse perspectives (73) and so that groups "can be revitalized and more enthusiastic" (315). However, Glenn and Goldwaite recommend that if groups are working successfully, the instructor may want to keep students in the same groups throughout the semester. Bishop notes that groups may need to be reconfigured if a group contains an overly dominant member of group is having a persistent issue, but she ultimately endorses letting "groups work out their own problems" (315).

Table 10: Summary of Handbook Strategies for Adapting Print-Based Peer

Interpretive Frames	Adaptations
Cultural, Rhetorical, Linguistic	**Providing Additional Training** • Continue to model peer feedback by having students discuss a sample student paper • Help students resolve conflicts (not specified how)
Contextual	**Modifying Enactment Modes** • Increase the number of questions students respond to as students become more adept at responding • Adapt questions based on the writing assignment and where students are in the writing process • Couple written with oral feedback as student become more adapt at responding to one another's drafts

	Altering Student Groupings
	- Alter groupings so students receive feedback representing diverse perspectives - Alter groupings if groups are dysfunctional, but groups should be encouraged to work out their own problems

Suggested Methods for Collaborating with Students

Lindemann's peer feedback system provides for some collaboration with students, but the overall model is essentially top-down, meaning directive instead of collaborative. The suggested strategies for collaborating with students regarding peer feedback protocol occur within the reflection stage, after students have already had some practice doing it. Within Lindemann's suggested reflection activity, instructors relate their observations of the first peer feedback session, and students share and learn what worked well for them; thus, the class is able to collaboratively generate some useful strategies. But the assumption is that the students' reflections should align with the instructor's expectations: "Communicating your assessment of the workshop enables students to adjust their behavior and their language so that next time their responses to classmates' drafts will be even more constructive" (208). The focus here is on the instructor's assessment instead of what the class has collaboratively determined constitutes appropriate behavior and modes of communicating about their writing.

Once students have had some practice, Lindemann also notes that instructors should consider allowing the "class to develop its own guidelines" (208). She explains:

Instead of acting as lawgivers and rule enforcers, we become advisors, helping students define and attain standards that the class, not the teacher, has established. … When students develop their own definitions of 'good writing' they become better at solving

writing problems. . .the hidden agenda, of course, is that students will develop criteria

similar to those we'd use anyway." (209)

Allowing students to generate "its own guidelines" facilitates collaboration of genre norms,

rules, and protocol, but if "the hidden agenda . . .is that students will develop criteria similar to"

the instructor's, this approach doesn't consider that students' conceptions of peer feedback, and

students' purposes for participating in it may not align with the instructor's purposes for

assigning. What if students have different agendas?

This recommended method of enacting peer feedback assumes students may not already

bring effective rhetorical strategies to these situations or that students may have different

conversational styles than the instructor or each other. In this case, the instructor dictates genre

ceremonials, norms, expectations, and moves rather than allowing students to voice their

expectations and contribute to creating them. Lindemann discourages instructors from "giving

[their] opinions on student writing" while groups are responding so that the instructor "weans

[students] from seeing [the instructor] as the only authority and encourage them to become

independent critics" (207), but the scaffolded stages (train, enact, reflect) largely focus on

aligning students' conceptions and strategies for participating within peer feedback genres with

the instructor's rather than teasing out the rhetorically, culturally, and linguistically informed

conceptions of peer feedback and resources for participating in them and capitalizing on those.

The St. Martin's Guide offers systems that encourage more student-teacher and student-

student collaboration throughout the peer feedback process. Some of the identified pre-peer

feedback activities and training methods outlined in this guide offer methods for the instructor

and students to collaborate. Bishop's recommended pre-peer feedback written accounts

encourage students to share their interpretations of and experiences with peer feedback and

illustrate their writing abilities. The instructor can use this information to determine how to train students and have them engage in peer feedback. This illustrates a mode of collaboration because the written descriptions provide a starting place for instructors rather than instructors imposing their conceptions of how students understand peer feedback and what strategies they bring to these genres.

The whole class workshop method also allows students and the instructor to model successful rhetorical strategies for engaging in peer feedback and for students to reflect on what strategies were most useful. Instead of the instructor solely explaining how to give feedback, the instructor and students are able to determine the most useful means of giving effective feedback.

Furthermore, the *St. Martin's Guide*'s recommended enactment and reflection methods facilitate student-instructor and student-student collaboration. For example, Bishop recommends that students be encouraged to write their own questions for getting/giving feedback (314), and Glenn and Goldwaite state that group members should share their reflections of group protocol and determine within the group how to capitalize on what is working and avoid what is not. These methods allow students opportunities to collaboratively generate community norms and expectations with each other and with the instructor.

Table 11: Summary of Handbook Strategies for Print-Based Peer Feedback Collaboration

Guide	Collaborative Peer Feedback Strategies
A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers	The scaffolded stages (train, enact, reflect) largely focus on aligning students' conceptions and strategies for participating within peer feedback genres with the instructor's rather than teasing out the rhetorically, culturally, and linguistically informed conceptions of peer feedback and resources for participating in them and capitalizing on those.
The St. Martin's Guide	**Training Methods** • Pre-peer feedback writing encourages students to share their interpretations and experiences with peer feedback and illustrate their writing abilities. • The whole-class workshop also allows students and the instructor to model successful rhetorical strategies for engaging in peer feedback and for students to reflect on what strategies were most useful. **Enactment Methods** • Students should be encouraged to write their own questions for getting/giving feedback. **Reflection Methods** • Group members share their reflections of group protocol and determine within the group how to capitalize on what is working and avoid what is not.

Overall Assessments of Handbooks' Print-Based Systems

Lindemann's print-based system offers readers some guidance for enacting a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy, in terms of scaffolding peer feedback, the preparatory, enact, and reflect strategies, but the few training and enact approaches mentioned focus heavily on the rhetorical fields and provide unclear or little guidance for adequately navigating and adapting to the cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields. It also strongly advocates a teacher-directive rather than a collaborative approach. Moreover, although the enact and reflect strategies recommend collaborating with students to align students' conceptions of peer feedback protocol and useful

peer feedback rhetorical strategies within the enact and reflect stages, the planning and reflective strategies are directive rather than collaborative.

Glenn and Goldwaite acknowledge that personality, gender, cultural, and educational backgrounds can complicate peer feedback because these factors impact students' expectations for appropriately phrased feedback and "preferences for the kinds of response they find useful" (78), but Glenn and Goldwaite do not specifically recommend how to emphasize these dimensions to students or how exactly these dimensions are considered in their training or enacting methods. Instead, they urge instructors to read Ilona Leki's article "Meaning and Development of Academic Literacy in a Second Language" anthologized in their guide (*St. Martin's Guide*) to better understand how students' language backgrounds impact their acquisition of academic discourses. Glenn and Goldwaite quote this excerpt from Leki's article:

> "Given how complex literacy issues in second, third, or fourth languages can become, perhaps the only reasonable stance to take, at least initially, is one of modest flexibility and willingness to learn from others, one in which 'you do a lot of observing and then you think about it'". (79)

They then suggest that students can practice this type of reflection when they consider their peer feedback groups strengths and weaknesses (79). It's implied that this will occur within Glenn and Goldwaite's suggested training, enact, reflect system, but they do not explain exactly how instructors might facilitate this happening in the train and enact stages. In other words, they do not discuss training methods or enacting methods in terms of how these methods make students aware of and adapt to linguistic and cultural differences. They do, however, recommend instructors garner student feedback through student conferences in order to determine how/if linguistic/cultural dimensions may be inhibiting peer feedback. Overall, though, dimensions of

cultural and linguistic differences are not fully integrated into their recommended system; it's unclear how their methods make students aware of culturally and linguistically informed interpretations within peer feedback genres and how students or the instructor might possibly adapt to these dimensions. The recommended training strategies discussed above, low-stakes group activities and whole class workshops, are certainly useful for helping students get to know each other, modeling and sharing effective feedback techniques, and illustrating useful hedging strategies for giving negative feedback, but these guides do not show readers how to emphasize to students the cultural and linguistic dimensions of peer feedback.

Suggested Methods for Conducting Peer Feedback in Virtual Spaces

My analysis of the handbooks' recommended systems of coordinating peer feedback in virtual spaces illustrates that passages where the handbooks discuss the use of asynchronous and synchronous modes are not clearly brought into conversation with the plan, enact, reflect systems for implementing peer feedback in face-to-face, print-based modes. For example, the guides are unclear exactly how/why instructors might integrate technology to *adapt* to specific rhetorical, cultural, or linguistic interpretive fields. Some of the guides offer general principles and strategies for the instructor as s/he prepares to use technology in the writing classroom, a few strategies for determining students' digital literacy practices, and strategies for training students to use the selected technology. However, the handbooks do not mention distinct strategies for having students reflect on the use of technology in the service of peer feedback, nor do the guides offer readers elaborate or detailed strategies for adapting protocol based on student feedback and instructor observations. Additionally, the guides are particularly poor in discussing how the linguistic field impacts interpretation and performance and how computer-mediated modes might be used to consider this interpretive field. In other words, use of computer-

mediated modes is not framed as a strategy for *adapting* to the rhetorical, cultural, or linguistic interpretive fields in order to better consider these fields. The assumption in these handbooks is that print-based, face-to-face modes are the default in most writing instruction, and if virtual modes are used, it is in the context of a face-to-face course because the discourses surrounding the use of computer-mediated peer feedback modes within these guides imply training and some student synchronous discussion occurs in class. None of the guides specifically discuss the unique constraints to coordinating and adapting peer feedback within completely online settings. They assume readers will connect the concepts and strategies recommended for face-to-face, print-based settings or within the chapters that discuss general principles for using new media technology to teach writing.

First, this assumption is reflected in how the guides index the use of new media technology. Mode is discussed in two ways within the handbooks: **directly** within only brief subsections situated in chapters or sections that discuss planning, enacting, and reflecting on peer feedback in print-based modes and **indirectly** in chapters that discuss the general use of new media technology to fulfill a particular pedagogical goal in the writing classroom. The following list summarizes how each handbook indexes using new media in peer feedback contexts:

- *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*' chapter entitled "Teaching Writing With Computers" discusses general benefits/tenets for using computers to teach writing and provides a menu of new media asynchronous and synchronous technology to accomplish various pedagogical goals, highlighting the affordances and constraints of each technology (word processors, email, chat, web forums, IM chats, and Courseware).

- *The St. Martin's Guide* includes an additional two-paragraph section within its "Everyday Activities" chapter entitled "Online and Electronic Peer Response."

- *Concepts in Composition* discusses the use of new media in the service of group work and peer feedback in one paragraph in its "Revision" chapter in a subsection entitled "Using Computers to Encourage Revision"; it also discusses general principles of using new media to teaching writing in "Chapter 11: Writing in Multiple Media."

- *Composition Pedagogies* briefly addresses the use of email to coordinate peer feedback in one paragraph in its "Collaborative Pedagogies" chapter; it also offers general principles of using new media within its "New Media Pedagogy" chapter.

I am not saying that the handbooks offer no strategies for planning or enacting peer feedback within virtual spaces, though. Some of the general principles for using technology in the writing classroom noted in the guides have teaching implications for planning peer feedback activities, selecting relevant technologies, training students, and orchestrating discussion within asynchronous and synchronous virtual modes. Additionally, all of the guides offer general principles for the instructor to consider when deciding whether to use new media technology in the writing classroom, and a few point to specific rhetorical and cultural benefits and hindrances associated with new media technology.

Handbooks' General Principles for Planning to Use Technology

Where general principles for using new media technology are discussed in the aforementioned chapters, the primary emphasis within the handbooks in selecting virtual media depends on what the instructor's pedagogical purpose is, what these technologies will allow students to do, and how/if instructors and students can access the selected technology. Thus, the first step in planning to use technology is determining how the technology will serve a particular pedagogical goal. Lindemann explains, "as you plan your class, consider ways that technology might influence how you conduct each activity" (287). Glenn and Goldwaite also claim that a selected technology "should support—not determine—your pedagogical goals" (68). They explain that just because instructors can have students engage in peer feedback using computer-mediated modes doesn't mean they should: "You can have students print out their papers and talk face to face" (68). Brooke's "New Media Pedagogy" chapter in *Composition Pedagogies* also states that instructors should select technologies based on what they "enable teachers and

students to do, not necessarily produce" (180), and Kennedy and Howard's chapter in the same handbook recommend readers avoid using technology for technology's sake but to take a "rhetorically thoughtful buffet-style approach" to selecting the technologies discussed in their chapter: instructors should pick and choose based on their accessibility, familiarity with the technology, and pedagogical goals (50) .

Grounded in these philosophical assumptions, the handbooks recommend some general principles for selecting and using technology in the classroom in terms of how computer-mediated modes consider rhetorical, cultural, linguistic fields, but only two discuss implications for peer feedback directly.

Rhetorical and Cultural Benefits of Using New Media

The rhetorical benefits include students' increased awareness of audience, extended space/time to give more thorough and thoughtful feedback, and the ability of new media to connect with students' non-academic literacy practices. Lindemann's and Girard's chapter report that students realize the rhetorical nature of writing because they are interacting with a real person in virtual spaces, or as Lindemann puts, they realize they are not "writing in a vacuum" (Lindemann 283). Gerard argues that certain virtual modes allow conversations to extend beyond the classroom and therefore may encourage longer, more developed exchanges, students have more time/space to manipulate and play with text, and they can therefore build a stronger sense of community (Gerard 417). Moreover, new media pedagogies better connect with the literacies students bring to the classroom and the types of writing they will be required to do outside the classroom (Brooke 187). Contextual/rhetorical benefits include computer-mediated technology to coordinate peer feedback can "simplify the logistics" of students exchanging drafts and giving feedback (Lindemann 283), can extend the space/time strictures of a traditional face-to-face

classroom, and create a written transcript of exchanges so that students can revisit conversations as they edit and revise their drafts (Clark 19).

Rhetorical and Cultural Hindrances of Using New Media

A unique hindrance to using virtual modes to teach writing cited within two of the handbooks is associated with issue of access. Lindemann and Brookes make readers aware that students' previous and current access to equipment, resources, and support impact students' "comfort levels and abilities to work with technology" (Lindemann 287); Brooke explains that this lack of access impacts possibilities for students: rhetorically, technically, and institutionally" (Brooke 184). Differences in the digital literacies students bring to classrooms because of access to different types of technologies and quality of the access creates "digital divides" among students (183-184). Thus, instructors must consider the cultural and material contexts surrounding the institutional and classroom contexts in which they teach new media when determining which media and mode to use in the classroom (185).

Table 12: General Benefits and Hindrances of Using New Media Modes in the Writing Classroom

Benefits	Hindrances
Rhetorical/Cultural: • New media technology connects with students' non-academic literacy practices. • Students use writing to discuss ideas. • New media modes emphasize writing as a social act. **Contextual:** • Computer-mediated modes create written transcript of exchanges. • Computer-mediated modes allow more time for students to read, reflect, and respond. **Linguistic:** • L2 writers prefer getting face-to-face feedback coupled with virtual feedback.	**Rhetorical/Cultural:** • Students often have unequal previous and current access to technology.

In addition to considering the potential rhetorical, cultural, and contextual benefits and constraints associated with using new media technology in the classroom, two of the handbooks recommend discovering the digital literacy practices students bring to the classroom in order to determine which technologies to select and how much training may need to occur. Glenn and Goldwaite's "Everyday Activities" recommends discovering the "literacy practices and values [students] bring with them" prior to selecting particular technologies by having them complete a writing activity that responds the following questions:

- What stories can you tell about when, where, how you first came in contact with computers? (including mainframe computers, personal computers, computer games)

- What stories can you tell about when, where, how you first learned to use computers to read or write? To speak or listen to others? To view/interact with/compose texts? Where did this take place? Did anyone help or encourage you? (Glenn and Goldwaite 69)

- Do you (or your family) own a computer(s) now?

- What specific kinds of reading and writing, speaking and listening, viewing/interacting and composition do you do now in computer environments at home? At school? Elsewhere?

- What are your favorite kinds of projects/activities in online environments? Please explain. (69)

Glenn and Goldwaite explain that "asking students to write in answers to these and other related questions and to share their responses with you and their classmates can help you gauge their level of comfort and expertise with computers and other forms of technology" (70). The responses will, then, help the instructor coordinate classroom activities and connect with the digital literacies students bring to these activities (70). They do not explain exactly how to use these responses to select particular technologies for using peer feedback, for further training, or for collaborating with students in determining appropriate technologies, however.

Lindemann's "Teaching Writing With Computers" chapter also urges instructors to distribute a survey at the beginning of the semester to determine students' "technological

strengths" and use the data to create groups (287). Lindemann does not provide sample questions

or explain how to use the data to create groups or select particular technologies, though.

Suggested Methods for Training Students to Enact Virtual Peer Feedback

The handbooks point to the need to train students to use particular technologies but offer

few strategies for tailoring peer feedback training methods to suit particular virtual classroom

settings and peer feedback modes, or to consider how the contextual field (mode and grouping

methods) impacts the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic fields of interpretation. However, all the

handbooks certainly acknowledge the fact that students bring different digital literacies and

comfort levels with using technology and therefore should be trained to use those selected for

particular purposes, a fact that acknowledges certain aspects of the rhetorical, cultural, and

contextual fields. *Concepts in Composition* reiterates that when new media modes are used in the

service of collaboration, instructors must carefully plan and train students so they have "clear

ideas of what they are expected to do or learn in the context of a particular assignment or task"

(Clark 19), and Lindemann points out that instructors must ensure students know how to use the

selected mode for its assigned purpose to avoid "technological pitfalls" (Lindemann 286).

Gerard also emphasizes that instructors must find a balance between teaching rhetorical and

technological skills, and training students how to use the selected technology "is part of literacy

instruction" (422). Glenn and Goldwaite also argue that it is important to train students to use

technology because they come to the classroom with different conceptions of technology and

skills for using it: "Although some students will know far more than you do about technology,

many will know far less" (Glenn and Goldwaite 77). Bamberg accurately points out that the use

of computer technology will only encourage students to make more meaning-based revisions if

they are already know how to; students must be trained to effectively give and get feedback

regardless of the mode used to enact the peer feedback session. She asserts: "Students must also be able to identify the types of larger changes that are needed and have a repertoire of rhetorical strategies at their command to make the needed changes" (89).

To account for students' various levels of preparedness to use the selected technology, all four guides recommend instructors give students step-by-step instructions in class on how to use the selected technology or provide a detailed handout on how to use the selected technology (Glenn and Goldwaite 77; Kennedy and Howard ; Lindemann 286). Glenn and Goldwaite as well as Lindemann also acknowledge that some students may be more adept at using technology than the instructor/peers, so it is a good idea to enlist students to help troubleshoot technological problems (Glenn and Goldwaite 77; Lindemann 287). Acknowledging the varying digital literacy practices students bring to virtual modes of peer feedback considers aspects of the rhetorical and cultural fields because one's familiarity with the selected technology and previous and current access to technology impacts one's interpretation of and rhetorical strategies for participating in the selected mode of peer feedback.

A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers and *Concepts in Composition* also acknowledge that students may post inappropriate, offensive, or alienating discourse within virtual spaces; thus, only two of the handbooks consider how these aspects of the rhetorical/cultural fields impact how students frame their exchanges and use metalanguage in the service of giving and receiving peer feedback. Lindemann recommends that instructors should inform students of these potential problems and generate guidelines for effective and appropriate responses (293). Lindemann and Gerrard offer a few specific methods for instructors to intervene within class synchronous chat in ways that model effective and appropriate strategies for giving feedback. For example, Lindemann states instructors might provide an initial posting that models an

engaging/compelling post (296), and as students post, instructors should give students feedback, pointing out effective posts as well as ones that need further clarification/detail (Lindemann 296). Furthermore, the instructor should encourage students to "clarify misunderstandings and avoid personalizing their debates" (293). Gerrard too recommends that instructors monitor chat feeds for consistently ignored posts or students who post aggressive or offensive comments (471). However, it is unclear which strategies instructors might use to help students clarify misunderstandings, help students avoid posting inappropriate comments, or encourage students to ensure all group members are participating equally. Moreover, the handbooks do not suggest how to tailor training in giving appropriate feedback within specific virtual spaces (face-to-face or entirely online writing courses) or in using particular peer feedback tools (asynchronous or synchronous). Furthermore, although Lindemann's guide mentions that the digital literacy survey data can be used to ensure at least one technologically savvy student is placed in each group, overall, the guides do not address how grouping methods for using various virtual modes impacts the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic fields.

Table 13: Handbooks' Recommended Virtual Peer Feedback Training Methods

Guide	Recommended Planning Strategies	Interpretive Field(s) Considered
A Rhetoric For Writing Teachers	• Train students to use the selected technology; enlist students to help one another and instructor troubleshoot technological issues • Train students to make appropriate virtual comments. • Use digital literacy survey data to group students.	*Rhetorical/Cultural* • Students' current and previous access to technology impacts how they interpret virtual peer feedback contexts and their available rhetorical strategies for effectively participating within virtual spaces. • Training students to make appropriate and specific comments within virtual spaces helps align their expectations for appropriate and useful comments within virtual peer feedback genres.

		Contextual • Guide does not mention how to tailor strategies to suit specific classroom configurations or modes. • Mixing groups in terms of digital literacy knowledge can facilitate students collaboratively learning and using the selected technology. *Linguistic* • Guide does not mention how language background impacts students' interpretation of and performance in virtual peer feedback.
St. Martin's Guide	• Train students to use the selected technology; enlist students to help one another and instructor troubleshoot technological issues	***Rhetorical/Cultural*** • Students' current and previous access to technology impacts how they interpret virtual peer feedback contexts and their available rhetorical strategies for effectively participating within virtual spaces. ***Contextual*** • Guide does not mention how to tailor strategies to suit specific classroom configurations or modes. • Guide does not mention how grouping students within virtual settings impacts the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic fields. ***Linguistic*** • Guide does not mention how language background impacts students' interpretation of and performance in virtual peer feedback.
Concepts in Composition	• Train students to use the selected technology. • Instructor should monitor groups' virtual exchanges and intervene when necessary. (Methods for training students beforehand or helping students adapt is not specified.)	***Rhetorical/Cultural*** • Students' current and previous access to technology impacts how they interpret virtual peer feedback contexts and their available rhetorical strategies for effectively participating within virtual spaces.

		• Training students to make appropriate and specific comments within virtual spaces helps align their expectations for appropriate and useful comments within virtual peer feedback genres. ***Contextual*** • Guide does not mention how to tailor strategies to suit specific classroom configurations or modes. • Guide does not mention how grouping students within virtual settings impacts the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic fields. ***Linguistic*** • Guide does not mention how language background impacts students' interpretation of and performance in virtual peer feedback.
A Guide to Comp Pedagogies	• Train students to use the selected technology	***Rhetorical/Cultural*** • Students' current and previous access to technology impacts how they interpret virtual peer feedback contexts and their available rhetorical strategies for effectively participating within virtual spaces. ***Contextual*** • Guide does not mention how to tailor strategies to suit specific classroom configurations or modes. • Guide does not mention how grouping students within virtual settings impacts the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic fields. ***Linguistic*** • Guide does not mention how language background impacts students' interpretation of and performance in virtual peer feedback.

Suggested Methods for Enacting Peer Feedback Using Virtual Modes

Although all four handbooks recommend general principles for selecting technologies in the service of teaching writing, only two of the guides urge instructors to consider that particular computer-mediated modes afford and constrain peer feedback or group discussions in unique ways that print-based, face-to-face interaction does not. *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers* includes a menu of new media asynchronous and synchronous technologies to accomplish various pedagogical goals, highlighting the affordances and constraints of each technology (word processors, email, chat, web forums, IM chats, and Courseware), and Lisa Gerrard's "Writing in Multiple Media" anthologized in *Concepts in Composition* discusses the benefits and hindrances of using synchronous technologies.

Asynchronous Modes

Within the menu of technologies discussed, Lindemann notes that asynchronous technologies such as email and discussion boards within a Course Management System can create spaces for class discussion and exchanging/responding to drafts. These modes, according to Lindemann, enable students to create social bonds in a way that face-to-face discussion may not because students feel freer to "engage in a bit of friendly banter or drift off topic" (292-293). Moreover, virtual class discussion lists provide a forum for students to openly debate classroom topics and use evidence to support their ideas (293). However, according to Lindemann, this mode can also complicate community building because asynchronous discussions do not allow students to read paralinguistic cues and tone of voice, so messages may be misunderstood. And some students may verbally attack their peers or post vague/shallow comments, practices that hinder collaboration and group cohesion (293).

Synchronous Modes

Both Lindemann and Gerrard identify distinct rhetorical and social benefits for using synchronous technologies such as Instant Messaging. Instant Messaging programs allow students to get instant feedback from one another, and this mode allows students to practice writing more often because they discuss their opinions in writing (Gerrard 417; Lindemann 295). An added social/cultural benefit is that a greater number of students are included in synchronous classroom chats. Students, used to using chat technologies in non-academic contexts, tend to see them as less formal and fun and therefore are more likely to joke around and engage in some off-topic chat in order to "overcome initial awkwardness" (Lindemann 296). Lindemann points out that the IM chat, which students use for non-academic settings, influences students to construct the space as informal and friendly, and this perception can contribute to students creating a sense of community and getting to know one another. In fact, IM chats, according to Lindemann, can even help mediate cultural and social differences in ways that face-to-face modes cannot. Lindemann argues that because of the social and spatial distances these technologies afford, they have a "democratizing effect on the classroom discourse" (296). She explains, "students who might remain quiet in face-to-face situations tend to contribute more in an environment where participants are judged on the quality of writing they produce rather than on gender, ethnicity, or some other factor" (Lindemann 296). Gerrard echoes these social benefits in her chapter as she claims students who are "shy" or "self-conscious" about speaking in face-to-face settings because of markers of difference such as "an accent or a stutter" often feel more comfortable sharing ideas within virtual spaces; students who need more time to think about their responses or students who are "silenced" by "louder or more aggressive classmates" often feel more comfortable interacting within virtual spaces (Gerrard 413).

However, both asynchronous and synchronous exchanges lack paralinguistic cues, so students may misinterpret messages, feel more at liberty to post hyper critical comments, and although these modes can be more inclusive, some students' posts/comments are still ignored within virtual spaces (Gerrard 417). Moreover, instead of these technologies allowing students to extend conversations and provide more thorough feedback, virtual modes can seem less serious and structured and therefore encourage students to *only* socialize and post shallow comments instead of focusing on the assigned task (Gerrard 417). Bamberg's "Revision" chapter in *Concepts in Composition* cites research that shows students perceive modes differently in terms of seriousness: cited studies show students found email more "serious" than IM chats even though students tend to make more references to the writing assignment and drafts under review within synchronous chats (88).

Concepts and Composition is the only handbook that briefly addresses how students' native language backgrounds impact their interpretations of and performance in peer feedback using various virtual modes. Bamberg's "Revision" chapter cites studies that show L2 writers see the benefits of virtual feedback but prefer getting oral feedback within face-to-face settings, but Bamberg's chapter section does not provide specific classroom strategies or implications for adapting to this interpretive field (88).

Table 14: Benefits and Hindrances of Virtual Peer Feedback Modes Identified in Handbooks

Benefits	Hindrances
Contextual: • IM chats allow students to receive instant feedback. • CM modes create a virtual space for students to debate ideas. **Rhetorical/Cultural:** • CM modes teach students to support their claims with evidence. • CM modes encourage a greater number of students to participate. • IM chats are less formal and create opportunities for community building. • Both a/synchronous modes can mediate social/cultural differences. **Linguistic:** • L2 writers are allowed more time and space to read and respond to peers' drafts using virtual modes.	**Rhetorical/Cultural:** • Exchanges can devolve into informal, unproductive discussions. • Certain modes can encourage shallow responses. • Students may only focus on threads that interest them, ignoring others. • Students may be hyperpersonal: post inflammatory comments. • Selected mode can encourage students to take assigned tasks less seriously. • Modes obscure paralinguistic cues and tone of voice, so messages can be misunderstood. **Linguistic:** • L2 writers prefer a mixture of virtual and face-to-face, oral feedback.

Suggested Virtual Peer Feedback Reflection Methods

None of the guides offers distinct strategies for having student reflect on how the selected virtual mode has inhibited or benefited peer feedback. Brooke's chapter on using new media technology in the writing classroom claims having students reflect on their rhetorical choices is critical to evaluating learning outcomes for new media productions" (187), but Brookes does not specify how this might be accomplished in the context of virtual peer feedback. My guess is the handbooks rely on readers adapting the reflective strategies provided for print-based peer feedback modes. Student reflection is critical for helping instructors and students adapt peer feedback and for instructors to determine how/if students need further training.

Suggested Methods for Adapting Virtual Peer Feedback

None of the guides offer specific means of adapting virtual mode to suit particular

classroom contexts. Glenn and Goldwaite recommend that to save time, instructors might

consider having students exchange drafts through email "if [the instructor has] already worked in

class on effective peer-response strategies" (77), but if instructors ask students to use this virtual

mode, they should also allow students to discuss their drafts in person "so they can ask questions

and make sure they understand the comments others have made on their work" (77). This

adaptation certainly could allow students more time to complete peer feedback, offer clearer and

more specific comments, offer some social distance for students who may not be getting along in

class, and better connect with second-language writers' needs for more time and distance to read

and respond to drafts, but Glenn and Goldwaite only identify the time-saving benefit.

Moreover, the guides are primarily geared toward coordinating peer feedback within

completely face-to-face or hybrid settings, and the implication is that once students practice

using the selected technology, they will not need further training to use it. For example,

Lindemann maintains that the more students engage in IM chats over the course of a semester,

the more comfortable they become using the technology (296).

Not one of the guides specifically addresses the unique circumstances associated with

coordinating peer feedback within online writing courses, a situation in which students and the

instructor do not meet face-to-face, and it is extremely difficult to coordinate schedules to use

synchronous modes. I taught two entirely online courses during the fall 2014 semester, and as I

read these guides, I wondered, after reviewing the instructor handbooks, what other options are

available for training students to engage in various modes of peer feedback within online

courses? What are some effective strategies for training students, considering the time/space

constraints? How might I address potential perceived linguistic and cultural differences among students?

Suggested Strategies for Making Virtual Peer Feedback Collaborative

Finally, there are no explicit strategies mentioned within the selected handbooks of how instructors might collaborate with students to determine whether to switch modes or modify virtual peer feedback protocol, but we see some evidence that instructors should collaborate with students by using digital literacy narratives or questionnaire data to select technologies and to group students. In addition, enlisting students as technological problem solvers is a means of pooling student knowledge so they can teach each other and, perhaps, the instructor, digital literacies, so this strategy endorses student-teacher collaboration for this aspect, but the handbooks do not emphasize the importance of dialoguing with students, for example, through reflections in order to modify or adapt virtual peer feedback protocol or mode.

Overall Assessments of Handbooks' Virtual Peer Feedback Systems

Overall, the handbooks seem to decontextualize virtual peer feedback by indexing peer feedback technologies within sections or chapters on using new media in the writing classroom and by mentioning general principles for using new media in sections not clearly in conversation with the specific contexts of peer feedback. Furthermore, the training methods focus more on determining students' digital literacies practices and training them how to use the selected technology rather than focusing training on how the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic fields impact students' interpretations of and performance in virtual media and mode. Finally, the guides offer little to no direction for helping students reflect on using digital technology to enact peer feedback and to collaboratively adapt virtual peer feedback.

In my overall analysis of the handbooks I did not find that the handbooks completely ignore pedagogies for teaching culturally and linguistically diverse groups of students, but these sections are not clearly put in conversation with the sections on orchestrating peer feedback. For example, three of the handbooks anthologize articles or include distinct chapters on working with linguistically and culturally diverse groups of students. The table below lists relevant chapters or articles that discuss pedagogies and strategies for working with linguistically diverse groups of students:

Table 15: Handbook Sections for Working With Culturally/Linguistically Diverse Groups

Handbook	Sections For Teaching Linguistically Diverse Groups of Students
St. Martin's Guide	"Meaning and Development of Academic Literacy in a Second Language" "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. Composition" "Avoiding the Difference Fixation"
Concepts in Composition	"Chapter 9: Non-Native Speakers of English" "Chapter 10: Language and Diversity"
A Guide to Composition Pedagogies	"Second Language Writing"

These sections of the handbooks express pedagogical implications for acknowledging and adapting to language diversity that should be applied to peer feedback, but the handbook sections where practical strategies for enacting peer feedback are discussed do not put the language diversity concepts in practice. Some relevant points abstracted from these sections that should be considered in the contexts of peer feedback are as follows:

- Instructors should gather language background information on students by administering appropriate surveys (Edlund and Griswold).

- Instructors need to better consider the literacies non-native speakers/writers bring to the classroom in order to better understand students' motivations and obstacles (Leki 446).

- Instructors should emphasize that readers have different expectations depending on culture. (Edlund and Griswold 327).

- In order to facilitate learning among students from various backgrounds, it is important not to assume that students are familiar with any particular mode of learning or classroom interaction (Matsuda and Hammill).

- In a mixed group of L1 and L2 writers, some L2 writers may not feel comfortable asserting themselves, and ultimately these differences can be so great that they cause miscommunication among students and among students and teachers (Matsuda and Hammill 269).

- When creating curriculum and classroom activities, instructors need to be mindful of potential literacy and language differences among students and how these might influence students' participation and rhetorical productions, by observing students, listening to them, and reflecting on their pedagogies (Leki 447).

Plus, Stephanie Kerschbaum's article "Avoiding the Difference Fixation" illustrates the emergent, dynamic, and contextual nature of marking difference as she analyzes a brief exchange between two students engaging in peer review. She claims peer review is an appropriate site for illustrating this theory because within the context of peer review, "[students] run the risk of being misunderstood and the risk of being positioned in undesirable ways by others—positions that they may not always be able to directly influence or change" (427). The exchange Kerschbaum analyzes illustrates how two students, because of the differences that emerge between them, fail to fully enjoy the purported benefits of peer review, but Kerschbaum does not offer instructors strategies for helping students realize and adapt to markers of difference in this peer feedback sessions.

This dissertation chapter is not arguing that the selected handbooks for instructing new teachers completely ignore issues of language, literacy, and cultural diversity in the classroom,

but the recommended peer feedback systems do not provide practical strategies for adequately attending to cultural and linguistic diversity within various classroom configurations: face-to-face as well as online writing courses. I also acknowledge the fact that these handbooks are just that, handbooks, which means they serve as quick references or rules of thumb for new instructors, so there may not be space to include an elaborate discussion of both face-to-face as well as virtual peer feedback; however, there are no strategies mentioned for working with L2 writers in peer feedback contexts, nor are there strategies for taking a more fluid, collaborative approach to peer feedback so that instructors might better attend to the needs of diverse populations of students.

Chapter 4: Choose Your Own Adventure: A Gamebook to Conducting Peer Feedback in Print-Based Modes

Chapter 3 emphasizes the need for clearer, more detailed, customizable guides to enacting a peer feedback hermeneutic pedagogy. This chapter responds to that need, as it provides a customizable peer feedback gamebook that better considers the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual interpretive frames and offers instructors a larger menu of strategies for tailoring peer feedback to better suit their students' needs. I mention in Chapter 1 that peer feedback research within mainstream and second-language writing classrooms and practical strategies for coordinating it is spread across teaching handbooks, academic journals, book chapters, and websites that are generally not in conversation with one another, nor does any one particular guide or piece of scholarship synthesize these strategies in ways that assist readers in enacting a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy. This chapter synthesizes plan, enact, and reflective strategies identified in various publications in ways that assist instructors in implementing a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy using print-based modes in face-to-face classrooms. Chapter 5, however, also recommends asynchronous and synchronous technologies instructors might use to coordinate peer feedback in face-to-face classes. The plan, enact, and reflect system outlined in this chapter discusses multiple strategies at each stage that enable instructors to collaborate with students on peer feedback protocol and adapt protocol and mode to suit classroom context.

Writing instructors often have teaching schedules that require them to navigate various classroom communities and settings, and they must make decisions about how to tailor writing instruction to suit these various groups. For example, in a given semester, a writing instructor may teach two sections of developmental writing, a section of FYC, and an online technical writing course. The instructor with such a teaching schedule is faced with the tasks of creating

writing assignments and activities that achieve different pedagogical goals for each course and engaging students with a range of writing abilities through different modes and media. As I have mentioned in previous chapters, students enrolled in these courses bring different interpretations of why they are being asked to engage in peer feedback and how to do it, and instructors understand how and why to assign peer feedback based on their previous experiences giving and getting feedback from peers and their previous training and classroom experiences. At its core, in any course, peer feedback consists of students reading and responding to one another's writing, but how students are trained and how the activity is enacted needs to be tailored to meet the needs of the instructor, students enrolled in the course, and the classroom setting. For example, an instructor with a rigorous teaching schedule and packed course schedules may not have as much time to assign a variety of peer feedback training and reflective activities, an instructor may be working with a significant number of second-language writers, the writing course may be part of a learning community, or the instructor and/or students may not have access to relevant technology for coordinating or enacting peer feedback. These factors impact how peer feedback training and enactment can and should be accomplished; thus, adapting a monolithic approach to peer feedback will not work effectively for all instructors, populations of students, and classroom settings. Instead, instructors and students need a menu of strategies available to them that they can use to collaboratively construct peer feedback protocol, an approach that is more suited for adapting to culturally and linguistically diverse groups of students and useful for new and experienced writing instructors who teach freshman and advanced writing courses in face-to-face and virtual settings. My analysis of the widely-used instructor training materials illustrated that they offer a dearth of strategies for helping instructors tailor peer feedback to a variety of classroom settings. This chapter elaborates menus of face-to-face, print-based preparatory,

training, enactment, and reflection activities, and discusses the distinct advantages and disadvantages so that instructors can select those most suitable to their teaching style, teaching schedules, and classroom populations. The menu of items gives instructors and students options for collaboratively creating their own peer feedback adventure so to speak, akin to how readers interact with a branching path book. The gamebook or choose-your-own adventure genre allows the reader to participate in the story and, to a certain extent, determine what happens and how it ends. Gamebooks are written in second person, placing the reader in the role of the protagonist, and allow readers to choose among various narrative branches, which leads to various possible experiences and endings; thus, the reader can re-read the book multiple times and experience different iterations of the story. This chapter first describes various planning, enacting, and reflection strategies or menu items and highlights their distinct benefits and drawbacks; I then include scenarios that explain how readers might select among the options catalogued in order to create their own peer feedback adventure tailored to suit the population of students they are working with.

Print-Based Peer Feedback Planning Strategies

Before selecting various branching paths or menus in constructing a peer feedback gamebook, the instructor should get a sense of the types of peer feedback experiences bring to the story, the game, or the adventure, so to speak. As I mention in Chapter 2, to enact a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy, within the initial planning/training stage, it is essential that instructors assign activities, whether they be writing or group activities, that enable them to tease out students' conceptions of peer feedback, previous experiences with peer feedback, and language and digital literacy backgrounds in order to better align students' expectations of and strategies for engaging in peer feedback spoken and written genres. Table 16 below reviews what

the planning/training or re-training phase should accomplish in order to account for the various interpretive fields, as outlined in Chapter 2.

Table 16: Review of How Training Strategies Should Consider Interpretive Fields

Rhetorical/Cultural Fields	- Training should tease out the rhetorical strategies for written and spoken peer feedback genres students bring to the peer feedback session. - Training method selection should consider students' previous rhetorical instruction. - Training should teach students rhetorical strategies for composing the assigned piece, strategies for specifically commenting on drafts. - Training should find out students' politeness expectations for engaging in written and spoken peer feedback genres. - Training should help align and norm politeness/conversational style expectations.
Linguistic Field	- Training should consider and adapt to students' abilities to produce code targeted in writing assignment. - Training should consider and adapt to students' abilities to comment on drafts and communicate with peers.
Contextual Field	Instructor and students can determine best mode and group configuration based on the planning and reflection strategies.

The menu of planning strategies detailed in this chapter is just that, a menu of options readers can select based on each strategy's pedagogical purpose, its specific advantages and disadvantages, the instructor's teaching style, and students' needs. The menu essentially allows users to create their own adventure of sorts or planning system based on classroom context. Although instructors certainly would not or could not use all of these approaches in a given semester, in order to collaborate with students in determining the most effective means of conducting peer feedback, it is important that instructors become familiar with and experiment with as many peer feedback strategies as possible in their classrooms.

Prior to selecting peer feedback training methods and modes of giving peer feedback, instructors need to determine responses to the following questions in order to consider the interpretive fields and select appropriate training, grouping, and enactment methods.

Table 17: Questions for Preparing to Orchestrate Print-Based Peer Feedback

Cultural/Rhetorical	- What types of writing have students previously completed either in academic, professional, or personal settings? - What are their majors? - What peer feedback literacy practices and experiences do students bring to this classroom?
Linguistic	- What are my students' native languages? Are they all native speakers of English? Speak English as a second or even third or fourth language? - If English is their second language, how did they learn English, and what are their written and spoken proficiency levels?
Context	What modes have students used to enact peer feedback, and which do they prefer?
Practical Questions	- How much class time do students have to complete this activity? - How much time do I have to collaborate with students and assess this activity?

Of course it would be impossible to gather exhaustive responses to all of these questions, and answers to some of these questions may be obvious by the type of writing class one is teaching or responses may emerge throughout the semester as students respond to writing assignments and conference with instructors. For example, if one is teaching a course specifically designed for non-native speakers of English, it would be obvious that students' native languages are not English. However, even if one is teaching a writing course for non-native English speakers, not all students will speak the same native languages nor have they learned English under the same conditions. Moreover, within mainstream composition courses, one finds students speak non-standard varieties of English, and even students who speak and

write in standard varieties may have different levels of facility with Standard Editing American English. But getting some initial sense of the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual interpretations students bring to peer feedback gives the instructor a clearer sense of what Juan Guerra call student "incomes": "what students bring with them when they come to school," and this helps instructors adapt to and connect with these student incomes ("Transcultural Citizenship," 296). The following section recommends some specific strategies for finding responses to these questions.

Introductory Letters/Questionnaires

Assigning students to compose a low-stakes letter to the instructor that elaborates their specific literacy backgrounds--types of writing they've completed (personal, professional, and academic), their attitudes about writing, their writing processes, and their previous experiences with peer feedback--is a useful way of determining student incomes (Appendix A provides a sample writing prompt). A less time-intensive version of this would be to create a student questionnaire based on these questions. The disadvantage to the survey is that students may not provide as much detailed feedback. Response data for either of these options can then be used to help instructors determine which training methods might best benefit students and which mode to use.

If instructors discover a good portion of their students demonstrate second-language writing features in their writing samples/identify as a second-language writer or if the course is designed for second-language writers, it may be necessary to have them complete language background questionnaires. Reid suggests devising a questionnaire that inquires about students' first language and their previous language instruction. If students identify as L2 writers/speakers, he suggests asking if they graduated from a U.S. high school and what types of English language

programs they were placed, other methods they learned English (i.e., consuming English language media), and their self-perceived levels of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and grammar (See Appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire.). The questionnaire data can help instructors determine group configurations, the training methods, and modes of peer feedback enactment (further discussed below).

Table 18: Methods for Discovering Student Incomes

Activity/ Assignment	Advantages	Disadvantages
Introductory Letter/Memo	**Rhetorical/Cultural/Linguistic** • Instructors get detailed accounts of students' literacy backgrounds, peer feedback experiences, and writing abilities. **Contextual** • Method can be used to help instructors appropriately group students and select modes of enacting peer feedback **Logistical** • Method consumes little in-class time if assigned for students to complete as homework.	**Logistical** • More time/effort required of students. • More time-consuming to evaluate than questionnaires.
Questionnaires	**Rhetorical/Cultural/Linguistic** • Instructors get general information regarding students' literacy backgrounds and peer feedback experiences. • Can be used to help instructors appropriately group students and select modes of enacting peer feedback. **Logistical** • Method consumes little in class or out of class time for students to complete.	**Rhetorical/Cultural/Linguistic** • Instructor gets less detail about students' backgrounds; does not provide instructor a writing sample.

Previous Language Instruction Questionnaires	Cultural/Linguistic	Logistical
	• Instructor gets specific information about students' second-language training and education. • Helps instructors learn the conditions under which students learned English. **Logistical** • Method consumes little in class or out of class time for students to complete.	• Requires additional time because the instructor must evaluate and additional survey data.

Grouping Methods

To purposefully group students in terms of diverse literacy practices, writing abilities, peer review experience, and language background, instructions can use data gleaned from the introductory letters or questionnaire data; however, grouping methods should be based on the instructor's pedagogical goals, the extent to which s/he wishes to solicit student opinion about the process, the amount of class time the instructor wants to dedicate to collaborating with students on this issue, and the nature of the feedback session (in terms of topic, complexity, and time required). The table below summarizes the grouping options noted in Chapter 2. It may be necessary to randomly group students the first week or so before the instructor has had time to review questionnaire or letter data, but after receiving student feedback, instructors can modify groupings accordingly. Additionally, the instructor may need to modify groups based on the projects or topics students are working on or if students report group members are dysfunctional.

Table 19: Review of Grouping Options

Student-Selected	Advantages	Disadvantages
	• Student select classmates they trust and like. • Method may lead to more effective exchanges and reviews of writing. • Method saves instructor time.	• This configuration may not offer students diverse opinions.

Teacher-Selected		
Random	• Method is useful at the beginning of the semester when students and instructor do not know one another. • This method saves instructor time.	• This configuration may not offer students diverse opinions. • Groups may become dysfunctional.
Mixing or Purposefully Grouping Students • Writing abilities • Majors/fields of study • Language backgrounds	• Method allows for students to get and receive diverse ideas. • Group can be comprised of a mixture of skills, knowledge, and abilities. • This method can be used to group students working on the same topics/majoring in same field.	• This method takes more time to use.
Stable Groups	• Method allows students more opportunities to get to know one another and work together. • Method allows same members to establish and modify group norms and expectations. • Method saves the instructor time.	• Groups may become dysfunctional.
Fluid Groups	• Method allows instructor to regroup students based on activity /assignment. • Method allows groups to be reinvigorated/members to share and learn new ideas and strategies. • Instructors may use fluid grouping in order to break up dysfunctional groups.	• Method may not allow same members to establish and modify group norms and expectations. • This method requires more time on the instructor's part.
Number of Members	**Advantages**	**Disadvantages**
Pairs	• Allows students (especially L2 writers) more time to complete activities.	• Students only get feedback from one classmate. • Being paired may make some students feel uncomfortable.
3-5	• Groups of 3-5 allow writers/readers to learn and offer multiple perspectives.	• Placing students in groups larger than 3 may prevent groups from completing tasks.

		• Larger groups may hinder social cohesion and marginalize some members.

Establishing Classroom Community

Whether students within a given composition class (freshman or upper level) have varying degrees of English written and spoken proficiency or not, it's important to establish a comfortable classroom atmosphere and trust among students because as one of my freshman students recently put it, telling relative strangers what is "wrong" with their writing is "weird." L2 scholar Dana Ferris argues that to give second language writers adequate practice, some form of group work should be incorporated throughout the writing cycle. In other words, peer feedback should begin as soon as the paper is assigned. This can be accomplished in a number of ways: class icebreakers, frequent group activities, and out-of-class low stakes assignments. L2 scholars reinforce the importance of helping L2 writers get to know each other prior to responding to each other's writing through icebreaker activities or completing low-stakes assignments in groups. For example, Berg suggests assigning students to complete "out-of-class" projects such as visiting a restaurant and reviewing it helps students get to know each other through social interactions.

In-Class Group Activities

John Bean's *Engaging Inquiry*, which has been widely used and referenced among writing program administrators on the WPA listserv (It was recommended at least 10 times within the ten-year span of WPA conversations I analyzed.), provides helpful tips for creating various types of group in-class assignments. He states an effective small group task "promotes controversy," results in a specified deliverable, can be reasonably accomplished within a designated timeframe in class, and is "directed toward a learning goal for the course" (152). He

further offers various categories of group assignments instructors can tailor to their pedagogical

purposes. The table below outlines these suggested group activities:

Table 20: Suggested In-Class Group Activities

Problem-Posing Strategy The instructor assigns an open-ended, thought-provoking, relevant question to which students co-construct an answer supported by evidence/examples. **The Question-Generating Strategy** Instructor assigns a general topic or provides a list of topics, and students design three questions about the topic. This works particularly well when students are generating research questions or methods.	**The Frame Strategy** The instructor assigns a writing prompt or thesis statement, and groups create and outline (or complete a diagram) with topic sentences or main points supported by evidence. **The Believing and Doubting Strategy** Instructor assigns a controversial topic and asks groups to present arguments for both sides or from multiple perspectives.
The Evidence-Finding Strategy Instructor provides a sample paper and asks students to analyze how another writer uses evidence in his/her argument, or the instructor can ask groups (outside of class) to locate evidence to support an assigned topic and present their findings to the class.	

Bean's menu of activities can be really useful for not only building community and

encouraging social cohesion among group members, but it also enables students to share and

learn rhetorical strategies for composing the assignment they will eventually discuss in the peer

feedback session, and doing so will enable them to give better quality feedback regarding

rhetorical strategies employed in drafts under review. However, just because students are

working together frequently in groups does not necessarily mean social cohesion will occur. As I

mention in Chapter 2, students' notions of polite behavior and conversational styles may conflict,

or students may experience communicative static. The methods detailed below on dramatizing

groups interacting and discussing conversational style can make students aware of these potential

conflicts and how to adapt to them.

Discussing PF's Purpose, Affordances, and Constraints

Prior to completing the actual peer feedback sessions, instructors can collaboratively generate with students a list of peer feedback's affordances and constraints. Many L1 and L2 composition scholars argue discussing these items beforehand helps students understand its purpose and align their expectations accordingly, but it also helps the instructor learn of students' experiences and perceptions regarding peer feedback (Wirtz; Paton; Edgington; Mangelsdorf; Berg; Ferris; Liu and Hansen). Liu and Hansen claim that within L2 writing classrooms, it is important for the teacher to address students' doubts about their peers' abilities to provide feedback: the fact that some students' comments can be too complimentary or too critical. Moreover, instructors should reassure students that peers' comments will be not used to determine the paper's final grade. These concerns are obviously not relegated to L2 classrooms—L1 students often have similar notions or perceptions about peer feedback. Ferris also argues that generating the pro/con list will help students discuss these issues and help the instructor clarify her purposes for assigning students to give one another feedback on their writing.

As I have mentioned in other parts of this dissertation, I frequently use this strategy in both my freshman and upper-level writing courses. First, I ask students to individually compile lists of the benefits and drawbacks of peer review (as a homework or in-class writing exercise). I then consolidate their lists and discuss them with the class (Appendix C provides a consolidated list of responses derived from in my freshman L1 composition courses over the years). Some students identify more benefits and some more constraints, and their individual overall initial attitudes and perceptions of peer feedback differed. Some even note they have never completed activities such as peer review or editing. I also add my pedagogical purposes for peer feedback, which typically mirror the rewards students identify. If not, I also add my comments to the list.

Collaboratively generating the pro/con list with students and highlighting the instructor's purposes for assigning it serve several purposes. These exercises allow students to air their concerns and ask questions, emphasize to students that the instructor values their previous experiences (both positive and negative), help students realize what they and their peers like and dislike about the peer feedback process, create a base from which to discuss students' and instructors' pedagogical goals for peer feedback, lay the groundwork for preparatory and reflection activities, and aid the class in determining the best methods for engaging in peer feedback. It's important to go beyond simply making a list and discussing it once, though. I build on this discussion when the class moves to specific training activities, saying something like, "Okay, these are our identified benefits and drawbacks; Now, let's discuss strategies for capitalizing on the benefits and minimizing the drawbacks." I also refer back to this list when I model peer feedback and have students reflect on their experiences (This is discussed more specifically in subsequent sections.).

Discussing Specific Previous Feedback Experiences

The class might also reflect on the types of comments they've previously received (Woods; Paton). Woods asks her students to respond to the following:

- List three comments/responses you have ever received on a piece of writing.
- List three comments/responses that if you ever received would discourage you from ever writing again
- List three comments that if you received you want to continue to write forever.
- Look through list and rank comments in terms of effectiveness, 1 being most and 9 being least. (189-190)

Then, each student reads one item from their list, and the class discusses commonalities and themes among the responses. For example, students typically point to confusing teacher comments that consist of abbreviations like "awk" or "trans." Students admit they do not know what these shorthand versions mean or how to use them to revise or edit their writing. Moreover,

students frequently note that it's particularly unhelpful when comments (both positive and negative) are directed toward the writer and not the ideas presented in the writing. Students are not quite sure what to do with certain positive comments like "Nice" or "Good." Thus, students rank general, vague, and complimentary comments low in terms of usefulness but rank comments that raise questions, describe what's happening in the piece, explain how something is or is not working, and suggests ways to develop their writing most helpful (190-192).

Woods' anecdotal evidence supports Cho, Schunn, and Charney's empirical research. Their linguistic analyses of comments perceived helpful by students revealed that directive and summative feedback coupled with positive feedback encouraged students to revise more frequently; conversely, overly critical and vague comments negatively influenced students to revise their writing (280). This activity serves several preparatory purposes: students begin to see how vague and hyper critical or overly congratulatory comments are unhelpful; it opens up the opportunity to discuss how to make specific, useful comments; and students begin to apply these concepts in their own responses to peers' writing. Furthermore, the teacher can refer to the lists and discussion throughout the semester to help students continually improve the quality of their feedback.

The strategies instructors choose for discovering students' incomes will depend on the language backgrounds represented in the class, the amount of class time, preparation time, and evaluation time available. Additionally, each strategy offers different advantages and disadvantages. The point is, instructors should select the strategy or a mixture of strategies that suit his/her teaching style and pedagogical aims, classroom population, and available time to prepare for, enact, and evaluate the various activities. The table below lists each strategy and relevant categories one should consider when selecting and using them.

Table 21: Summary of Activities For Establishing Classroom Community

Activity/ Assignment	Advantages	Disadvantages
Icebreakers	**Cultural** • Encourages students to get to know each other	**Cultural** • If only done once at beginning of semester, it will not encourage sustained community.
Low-Stakes or No-Stakes In-Class Group Activities	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Encourages students to get to know each other • Encourages students to learn from one another and allows students a comfortable space to ask questions from peers (less intimidating than asking instructor) • Encourages students to learn relevant course content and skills and genre moves for the writing assignment they are working on	**Cultural/Rhetorical** • Not all students willingly or equally participate. • Discussion can veer off topic if group task's purpose and protocol is not adequately explained. • Having students frequently work in groups does not ensure they will do so successfully or politely.
Out-of-Class Outings	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Encourages students to meet local and international students and feel more comfortable in their new surroundings • Encourages students to get to know each other • Encourages students to learn from one another • Encourages students to learn relevant course content and skills	**Cultural/Rhetorical** • Not all students willingly or equally participate. • Groups may be dysfunctional. • Students who hardly know each other must coordinate schedules. **Practical** • It takes more time and effort than in-class activities.
Discussing Previous Peer Feedback Experiences	• Allows student to discuss their conceptions of and expectations for peer feedback and move class towards norming peer feedback rules/protocol • Allows students to discuss specific helpful/unhelpful comments **Practical** • Can be planned, implemented, and evaluated rather quickly.	

Modeling Peer Feedback

The next step in the preparation process involves modeling effective techniques for

engaging in peer feedback. Instructors should model the necessary metalanguage, specific and

useful responses, incorporating peer feedback, and appropriate politeness strategies for offering

and responding to negative criticism, but instructors should also invite students to share

successful strategies for doing these things in order for the class to collaboratively construct

written and spoken peer feedback strategies and norms. The sections below offer instructors

methods of modeling peer feedback.

Discussing Peer Feedback-Related Media

To give students some context for discussing how to give and receive peer feedback,

instructors can assign students accessible readings or videos on how and why to do it. Various

composition programs have created videos highlighting the benefits of peer review. The Writing

Commons website offers multiple videos instructors can use to explain the purposes of giving

and getting peer feedback. For example, on the Writing Commons website, Daniel Richards'

"Why Peer Review?" video and MIT's Tech TV website's "No One Writes Alone: Peer Review

in the Classroom, A Guide For Students" presentation briefly explain the inherent socially

constructed nature of writing, ways peer feedback is used in academic and professional settings,

the rhetorical benefits of getting and giving feedback, and few strategies for giving useful

feedback.

A similar approach is to assign readings about peer feedback. For example, Chisholm has

students read and comment on his article "How to Conduct Collaborative Peer Review of

Writing: Giving and Getting on Important Documents." The reading offers a case study of two

workplace colleagues who fail at peer response because neither knows how to ask for feedback

or effectively give it. It then details strategies the individuals in the scenarios could have used to effectively solicit and provide feedback. It culminates with the overall benefits of peer feedback and the writing program's (Chisholm's) pedagogical purposes for assigning students peer feedback. The article ultimately suggests adopting a systematic way of giving feedback: explaining the state of the draft to the reviewer, using guided questions, giving specific written and oral feedback, and writer taking notes as the piece is discussed. After reading and discussing Chisholm's piece, students then freewrite their concerns about responding to each other's writing in the class. These exercises serves several purposes simultaneously: the content allows students to think about and discuss the pros and cons of peer feedback; the review session allows the instructor to model suggestions in the article (ways to solicit and give feedback); it also teaches students that peer feedback is used in professional settings as well. Students and instructors can reference the paper and feedback session throughout the semester to discuss effective and ineffective feedback[4].

To further emphasize the socially constructed nature of knowledge and how peer feedback operates in academic settings to students, Berg suggests showing students examples of how scholars collaborate and review one another's work. She does this by having her L2 writers read and analyze the "acknowledgements" section in their textbook and examples of writers acknowledging their peers' feedback within academic journal articles (239). This activity helps students realize that even disciplinary experts have their work reviewed, and they use the feedback to improve their writing (239). Ferris also suggests that in L2 classrooms, in order to reinforce the importance and benefits of responding to each other's writing, the teacher might

---

[4] Instructors who want to incorporate student-appropriate readings about peer feedback might also include Michelle Trim's student handbook on responding to peers' writing, *What Every Student Should Know About Practicing Peer Review.*

also reference research that demonstrates the associated benefits, note that the practice is common among academics, and emphasize that even effective/accomplished writers seek peer feedback. Moreover, the instructor might illustrate how s/he has previous used/engaged in peer feedback.

Conducting Mock Peer Feedback Session

Both L1 and L2 writing scholarship, as well as the handbooks analyzed in Chapter 3, claim instructors should model how to complete peer feedback through an in-class mock peer feedback session (WAC Clearinghouse; Edgington; Paton; Ferris; Lui and Hansen; Berg; Kurtz and Connor). One method of doing is this is by distributing or projecting an average student sample paper (preferably not a student enrolled in the class)[5] and having students comment on specific features that make the paper strong or weak in terms of the situation for which it was written. This can be accomplished as a whole class workshop, or after students have read the sample paper, groups can discuss the paper and share their responses in a plenary discussion (Ferris; Lui and Hansen; Edgington). The instructor should consolidate the group responses and add his/her comments. The teacher needs to model means of giving effective feedback by pointing to specific strengths and weaknesses in terms of HOCs such as purpose, focus, organization, development, opening and closing moves, etc. or LOCs such as paragraph organization, sentence structure, grammar, mechanics, or spelling, depending on the focus of the upcoming feedback session. The instructor can also model metalanguage and appropriate and polite wording for critique and comments. A related activity is to illustrate peer feedback comments that fail to really help the writer understand the strengths and weaknesses and revise/edit accordingly. For example, I show my students a completed peer feedback sheet with

---

[5] Teachers who elect to use papers of students enrolled in the course should get the students' permission ahead of time in case the student is uncomfortable having his/her paper critiqued in front of the class.

comments such "Looks good" or "You need to edit some of the unclear sentences." I then model how to make these comments more useful by pointing to specific places in the paper and offering specific revision or editing suggestions. These exercises benefit students even more if the paper is written in the same genre the students are currently composing because they get a sense of strategies that might be working well or not in the contexts of their own papers, and they practice identifying these in others' writing. Students also get a clearer sense of the teacher's expectations of effective and ineffective responses to the writing prompt.

It's also important to help students apply the selected peer feedback worksheet prior to using it. This reminds them (or familiarizes them) with the instructor's expectations for their final products. Having them practice using the peer feedback worksheet during practice sessions can also give them the opportunity to collaboratively revise the sheet with the instructor and each other. For example, as they're learning to use it, they may point out unclear questions, seemingly irrelevant questions, or they can suggestion additional questions. This activity can take place during the practice peer response sessions mentioned above. This strategy allows for students to collaboratively generate the feedback questions with their peers and the instructor.

Berg suggests practicing peer response with L2 writers on a smaller scale. She assigns L2 students to respond as a class to a sample unknown peer's paragraph. Students comment on effective and ineffective elements: theme, organization, unity, clarity, grammar, and spelling. Students then discuss possible revision and editing strategies (239). In this same activity, Berg has students practice replacing potentially offensive comments such as "Your writing is really bad" with "It would be great if you added an example here" (239). Another alternative is having groups collaboratively compose a paragraph and assigning another group to respond to it (Ferris). These same activities can be useful in mainstream classrooms for illustrating less

offensive and effective comments. Moreover, if the writing instructor does not have time for students to read an entire paper, the scaled-down paragraph approach could also work well.

Dramatizing Peer Feedback

A very engaging way of modeling peer feedback, particularly in terms of polite behavior, is to incorporate a little drama into the classroom. Conducting scripted fishbowl activities where students, teacher and students, or teacher and a colleague dramatize a session that emphasizes effective and ineffective comments and behavior can have a powerful and memorable impact on both L1 and L2 writers (Edgington; Bruffee, *Higher Education*; Berg; Ferris; Liu and Hansen). Berg also suggests having students watch videos of peers responding to each other's writing (Berg; Ferris). Students then discuss the roles both the writer and reviewer assumed, turn taking, listening skills, appropriate and inappropriate vocabulary, and beneficial and less useful comments. In Henry and Ledbetter's study of peer feedback across the disciplines, they point out that the demonstration is more useful and meaningful to students if they have read the paper the actors are discussing. They suggest having an instructor and colleague comment on each others' writing (pieces written in the same genre students are currently writing) in front of the class. As with the other activities, the instructor and students can use the reenactments as reference points throughout the semester to discuss effective and ineffective methods of interaction.

Enlisting Writing Center Tutors

Writing center tutors can be enlisted to help train students to effectively respond to each other's writing. The tutors can be part of a drama, model specific feedback with a sample paper or paragraph, or sit in on students' sessions and model how to give useful and effective feedback. The benefit of enlisting a tutor is they are obviously already trained to respond effectively to peers' writing, but they are typically closer to students' ages and do not grade the students'

papers. Therefore, students may trust and better relate to writing center tutors. When tutors sit in on sessions, they can also relay to the instructor what is and is not working. Finally, this partnership will introduce students to the writing center and encourage them to visit it for subsequent writing assistance. The tutor puts a friendly face to the writing center and illustrates ways tutors can help students with future writing projects (Byland; Beaudin, Corbett, and Crawford).

Illustrating Feedback Incorporation

Even after students are trained to offer effective feedback, many are still confused about how to use their peers' comments. Ferris suggests L2 writers also need to see sample drafts in which peer feedback is incorporated or even rejected for some reason, so showing subsequent versions of a paper can also help students conceptualize how to use their peers' comments. The same is true of many L1 writers. Berg's scholarship offers a useful method for illustrating how to incorporate feedback. She has students read several drafts of a conference proposal with her colleagues' comments on them. The various proposal iterations illustrate how she used their comments to improve the proposal (239). This exercise illustrates not only how to give and use specific feedback but also that academics solicit and use peers' feedback in their writing. Instructors could replicate this exercise using a sample student writing to illustrate how a peer uses feedback across drafts.

Although we want students to take peers' comments seriously and use them in effective ways, as Liu and Hansen point out, we must emphasize to them that the author is ultimately responsible for and credited for the final draft, so s/he must learn to use the comments in ways that align with the assignment's scope and purpose as well as the author's purpose, focus, and selected persona in the paper. Thus, it is not necessary to always use all peer feedback.

Discussing and Illustrating Conversational Styles

Second-language writing scholars accurately note that no classroom is entirely culturally or linguistically homogenous, and in order to capitalize on this diversity, writing instructors should "teach students to work with peers who are different from the in many aspects in order to foster a healthy intercultural communication environment" (Liu and Hansen 78). Carson, Carson, and Nelson found that students who come from collectivist cultures may value group cohesion over helping an individual writer improve his/her draft, so their comments are often only complimentary. In their study of peer response among Chinese and Spanish students, Chinese students were reluctant to initiate comments, and when they did, they hedged them in ways that would avoid overt conflict. The Chinese students were more concerned with group cohesion and therefore resisted making negative comments because of the perceived rift in the group it could create. The Spanish students preferred direct, specific constructive comments (even if they are negative) about their drafts, but the Chinese students preferred reviewers to use more hedging techniques (Lui and Hansen 19-20). Nelson and Murphy's study also emphasizes the need to discuss conversational styles with culturally and linguistically diverse groups of students because L2 students often fail to incorporate peers' suggestions when they are perceived as "defensive in nature" (77).

And peer feedback can get particularly complicated in courses comprised of native and non-native speakers. A good example is the case I mentioned in Chapter 1 with the students enrolled in my grammar course. The native English speakers in the group inaccurately ascribed the South Korean student's identity. Instead of positioning her as a capable, knowledgeable peer, they positioned her as the "foreign" student whose spoken American English was not as strong as theirs, so her contributions to the group effort were ignored. The literature review in Chapter

1 also reflects how intercultural differences are manifested in feedback contexts. For example, Zhu found that in groups of mixed native/non-native speakers, non-native speakers often take fewer turns speaking, are interrupted more frequently than native speakers, and can misunderstand or misapply peer feedback (Zhu). Ferris also posits that ". . .the personae expressed by students [among L2 writers as well L1/L2] during peer review could have substantially positive or negative effects on their outcomes and students' attitudes about the value of peer review" (84). Lui and Hansen show that within L2 composition courses, even though students are motivated to participate within group discussions, they may be reluctant to because "[t]heir own social identities and their perceptions of what is appropriate behavior in a group in their home cultures often serve as reminders before they take chances to speak up" (91). The same is true in classrooms comprised mostly of L1 writers. Henry and Ledbetter found that "students who feel insecure in an academic setting are more willing to keep quiet during peer review sessions. . .students who feel confident in such settings are the first to display authority" (51).

Most effective writing instructors teach students to analyze and adjust for context when writing to a specific readership, but instructors also need to frame peer feedback sessions as rhetorical situations to which they must adapt their rhetorical and linguistic skills. In informal interviews with students whose collaborative activities and projects were not going smoothly, I discovered that in some cases, they had simply misinterpreted one another's signals (e.g. s/he was rude, interrupts, rarely speaks, or remains silent).

Assigning activities that help students unpack and discuss notions of politeness and conversational style differences can make these dimensions explicit to students and provide them with strategies for adapting their communication expectations and norms while giving and

receiving peer feedback. To do this, I had recently had a group of my English 219: Technical and

Professional Writing students read and discuss conversational style categories noted in Joanna

Wolfe's *Team Writing: A Guide to Working in Groups* and Louise Rehling's "Improving

Teamwork Through Awareness of Conversational Styles."

- **Overlapping:** speakers' conversational moves overlap one another: intimate, impulsive, spontaneous, supportive, ideal for brainstorming (Rehling 478)

- **Turn Taking:** speakers take turns speaking: Formal, sequential, focused, respectful (Rehling 478)

- **Competitive:** speakers frequently interrupt each other and seem more concerned with making their own points than with listening to others (Wolfe 89)

- **Considerate:** speakers allow others to speak and provide support through back-channeling (e.g., "uh-huh," "yeah," head nodding) (Wolfe 90)

Wolfe's chapter also suggests strategies for adapting conversational styles, as listed in the

table below.

Table 22: Suggestions for Adapting Conversational Styles

How Competitive Speakers Adopt a More Considerate Style	How Considerate Speakers Can Adjust to Competitive Styles
- Summarize ideas before disagreeing with them. - Repair interruptions and other competitive behaviors. - Check in with quiet speakers. - Pay attention to body language. (Is someone using gestures that indicate he/she wants to say something?) (Wolfe 93)	- Learn how to prevent or forestall interruptions. - Make shorter or fewer pauses, - Use gestures or metalanguage that indicates you're still speaking. - Find gentle ways to interrupt. (Wolfe 94)

Rehling's article argues oftentimes students fail to effectively accomplish group work as

they "struggle to adapt conversational styles to an unfamiliar format: outside the familiar

structure of family and friends and focused particularly on problem solving related to writing"

(475). Students employ a familiar conversational style influenced by "family, culture, and gender" (475). Overlapping style is often appropriate among speakers who know each other well. The turn-taking style is more formal and sequential: each speaker adds to the conversation in turn with few or no interruptions (478). This style is often appropriate in contexts where a power differential among speakers exists or speakers are unfamiliar with one another (478).

 After we discussed terms from the assigned readings, I had my 219 students watch videos of dysfunctional collaborative writing groups working together. These videos are companion media to Joanna Wolfe's *Team Writing: A Guide to Working in Groups* and are free to the public on the handbook's website (Wolfe, *Team Writing*, Web). Although the videos depict scenarios of students co-authoring projects, they were still very useful for discussing conversational styles, as the dramas illustrate students who use dominating and interrupting styles interacting with students who use turn-taking and considerate styles. In fact, in one video a student hardly says anything at all because a classmate with a dominate style dominates the conversation. As we watched the videos, the class and I discussed their conceptions of how groups were communicating in the dramas: Which groups exhibit more effective communication and why? Which groups do not communicating effectively, and how might they adapt their styles to reduce conflict or include more of the group members? We used terms from the readings (interrupting style, dominating style) to pinpoint specific styles and discussed how some of the suggested strategies noted in the reading might help the groups communicate more clearly (i.e., noticing body language and checking in with quiet members).

 After we discussed the readings and the videos, I had students complete self-assessment discussion style worksheets sheets (See Appendix D.) that I had downloaded from Wolfe's companion website. The worksheet describes group communicative situations and asks students,

using a five-level scale (never, rarely, sometimes, frequently, and always), to rank how accurately each scenarios reflect their communicative styles. Each response is worth a point value, and the worksheet totals indicate where students fall on the consider-competitive continuum. Groups of students shared and discussed their scores, and in a plenary discussion, we talked about how being aware of your own conversational style might help you adapt to your classmates' styles in the context of peer feedback. When we complied the list of peer feedback protocol as a class (See the subsection below.), I added students suggestions' for using appropriate conversational styles to the list.

Perhaps a more efficient way of discussing conversational style (or one that could be coupled with the method detailed above) is to adopt Liu and Hansen's method. They suggest showing students lists of inappropriate sentences students might use and offering more sociolinguistically appropriate alternatives. Liu and Hansen's suggestions are provided in Table 23 (Liu and Hansen 141-142) below:

Table 23: Inappropriate/Appropriate Ways of Phrasing Feedback Comments

What Students Might Say	**What Might Be More Appropriate**
This wrong.	- Is this right? - I am not sure if this is right. - I wonder whether this is what you had in mind? - I'm afraid I don't understand what you meant. - Could you explain to us what you wanted to say here? - I did not quite understand your point here. Would you please rephrase the sentence?
How could you say that?	- What do you mean here? - This idea is interesting, but I could not find any discussion in your paper to support this idea. - Your point is well made, but there is a lack of evidence to convince me.
I don't like this paper.	- I am a little confused about the paper. - I am not sure I agree with your ideas. - You put a lot of effort into this paper, but I feel I could have enjoyed it more if I knew what you intended to say.

	• Although some points are well made, I guess your way of thinking is different from mine.
How could you write this paper without a thesis statement?	• Can you tell me where your thesis statement is? • I'm afraid that I cannot find your thesis statement. • Your thesis statement is unclear to me. • Could you help me locate your thesis statement in the paper?
Why did you use this word/expression/sentence again and again?	• Can you use another word here? • You use this word a lot. Maybe use a different word. • This word/expression/sentence is good here, but its power is decreased due to its overuse. • I like this word/expression/sentence, but your paper might be better with a variety of expressions. • Could you think of another/word/expression/sentence to enrich this sentence?
You could have done a better job.	• This is good but you need to. . . • I like your paper but you can. . . • I can see your effort here, but I am sure you can find many ways to improve your paper, such as. . . • I can see you have a lot to do in your revision of this paper, although the basic idea of this paper is there.
This paper is perfect.	• Very good. You could. . . • This good but if you want you can. . . • Well done. But this paper could be better if you. . . • What a good job! If I were you, I would still work hard to improve. . . • Nice job. I believe you can still work on. . .

The goal in these exercises is to introduce students to terms for conceptualizing conversational exchanges but also to engage students in metadiscourse to draw out their perceptions (preknowledge), notions of polite communication (encouraging them to "look back," as philosophical hermeneutics suggests) and then encouraging them to look forward, to broaden their interpretive horizons as they dialogue with classmates to collaboratively create appropriate peer feedback protocol.

Distributing a List of Peer Feedback Tips and Protocol

Before students embark on responding to peers' writing, instructors can consolidate the information gleaned from the exercise(s) by distributing a list of tips. The list in Appendix E synthesizes tips from various student and instructor guides, and each item should be emphasized in some way in the preparatory exercises. Obviously the list should be tailored to what the class discussed and how concepts and terms were articulated in class, and it essentially becomes the class-generated list of rules/expectations for completing peer feedback throughout the course of the semester.

Modeling peer feedback can instill positive students' attitudes and motivation regarding peer feedback because it allows a space for peers and the instructor to hear and value their positive and negative experiences with it, and their attitudes and motivation increase if they understand how and why do to. Modeling considers the rhetorical and cultural fields because it norms students' expectations and provides them with strategies for doing and using it effectively. Moreover, discussing individual peer feedback experiences with their peers and collaboratively generating effective and ineffective strategies can encourage students to learn from their peers' experiences. Also, dramatizing or illustrating polite and impolite responses and behavior can improve students' interpersonal communication when responding to one another's writing. Finally, students begin to learn a metalanguage, and L2 writers practice their written and oral language skills by analyzing and discussing samples.

The strategies instructors choose for helping students practice peer feedback prior to enacting it will depend on the language backgrounds represented in the class (mainstream comp class, L2, mixed), students' classifications, and the amount of class time, preparation time, and evaluation time available. Additionally, each strategy offers different advantages and

disadvantages. Instructors may choose to do a combination of strategies in order to emphasize

different aspects of the written and verbal genres associated with peer feedback. Moreover, after

students have completed their first round of peer feedback and have given the instructor feedback

through reflection activities (discussed below), the instructor may choose to further engage

students in more preparatory activities. For example, if instructors notice students complaining

about overly harsh comments, s/he might create a drama or show videos that illustrate more

effective means of framing comments. Or if the instructor notices students are failing to

incorporate comments, she or he may provide examples of how writers use feedback across

drafts. Thus, the preparatory activities can be revisited, depending on the instructor's

observations of group interactions and student reflection comments. The table below lists each

strategy and relevant categories one should consider when selecting and using them.

Table 24: Summary of Methods for Training Students to Give Peer Feedback

Activity	Advantages	Disadvantages
Discussing PF-Related Media: readings, videos, articles. **Prep Time:** Depends on selection of media **In-Class Time**: Part or most of a class period **Evaluation Time**: None or little	**Cultural/Rhetorical** • Introduces students to the purpose of this practice and gives them rhetorical terms for conceptualizing it. • Exposes students to research on the topic: theory, pros, cons, etc. • Illustrates that academics and professionals have their work reviewed by one another.	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Does not model verbal/nonverbal aspects of the PF session. • **May not** model how to in/effectively complete it: use of comments across drafts. Depends on selected media. • **Practical**: Requires more outside reading than the other methods.
Mock Peer Feedback Session **Prep time**: Considerable **In-Class Time**: 1 class period **Evaluation Time**: None or little	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Models how to in/effectively complete it: helpful comments, politeness, communication style. • Students learn teacher's and classmates' notions of effective & ineffective writing.	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Does not model how to incorporate comments into writing.

Illustrate Revisions Across Drafts **Prep Time**: Moderate **In-class**: half a class-full class **Evaluation Time**: None	**Cultural/Rhetorical** • Models how to effectively give and receive comments. • Models how to incorporate suggestions.	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Does not model verbal/nonverbal aspects of the PF session.
Dramatizing Peer Feedback **Prep Time**: Considerable **In-class**: Entire class **Evaluation Time**: None	• Engages students, especially if they are included in the dramatizations. • Models how to in/effectively complete it: helpful comments, politeness, communication style. • Students learn teacher's and classmates' notions of effective & ineffective writing.	• Does not model how to incorporate comments into writing.
Enlisting Writing Center Peer Tutors **Prep Time**: Moderate **In-class**: Entire class or more **Evaluation Time**: None	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Models how to in/effectively complete it: helpful comments, politeness, communication style. • Students often more comfortable asking the peer tutor writing-related questions. • Introduces students to valuable tutoring services	**Cultural/Rhetorical** • Does not model how to incorporate comments into writing, necessarily.
Discussing culture, politeness, and conversational styles **Prep Time**: Considerable **In-class**: Entire class or more **Evaluation Time**: None or Little	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Helps students think about culturally-informed communicative differences, especially when watching dramatizations.	**Cultural/Rhetorical** • Does not model how to incorporate comments into writing. • Does not *model* how to in/effectively complete it.
Creating List Detailing PF Protocol **Prep Time**: Moderate **In-class**: Entire class or more **Evaluation Time**: None	**Cultural/Rhetorical** • Consolidates rules/protocol for students • Provides a written record of what has been discussed. • Validates students' suggestions and concern • Couples well with other methods	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Does not model how to incorporate comments into writing. • Does not *model* how to in/effectively complete it.

Print-Based Enactment Strategies

Once students have conducted relevant preparatory exercise(s) that emphasize the purpose and benefits of peer feedback and effective ways of giving it, the class and instructors should discuss the logistics for completing peer feedback and determine some protocol and norms for completing it. The instructor can determine the extent to which s/he wants to garner student feedback. For some of the items listed below, for the sake of time and efficiency, the instructor can initially establish and then modify based on his/her observations and on student reflections and feedback. However, Liu and Hansen point out that to better acquaint students with the process, create student buy-in, and tailor it to each classroom of students and to each assignment, instructors should collaboratively "establish norms and rules early on" but allow students the space/opportunity "to revise their rules as they become more acquainted [and more adept] at the process" (69-70). The following section offers a menu of practical strategies for collaboratively structuring various aspects of peer feedback with students.

Determining Peer Feedback Protocol and Norms

In structuring the feedback session, instructors should determine response to the following questions, and the instructor should solicit student feedback on some of these items in order to enact a hermeneutic pedagogy.

How should the peer feedback sheet be constructed?

- o What are your (the teacher's) criteria for the assignment?
- o In what stage of the writing process are students?
  - ▪ What level of feedback should students provide?
- o What are students' goals for the feedback session? What individual concerns do they have about their individual drafts?

Where and how should peer feedback take place?
- o Partially outside of class and partially in class?
- o Entirely in class?
- o What should be the order of turn taking within the peer feedback session?

- ○ Should feedback include written and oral comments?

What constitutes a draft for the session?
How many copies should students bring to class?
- ○ What should the penalty be if a student fails to bring and adequate draft of no draft?
What if a student is absent from class?
- ○ How should absent group member make up missed session? (Liu and Hansen70)
- ○ How should groups deal with chronically absent and unprepared students? (Liu and Hansen70)

Responses to these questions will give the instructor some relevant information for determining mode, the nature of peer feedback questions, and grouping methods. The section below explains why it is important to ask these questions and it provides various methods for enacting peer feedback.

Creating the Feedback Questions

It's important to create a clear and precise list of questions for students to use in their feedback discussions because it keeps them focused on relevant items during the session (Byland). In creating the feedback questions, instructors should first revisit the writing assignment itself and incorporate questions that prompt students to determine whether a draft is meeting assignment criteria; thus, the questions should be tailored to each writing assignment (Paton; Cahill; Ferris). For example, one should not use the same criteria and questions to determine the effectiveness of a memoir and of an instruction manual because these pieces are written in different genres for different purposes and audiences.

To ensure the assignment questions are incorporated into the feedback session, the instructor should incorporate language/criteria directly from the prompt into the peer feedback sheet. The point is, the questions should clearly reflect the instructor's pedagogical purpose for the peer feedback session but also consider student's writing agendas (WAC Clearinghouse). Using the assignment's criteria as a basis of analysis "familiarizes students with the tool the

teacher will use to grade their own drafts and thereby better aligns the teacher's and students' expectations" (Ferris 173).

Thus, it is important to sequence workshops throughout the writing process. Questions should initially focus on higher order concerns (HOCs) such as topic, purpose, and key supporting points for the first workshop while the students are still conceptualizing their ideas. Then, as their writing progresses and takes shape, subsequent workshops can then focus on items such as supporting evidence and organization of ideas, and then lower-order concerns (LOCs) such as style, grammar, and mechanics (WAC Clearinghouse; Beaudin et al). Peter Elbow and Pat Belanoff's *Being A Writer: A Community of Writers Revisited* recommends general feedback strategies for each stage of the writing process, and these can be adapted to suit different writing assignments. For example, for early drafts, they recommend the author simply read the rough draft to his/her peer and simply ask for feedback on the general topic. For more developed and revised drafts, they recommend responders provide descriptive outlines that include sentences about what the entire paper as well as each paragraph "says" and "does." Clearly these exercises ask authors and responders to solicit and offer different levels of feedback for different drafts (See Appendix F for a summary of Elbow and Belanoff's complete taxonomy.). Tailoring the questions to various levels of concern helps students focus their feedback and helps them avoid focusing on grammar and mechanics at the early stages of the writing process. Moreover, the feedback sessions should take place before the writing instructor comments on or conferences with students regarding the issues targeted in the session. Although many students enjoy the benefits of peer feedback, they may not be as invested in gleaning a peer's feedback if the instructor has already given them feedback (Liu and Hansen).

Also, the questions should not consist merely of checklists or yes/no questions (Ferris; Paton). These types of questions do not encourage substantive feedback. It's also critical that the session not ask students to respond to too many questions. If it does, groups may have trouble completing it within the time frame allotted. Plus, if the students feel rushed they may offer terse or shallow comments to all or some of the questions. This is especially important for L2 writers because it typically takes them more time to read and respond to drafts. The feedback session should typically focus on no more than 5 questions, particularly if students are reading and responding to drafts in class only (Paton; Ferris).

The feedback sheet needs to include space for responders to note what the draft does successfully. Requiring students to make this move helps readers highlight areas that work well and it serves to hedge negative criticism. In discussions with my own students, they have reported they appreciated the "did well" comments because it made them feel confident/proud of parts of their writing, it helped them understand which parts they might keep in their drafts, and it tempered the negative criticism and thereby helped to maintain more positive social relationships with their peer.

For LOC peer editing sessions, the list of questions should encourage students to focus attention on stylistic, grammatical, and mechanical issues relevant to the writing assignment they are drafting at the time and that have previously been part of class instruction. This emphasizes to students that these communicative elements are contingent upon context. Plus, it would be impossible for the instructor and students to address as a class every possible mechanical, grammatical, or stylistic issue in a draft, especially since in some cases a deviation from standard varieties is not rule based but based on the writer's idiosyncratic use of language. Second-language writing scholars recommend instructors discuss the grammatical issues that are "typical

and consistent error patterns" (115). This approach to teaching grammar and incorporating it into peer feedback sessions is especially helpful for non-native speakers and multilingual writers because they can focus on specific grammatical and stylistic concerns in theirs and peers' drafts, and students will not feel the need to "correct" every perceived error in the draft or to line edit their peers' drafts.

Instructors can engage in various levels of collaboration with students when generating or adapting the peer feedback questions. Some instructors will go as far as collaboratively generating the criteria for grading the paper and therefore all questions for the feedback sessions. Liu and Hansen's study on "flexible peer response sheets" found that when students were allowed to help construct the questions, they "were more invested in the peer response, had greater interest in peers' comments, and had more favorable perceptions of the usefulness of peer response" (Liu and Hansen 147). They also found these perceptions led to more useful discussion and collaboration "during the oral component of peer response, generating more specific comments, which ultimately led to greater and more extensive revisions on subsequent drafts" (147). Kurtz and Connor also argue that it's important for both L1 and L2 writers to bring 3-5 of their own concerns to the feedback session and thereby set their own agendas for peer feedback. My own experiences creating peer feedback questions with students have shown me that students appreciate some guidance but also like the freedom of creating their own questions and providing input about how the review process is conducted. For example, one semester I informally interviewed some of my English 102 students in my office about the peer feedback sheet we had used for the previous session, and many of them told me that they thought the questions were helpful in guiding them through the review, but, as one student put, "Sometimes I just need to write my own questions in my own wording." I thought that was a really good

suggestion, so from then on I began leaving space on worksheets for the author to articulate his or her own questions. However, collaborating on every aspect of the peer feedback sheet can be time-consuming and a little daunting for some instructors and students, especially if it is the first peer feedback session or if an instructor is teaching his/her first writing course. Furthermore, some student-generated questions may fail to consider criteria noted in the assignment's prompt and rubric—they may be a little too idiosyncratic and fail to consider the written piece's context. A sort of in-between approach is to include questions based on the prompt and rubric but allow students space to write their own questions. In the worksheets I create for my own courses, I foreground the author's concerns by having groups first focus on the author's questions; then, after doing this, they focus on my questions derived from the writing assignment's prompt and rubric.

Stipulating Length and Number of Drafts

If students bring inadequately developed drafts to the response sessions, it reduces the workshop's usefulness/effectiveness (Trim 16). Thus, it is important for the instructors or instructors with feedback from students, to stipulate what constitutes an adequate draft for the upcoming response session (Paton 292). The teacher or class may choose to select a word count or page length and or to bring a typed or handwritten draft. A related concern is determining the penalty if students fail to bring an adequate draft or no draft at all. I have found that consulting students regarding this rule helps them feel more responsible for abiding by it since they helped establish the draft criteria and penalty for failing to abide by it.

Instructors also need to specify how many copies of their drafts students need to bring, and this will depend on which in-class peer feedback method they chose to assign students to engage in. If students are placed in groups of three and required to read both classmate's drafts,

the author may need to bring two drafts, one for each reader. However, if students use a round-robin style, each reader can read one draft and pass it to the next reader and then read the draft that is passed to him/her; in this case, authors would only need to bring one draft. Again, this is a dimension the instructor might solicit student feedback on to determine which method works best for them.

Specifying When Drafts Are Due

It is also important to note when drafts are due, and this will depend on where and how drafts are responded to. If students respond to each other's drafts solely in class, obviously the drafts would be due at the beginning of class. However, if students decide they need more time than class allows and request to respond to drafts outside of class, the drafts would obviously need to be due in class or over email, class blog, etc. the class period before the in-class discussion.

Dealing With Absent or Ill-Prepared Students

An important occurrence to consider that influences student motivation and peer feedback's effectiveness is dealing with students who are absent are ill-prepared on the days in-class peer feedback takes place. The instructor has a number of options for dealing with this. Obviously if an attendance policy is enforced, the student would be considered absent. However, the instructor and students will need to determine how the student should make it up outside of class. Will the student be allowed to submit the final draft without completing it? Will s/he receive a point deduction for the peer feedback session? It may work best to discuss with students what serves as a better motivator for them.

Assigning Roles to Group Members

Scholarship on L2 writers and peer feedback suggests instructors assign students specific roles during peer feedback to keep groups on track and to ensure each draft is given equal amounts of time during the session. Ferris and Liu and Hansen suggest that each response group have a timekeeper, who ensures each paper is given equal coverage; a notetaker, who notes what each responder says; and a moderator, who ensures every participant is given equal opportunity to respond (Ferris171; Liu and Hansen 42). Assigning roles may prevent one member from dominating the group and allow more timid members space to comment. If a member persistently dominates the discussion, the instructor and students may instate "explicit turn-taking guidelines within groups that require each student in turn to ask one question and/or make a comment until everyone else has had a turn" (162). Establishing roles and/or turn-taking protocol certainly encourages equal participation, and instructors need to determine with students if/how roles will be assumed prior to students enacting peer feedback.

Crediting Students

To create better student buy-in and to reinforce the importance of peer feedback within the writing classroom, it's important that instructors provide undergraduate students some sort of extrinsic reward for completing it. Both L1 and L2 writing scholars argue instructors can better motivate students by making peer feedback a significant portion of their final grades (Paton; WAC Clearinghouse; Mangelsdorf; Melkun). The feedback can be evaluated on one more of these dimensions:

- Quality and thoughtfulness of commentary on peers' papers,
- Incorporation of peer feedback, and/or
- Quality and thoughtfulness of peer feedback reflections.

The credit can be in the form of a distinct peer feedback grade based on the specificity of students' responses and reflections, or an instructor might impose a penalty if the peer feedback is not completed, for example by failing to accept the final draft until the peer feedback is completed. Alternatively, the instructor may base a portion of the grade on the author's rating of the feedback quality (WAC Clearinghouse). The instructor can determine the percentage and protocol alone, or s/he might garner student feedback to determine the method that best motivates students. I collaborated with students regarding how they are credited, and many have told me that if it constitutes a significant portion of their grades, they are more likely to put more effort into peer review.

Scholars offer a number of different strategies for conducting peer feedback sessions. To enact a hermeneutic pedagogy, it's important for instructors to be aware of a number of strategies for enacting peer feedback and trying them out with students and then adapting them according to student reflections. The following section details specific methods instructors might have students employ.

Selecting Print-Based Peer Feedback Modes

Reviewer-Focused

The most common method seems to be reviewer-focused with the reviewer/responder offering a mixture of oral and written comments. The reviewer-focused method asks students to bring hard copies of drafts which groups of students swap. Students read each other's drafts, reviewers comment on a review sheet or on a blank piece of paper, and author and reviewers take turns discussing each paper in turn. With this method, each reviewer/responder is responsible for writing extensive comments; thus, the writer receives direct feedback from readers. However,

sometimes authors cannot read the reviewers' handwriting, and the reviewer instead of the author spends more energy writing comments about the author's writing.

Author-Focused

In the author-focused model, after reviewers have read a draft, the author interviews them using the peer feedback questions and records reviewers' comments. This way, the bulk of the work rests with the author, and s/he should be able to read his/her own handwriting. Moreover, during these interviews, the author can ask follow-up questions to tease out any of the responders' unclear/vague responses. I have tried both reviewer and author-focused methods in my classes and have found many students prefer to use the author-focused method, although a few are so accustomed to the more traditional reviewer-focused method that they prefer it. During the Spring 2014 semester in my English 219 course, I had students try author-focused for the first review and reviewer-focused for the subsequent one. After they experienced both methods, I allowed groups to select the one they found most effective, and for crediting purposes, I had them note on the review sheets who had recorded their comments: author or reviewer. A good portion of the class selected the author-focused method. However, many still went with the familiar reviewer-focused method.

Reinforcing Written Feedback with Oral Feedback

Both scholarship in mainstream and second-language writing classrooms argue students should reinforce written comments with oral feedback. Ferris argues the written feedback offers L2 writers several advantages: "It allows students more time to think and compose helpful feedback; it gives the writer a record of what was said as she or he goes to revise; and it allows the teacher to hold the students accountable for giving good feedback and to monitor the effectiveness of feedback sessions, both as to types of feedback given and as to its usefulness for

subsequent revisions" (171). Moreover, reinforcing written and oral feedback allows responders to clarify any vague or unclear suggestions (Kurtz and Connor; Liu and Hansen 148). Clearly L1 students are afforded these same benefits. However, Ferris also points out that coupling written feedback with oral feedback takes more time (171). Ferris also points out that since it takes L2 writers longer to read and writer comments, it may actually be more effective to have responders read a few drafts and only offer authors oral feedback instead of extensive written criticism. This practice focuses responders on big-picture ideas and allows them to focus on the major effective and ineffective strategies.

Having the author read his/her draft aloud to the response group for several reasons can enhance the review session's efficacy. First, it allows author and listeners to hear the piece's pace, diction, etc. Because students know they will be reading it aloud to classmates, it encourages them to bring a better quality draft and encourages responders to be more attentive. However, there are some disadvantages to this method. If authors bring only one draft, responders do not have a written version they can return to/point to in their comments. But, if properly prepared, students could bring multiple drafts so responders could follow along and make comments on the drafts as the author reads the piece. A second disadvantage is that the author reading aloud and then having responders comment can take longer than having responders read it silently and respond, especially if the drafts are lengthy and complicated. However, if the questions are kept to a minimum, time may not be too much of an issue.

Anonymous Author Review

Students may also prefer to give feedback anonymously in order to feel they can offer more honest feedback and avoid offending the author. One scheme involves the instructor collecting multiple anonymous drafts from each student, students read several different

anonymous drafts (obviously, each group receives papers written by classmates not in the group), individual members make marginal comments on the drafts as they read, the group discusses the paper, and then the group collaboratively generates the overall response to the anonymous author (Vatalaro 25). Anderson's research showed that double blind reviews tend to encourage reviewers to feel less nervous about offending the other and thereby give more constructive rather than congratulatory comments (195).

A similar method is what Corbett calls the "7up" method. In this configuration, students anonymously read, comment on, and rank seven of their classmates' papers. Students also rank the papers from strongest to weakest. The class then discusses the top 2-3 papers and the nature of the comments to determine helpful/unhelpful comments (238). The anonymous approach allows authors to get a range of feedback from his/her classmates, and the responders feel more comfortable providing honest feedback. However, if groups discuss drafts aloud in class, it's possible the author could overhear the group discussing the draft, so the responders' identities could be revealed. Moreover, the inability to dialogue with the responders disallows authors the chance to clarify feedback. Additionally, if reviewer responses are not written legibly, the author may not be able to read the reviewers' comments. Finally, since responders feel a sense of anonymity, their comments may be overly harsh and therefore counterproductive.

Inside/Outside of Class Peer Feedback

The previous sections discussed methods of having students give feedback in class only; however, a good bit of scholarship advocates having students respond to each other's writing both outside of and in class. The involves distributing drafts and having students read and respond to one another's drafts outside of class and then meeting in class to discuss the comments in person. For instance, students might bring printed copies of drafts with a short

memo on the back noting what s/he would like classmates to respond the class period prior to the feedback session. Then, responders write elaborated letters directly to the author, print them, and bring them to the following class to discuss in person (Oakes). This method affords students a number of additional benefits for both L1 and L2 writers. Responders are allowed more time to read the drafts and offer more thorough, thoughtful, and socially appropriate feedback. Elbow and Belanoff also note that this method saves in class time and is particularly useful when drafts are long and/or complicated (6). And more reading/response time is especially helpful to L2 writers. Oakes also argues since students more thoroughly and thoughtfully respond, the sessions are more productive, and students thereby produce better quality final drafts (52). This method, of course, has its disadvantages. It takes more time to organize and requires more time and effort on the students' part. Additionally, an elaborate letter may require significant time and effort on the parts of L2 writers, so, perhaps, just having them focus on a few items in a series of short paragraphs would be more suitable.

Whole-Class Workshops

Ian Barnard's scholarship offers an interesting take on the traditional break-out group method. He assigns his students to engage in whole-class responses rather than small-group responses. In this configuration, only a few papers are read and discussed during the workshops, and students take turns serving as workshoppee's, respondents, and facilitators. Depending on the length of the class, 2-3 papers are discussed by the entire class. The class period before, workshopees distribute hard copies of their papers to the entire class and to the instructor, respondents (which is essentially the rest of the class) type 200-250 word responses in terms of pre-established criteria, and the class discusses the responses. Respondents bring two copies of their responses, one for the author and one for the instructor to grade. Facilitators lead the

discussion, keep discussion on track, ask the respondents and the author relevant and effective questions (i.e., open-ended), avoid dominating the discussion, encourage respondents to elaborate, ensure all respondents get to speak, encourage dialogue among respondents; don't allow the writer to speak while respondents are sharing, and ensure the writer asks questions after the responses are shared, and monitors the time. So if three papers are being discussed, the class would engage in three discussions, with three different facilitators moderating the discussion, and three different authors having their papers workshopped. The authors remain silent until the respondents have finished discussing the comments, and then s/he must ask at least one question of the respondents and ask them to clarify or elaborate on their comments. Students never serve as facilitators and workshoppees on the same day.

The instructor has to do a considerable amount of preparation prior to assigning the whole-class workshops. Near the beginning of the semester, students randomly draw dates for serving as workshoppee, and students sign up dates to serve as facilitator. Thus, the instructor must know exact dates of workshops throughout the semester at the beginning of the semester so students can sign up for them then. Students not serving as workshoppees or facilitators, serve as respondents. Prior to the first workshop, the instructor explains the process with students and solicits feedback. Barnard did this by distributing handouts detailing the process, asking groups of students to discuss and record questions and concerns, and using their comments to modify workshop protocol. Barnard also distributes samples of detailed and effective respondent feedback so students have models of what these look like. Moreover, the instructor and students collaboratively generate the evaluative criteria for each workshop ahead of time. For the first workshop, the instructor serves as facilitator and models how to and not to facilitate the

discussion. The instructor assigns students grades for effectively serving as respondents (by grading the written comments), serving as facilitator, and serving as workshoppee. Barnard notes that because of the limited number of dates within a semester and roles for students to play, the ideal class size is 20-25. Smaller class sizes do not provide as many rich and varied responses, and larger ones are logistically difficult to enact (lack of time for respondents, not enough dates for students to serve as facilitators and workshoppees).

Group Conferences

Conducting peer feedback sessions in the context of face-to-face, out-of-class conferences with the instructor (Shirley; Miller; Mezeske) offers the class a number of distinct advantages. Essentially, instructors conflate individual teacher-students conferences and peer feedback. This method requires groups of students to swap drafts at least 3-4 days before the group conference, each member produces written responses to all group members' drafts, noting what they did well and what they need to improve, and brings responses to the conference, and the students and teacher discuss the drafts in turn during the conference. As responders give feedback, the author seeks clarification and summarizes what ways s/he plans to revise the paper. The instructor allows all the student responders to share their comments first so that s/he can reinforce and lend credibility to them. This approach offers a number of advantages for students. First, the quality of students' responses is typically better because they focus on higher-order concerns and provide more specific examples. Second, the instructor models how to give effective feedback (both spoken and written). Third, when students hear their peers and the instructor raise the same questions, it lends more credibility to all responders' questions. Fourth, the instructor gets to know students' abilities to respond and can then better group them in subsequent feedback sessions. Finally, because the instructor is involved, students get a clearer

conception of his/her expectations for the assignment. However, as with every method, this one also has a few disadvantages. It takes more time and energy on the students' parts, and it requires more preparation and time. Plus, it may take longer for the instructor to read through students' elaborate responses rather than simply reading their responses on a review worksheet.

As with the preparatory strategies, the instructor should select the enacting strategy most appropriate for his/her population of students. The table below notes the advantages and disadvantages of each. The instructor might consider distributing the table below to students and discussing the pros/cons of each method and having students vote on the one(s) they prefer. The class could try one or a modified version of one out, reflect on it, and then select another method of needed.

Table 25: Summary of Print-Based Modes of Enacting Peer Feedback

Activity	Advantages	Disadvantages
Author-Focused	• Author controls/leads PF session • Author receives written and spoken feedback. • Author can clarify vague or unclear feedback	• Responders may be reluctant to give honest feedback.
Reviewer-Focused	• Author receives written and spoken feedback	• Reviewer writes comments. • Author may not be able to read reviewers' handwriting.
Anonymous Reviewers/ Authors	• Author receives candid feedback.	• Author may receive overly-candid feedback. • Author cannot dialogue with responders about their comments. • Author may not be able to read reviewers' handwriting.
Anonymous Author	• Author receives candid comments from a number of classmates.	• Author cannot dialogue with responders about their comments. • Author may not be able to read reviewers' handwriting.

Inside/ Outside of Class	• Author receives written and spoken feedback. • Reviewer has more time to thoroughly read and comment on draft. • Reviewer has more time to consider means of wording/ framing comments.	• Requires more out of class and in class time.
Whole-Class Workshops	• Author receives feedback from the entire class. • Students gain extensive experience responding to drafts. • Students gain experience running class and leading discussion. • Reviewers have more time to thoroughly read and comment on draft. • Reviewers have more time to consider means of wording/ • framing comments.	• Students do not receive feedback on every writing assignment, only the ones for which they serve as workshoppee. • Shy students or students insecure about their writing abilities may find having the entire class respond to their writing terrifying. • It requires considerable planning and class time.
Group Conferences	• Instructor models methods ways to effectively respond. • Reviewers have more time to thoroughly read and comment on draft. • Reviewers have more time to consider means of wording/ framing comments. • Responses more developed and specific. • Author receives feedback from group plus the instructor. • Instructor can reinforce peers' comments. • Students gain clearer conception of instructors' expectations. • This method can be combined with student conferences.	• It requires more planning.

Specific Considerations For L2 Writers in Enacting Print-Based Peer Feedback

This section provides strategies instructors should consider if s/he has L2 writers in the classroom. Liu and Hansen suggest having authors take a few minutes to give responders some background information about the topic, if responders lack the background knowledge to understand the piece. Additionally, because it takes L2 writers longer to read and process spoken English, they should be encouraged to write down words they have difficulty saying, generate lists of difficult vocabulary to discuss before response session, take notes in their native languages, and tape record sessions if necessary (Liu and Hansen 42). To help students focus on individual grammatical errors, the instructor may also have students keep a log of the common errors they make and how to correct them. The students use the log as a reference as they draft and edit their papers throughout the semester "in the future in order to monitor their own error patterns and become self-sufficient in editing" (Liu and Hansen 121). Notice, though, that some of these strategies may also be applicable with native English speakers. It would also help their response process if they were offered background information on the topic, recorded and discussed words they do not understand, focused only on common grammatical errors, and logged/monitor their individual grammatical errors.

The Instructor's Role During the Peer Feedback Process

For peer feedback to succeed and achieve its purported benefits, it's also important for instructors to realize his/her role during and after the peer feedback session because too much interference can undermine the entire process. During the sessions, it's essential not take over group discussions thereby undermine the whole purpose of collaborative learning. The instructor should walk around and ensure groups are on task and answer any questions but not hover or take over the groups' conversations. Ferris suggests that if groups finish quickly, the instructor

might interview group members about what they discussed—in other words, get them to elaborate (173). Second, s/he should wait to comment on the drafts or conference with students one-on-one until after responders have so that students are more invested at the point of the review session in hearing what their peers say. Otherwise, the students may focus on the teacher's comments only and ignore peers' comments altogether (Paton; Reid; Edgington; Mangelsdorf). Finally, in order value students' feedback, the instructor should reference their feedback in his/her own. This act acknowledges responders' comments and creates a dialogue among author, responders, and instructor.

Print-Based Reflection Activities

It is essential that instructors and students reflect on the benefits and drawbacks of the peer feedback process in order to determine if/how the process needs to be adapted. There are multiple strategies for having students reflect on the peer feedback process, and instructors should assign one or more of the following reflection activities. The section below describes various reflection techniques and the advantages and disadvantages of each.

Responses to Teacher-Generated Questions

A fairly economical way to have students reflect on the peer feedback process is to have students respond to some relevant questions either through a brief freewrite in class or through a low-stakes homework assignments. Elbow and Belanoff suggest having students respond to the set of questions below:

- What works best in your group?
- What is not working well?
- Do you wish members were more critical of your work? less critical?
- Which has been the most helpful to you, oral or written responses?
- Does your group work best with detailed instructions? with little guidance?
- Is there someone who always seems to take charge? or who doesn't participate much? How do you feel about this?

The instructor can locate common themes in terms of what is working well/isn't working, discuss them with the class, and adapt the feedback sessions accordingly. The responses may required that the instructor go back and do additional preparation activities. For example, if students claim their group members are failing to give specific or useful comments, the instructor may decide to conduct another fishbowl exericse illustrating how to do this, or s/he may conduct another mock peer feedback in which the class practices responding to a sample paper.

In-Class, Post PF Reflections

Several peer feedback publications also suggest having students reflect on the peer feedback session in class immediately after it occurs. Students can create a revision/editing plan of sorts: they briefly write down in class which peer suggestions they will use and which they will not (Reid; Edington; Mumma 427). These brief reflections are submitted with the peer review worksheets, drafts, and the final draft. Paton has her students do a more elaborate version of the in-class, post-feedback reflection. She requires students to keep a log of their post-feedback reflections and submit them with the final draft. The advantage of this strategy is that students are encouraged to reflect on each session specifically and consider exactly how they might/might not use the feedback. However, this approach requires more time and effort on the students' part, and it requires additional evaluation time on the instructor's part.

Liu and Hansen and Ferris also suggest that having second-language writers reflect on the peer feedback session immediately after it takes place encourages them to reread the comments, consider how/if they might use each suggestion, and think about what peer feedback protocol is/is not working well for them.

Student Conference Discussions

Instructors may also garner student feedback in person during students conferences, as Glenn and Goldwaite's handbook recommends. Asking students questions such as "How is your writing group going?" or "What kinds of classroom activities have been most or least helpful to you in your writing?" give students opportunities to identify group issues related to cultural/linguistic differences so the instructor can further train students in particular areas/modify group protocol in some way.

End-of-Sequence Written Reflections

The instructor may want to conflate peer feedback reflections with students' general end-of-sequence reflections. So, for example, the end-of-sequence reflective letter or memo to the instructor can also include questions about students' peer feedback experiences. Henry and Ledbetter had students in their study reflect on how peers' comments helped them revise/edit in terms of audience, authorship, or aim (9). The advantages of employing this reflection model is that students are encouraged to provide detailed, elaborated information about peer feedback's process and usefulness. However, if students wait to reflect on their peers' feedback once they've already revised and edited the final piece, they are not being asked to reflect on how or if they will use peers' suggestions in their revision/editing plans. The other disadvantage is that longer written reflections takes more time on the students' and instructor's parts. Plus, I have noticed that even though having students write a reflective letter or memo encourages them to write more elaborated reflection, they do not always do so. For some, it seems like additional busywork they have to do in addition to finishing the final, polished draft of the writing assignment. I often get shallow, short reflections because students tend to compose them at the ninth hour, so to speak, and they are more concerned with finishing the paper than writing the reflection.

Instructor Observations

A really useful piece of advice from Wendy Bishop's scheme discussed in Chapter 3 is that instructors observe how effectively peer groups are performing. She recommends instructors monitor groups by observing their interactions and "taking records of groups" through "personal journal, tape recording them, visiting with and participating in groups, and reviewing [group] logs" (316). It may not be logistically possible to employ all of these strategies (and ethically questionable to tape record students), but it is important that instructors observe student interactions during sessions, analyze their worksheet responses for depth and usefulness, and notice how or if students are incorporating peers' suggestions in order to determine how or if students need further training or to select different modes of orchestrating peer feedback. This method works best if instructors couple this method with student reflections, though, in order to appropriately adapt training and peer feedback protocol; otherwise, they may not be considering students' needs as well, and they are, in a sense, failing to collaborate with students regarding peer feedback adaptation. The table below provides a brief overview of each reflection strategy.

Table 26: Summary of Methods for Reflecting on Peer Feedback

Activity	Advantages	Disadvantages
Respond to PF-related questions	• Students reflect on the PF process and protocol for each assignment immediately after each session. • Instructor learns what is/is not working and can adjust before semester's end. • Method takes very little time on students' part and for and instructor to evaluate.	• Students tend to write less developed responses and are not required to focus on how they used/why they didn't use peers' feedback.
Peer Feedback Logs	• Students read and reflect on their peers' comments immediately after peer feedback session. • Students provide developed reflections on the PF process and protocol with each assignment. • Instructor learns what is/is not working.	• Requires more time/work of student. • Instructor spends more time evaluating (than other methods)
End-of-Assignment Reflections	• Instructor learns what is/is not working at the end of each assignment and can adjust accordingly.	• Students are not required to consider how they will/might use peers' suggestions in a revision/editing plan. • Requires more time/work of student. • Instructor spends more time evaluating (than other methods).
Instructors Observations	• Instructor observes what is/is not working well in peer feedback groups and can adapt accordingly.	• If not coupled with student feedback, instructors may not adjust peer feedback training, mode, grouping, ect. that attends to students' needs.

The reflections are critical to enacting a hermeneutic pedagogy because the instructor uses the feedback to determine, with students, ways to modify peer feedback protocol or offer additional training if needed. For example, if the student reflections and the instructor's observations reveal that students' responses are unhelpful, short, or lack substance, the instructor might enlist a writing tutor to come in during the next peer feedback session to model how to do this, engage students in another mock peer feedback session, or conflate peer feedback with student conferences. Or if students report classmates have made disrespectful or inappropriate

comments, the instructor might create a drama demonstrating appropriate ways to give and get peer feedback, distribute Liu and Hansen's list of inappropriate and appropriate comments, and/or discuss conversational styles and notions of politeness. Or if a group reports a particular member is dominating sessions/discussions, it may be wise to assign group roles or instate turn-taking protocol so that quieter members get the opportunity to speak. Students may also report that they are running out of time in class to complete the worksheet or they cannot read reviewers' comments, so the instructor might require students to distribute drafts in class, read and compose typed responses outside of class, and discuss their comments in class. Finally, if the instructor observes that students are failing to consider or incorporate their peers' comments, s/he may illustrate how effective writers use peer feedback and require students to draft post-workshop revision plans based on peers' comments.

To illustrate what a hermeneutic print-based peer feedback pedagogy looks like in practice, I'll explain how I adapted the aforementioned train, enact, reflect strategies to one of my courses in the spring of 2014. The course was a technical and professional writing class linked with a management course, and my teaching partner and I assigned several group projects throughout the semester, so I knew it was critical to prepare these students to collaboratively learn from each other by first training them how to engage in peer feedback. Although all the students enrolled in these courses were business majors or minors, their language backgrounds and workplace and academic writing experiences were quite diverse. For example, a student from India spoke five languages, and he had completed several corporate internships; another Spanish-speaking student had worked fifteen years as a graphic designer; and one of the native English speakers was a psychology major who was minoring in management, and she had a good bit of experience writing scientific reports. I knew this information about my students because I

assigned a preliminary low-stakes assignment, and I and my teaching partner engaged them in icebreakers that teased out this information. I assigned students to draft a memorandum to the class that gave students and me some information about their learning goals for the course, their previous experiences working in groups, and their perceptions of what constitutes a successful team. I thought it suited the class to assign the memo genre because it is a genre students were learning in the class. In the memos, students discussed the following:

- their majors,
- personal learning goals for taking the course,
- previous experiences working in teams,
- benefits and hindrances of working in teams,
- their perceptions of what characteristics make a successful team,
- the types of team members they enjoy working with,
- skills and knowledge they could contribute to a team project, and
- any concerns they have about working in teams.

Students then read each other's responses and emailed me a list of the classmates with whom they would like to be grouped for team projects. I and my teaching partner used the memo responses and their grouping suggestions to form groups. Even though the questions focused on completing group projects, the information was useful in discussing peer feedback, training students to give and use peer feedback, and grouping students for peer feedback because it gave me a sense of their perceptions of working in groups and their writing abilities.

I began preparing the students to complete peer feedback through in-class activities and low-stakes writing assignments, and this preparation began as soon as the first day of class. We began the first class period by engaging in icebreakers that asked students to introduce themselves by discussing two discourse communities with which they affiliate (professional and non-professional). This exercise gave each student the opportunity to give classmates and me a snapshot of some of the literacy practices with which they were familiar and also to establish a certain level of authority in serving as the resident expert in those literacy practices. The exercise

emphasized that each student brings unique knowledge and literacy practices to classroom, and that we can all learn from each other.

Next, as they were drafting their first high-stakes writing assignment, the professional portfolio, I assigned groups to discuss effective/ineffective rhetorical strategies located within sample professional portfolios. This activity aligned their understandings of the genre in which they were writing (the portfolio) and accustomed students to working together in groups, using metalanguage, and offering suggestions for making the sample piece stronger, which are all skills essential for effectively participating in peer feedback genres.

Finally, the class period before the first peer feedback session, we reviewed their memo responses in terms of what they like and dislike about working in teams and discussed how some of this information applied to peer feedback, and I then modeled peer feedback through a scripted peer feedback dramatization. A student volunteer and I, using one of the sample portfolios the class had already read, illustrated various examples of appropriate/inappropriate behavior (hedged comments versus rude or overly harsh ones) and effective and ineffective revision and editing comments within the dramatized scenario. After we completed the mock session, the class then discussed which dimensions of the drama they deemed effective and ineffective, what specific strategies the characters need to continue enacting in subsequent sessions, and which they need to modify or discontinue altogether. This activity allowed the class and I to collaboratively determine what constitutes appropriate behavior and effective rhetoric within peer feedback contexts.

For the series of peer feedback sessions, students engaged in print-based, author-focused reviews, meaning the author interviewed responders using questions located on printed worksheet questions and then recorded their responses in spaces provided on the worksheets. The

worksheets were comprised of questions I had created based on dimensions detailed in the writing prompt, and these questions encouraged students to note what the author had done well and needed to keep in the draft as well as what the author needed to revise or edit and how s/he might make the revisions/edits. The worksheets also provided a space for the author to generate his/her own questions. I grouped students based on the types of job or internships each student was targeting in their portfolios: students applying for similar positions were placed in the same groups.

After students submitted their final portfolios for a grade, I asked them to respond to a series of questions regarding their peer feedback experiences in terms of which aspects had been most beneficial, which aspects had been less helpful or even a hindrance, and how we might improve future feedback sessions. Most of the students reported the sessions had helped them revise/edit their drafts because they gathered useful ideas from reading peers' portfolios or peers had given them specific suggestions to revise their own portfolios; however, some students also reported the classmates they had been grouped with did not offer them very useful suggestions, that there were too many questions on the worksheet, that they wished they had had more time to complete the review session, that they preferred reader-focused (the reader completes the worksheet responses) rather than author-focused reviews, and that they were not sure how I would be grading the worksheets and what percentage peer feedback sessions counted toward their final grades. I also read through the peer feedback worksheets students had completed within the sessions and discovered some of the worksheets indeed contained short, unclear responses to the questions, which was either a result of the author failing to adequately record exactly what classmates had said or classmates had simply not offered very useful feedback.

After considering student feedback and my own observations of their review sessions, I decided to further train students how to give useful and specific comments by discussing examples of strong and weak examples, and the class discussed how the reviewer might have made the improved the weak examples. I also told students that I had read their peer feedback reflections and had decided to modify the sessions based on their suggestions: I included fewer questions on each worksheet, let individual groups decide whether they wanted to use author or reviewer-focused peer feedback, provided students more class time to complete the response sessions, and engaged students in virtual, face-to-face feedback sessions: I created a discussion thread in the Course Management System and posted the peer feedback worksheet, students posted their electronic drafts in Word format to the thread before class, and then in class, students downloaded the worksheets and peers' drafts, discussed and typed their responses, and uploaded the worksheets to the discussion thread. I also created a simple rubric that explained how I graded their peer feedback sessions and reminded them how many points each session is worth (I had discussed this on the first day of class but had not brought it up since.).

This classroom example illustrates one way an instructor might use the train, enact, and reflect strategies offered in this chapter, but is not the only way. I selected training methods based on the amount of class time I and students had to complete the activities, and I adapted peer feedback protocol based my students' reflections and the technology available to us in the classroom. Alternatively, after the first round of peer feedback, I could have distributed the "Enacting Peer Feedback" table above to students and have them determine whether they'd prefer to try a different approach. Moreover, students are often quite adept at suggesting more effective modifications to the aforementioned strategies for enacting peer feedback. Thus, the class might have even generated a novel method more suitable to the class.

The point is to see the plan, enact, reflect strategies elaborated in this chapter as possible narrative maps that the instructor and students might use to collaboratively construct their peer feedback adventure, their own gamebook. The narrative line may look similar across classes because as rhetorical genre theory argues, in order to be recognizable as a genre, the social/textual situation has features that make it identifiable as a genre, but genres are also adaptable to suit context. The characters (the students) participating within each iteration of the peer feedback gamebook will inevitably alter the course of events and the outcome, creating a peer feedback adventure that more populations of students are able to participate in.

Chapter 5: Choose Your Own Virtual Adventure: Constructing a Gamebook for Conducting Peer Feedback in Computer-Mediated Contexts

This chapter provides a hermeneutic peer feedback approach to using new media technology within face-to-face writing classes, hybrid courses, and completely online courses so that instructors and students might collaboratively construct a tailored virtual peer feedback gamebook. Even though medium or the contextual interpretive field is foregrounded in this chapter, I argue it is critical not to emphasize this element in a way that neglects the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic interpretive fields. The asynchronous or synchronous technology selected for peer feedback and the classroom setting (face-to-face, hybrid or entirely online) shapes how students interpret what is happening/supposed to happen within peer feedback activities, and it can limit or enable the rhetorical strategies students employ to participate in peer feedback as well as how or if they use feedback data to make revisions and edits to their papers. Moreover, students' educational and socioecomomic backgrounds contribute to their exposure to and knowledge of computer technology and therefore their abilities to successfully use the selected technology. Virtual peer feedback, as with print-based, should be situated within a larger plan, enact, and reflect system, and these activities need to be adapted to suit the classroom context and virtual mode. Furthermore, instructors need to collaborate with students throughout the plan, enact, and reflect stages in order to determine the most suitable mode for training and enactment modes within the classroom setting. This chapter's subsections provide a menu of plan, enact, and reflect strategies for instructors to choose from in order to construct a virtual peer feedback gamebook within face-to-face and entirely online courses.

Virtual Peer Feedback Planning Strategies

In order to determine which mode of virtual peer feedback is most suitable for a particular classroom of students, instructors need to first determine students' digital literacy

knowledge and consider the selected mode's technological flexibility. It is often inaccurately assumed that students born between the late 1980s and early 1990s, known as "Generation Media, Generation MySpace, or the Millenials," are fairly at ease using computer technology because a significant part of their daily lives involves using social media to connect, file sharing, and repurposing Internet material (Vie 12), but this is not always the case. Technological literacy refers to more than merely the understanding of how to use a technology; it entails "understanding the complex sets of cultural beliefs and values that influence our understandings of what it means to read, write, and communicate with computers" (Selfe 432). Teaching students to use technologies for enacting peer feedback also includes teaching them effective rhetorical strategies for reading and responding to one another using the selected peer feedback technology.

A related aspect of digital literacy has to do with "technological flexibility" (Breuch 111). The term includes instructors' and students' access to the technology inside and outside the classroom, the technology's compatibility among users, and the technology's distinct educational benefits and constraints (111). Although research shows that "even students in lower socioeconomic brackets or in minority homes have greater access to technology than just a decade prior" (Vie 12), it is not safe to assume students have or have had equal access to technology nor that they possess similar digital literacy skills. Students' access to technology impacts opportunities for students' to use it, but a historical lack of access also contributes to their knowledge background and abilities to effectively learn and use new technology and possibly troubleshoot problems/issues. Considering issues of access when teaching at institutions with historically underserved populations of students or in courses populated by non-traditional students is profoundly important because digital divides exist between students who have or have

had greater access to technology. Inaccessibility can also occur if a student only has access to slow Internet, owns an older computer, or uses software incompatible with downloading peer feedback materials (Breuch 99).

Having taught historically underserved populations of students at the University of New Mexico, I have found that students' inaccessibility and differing levels of technological literacy unfairly disadvantages them. As recently as 2010, I was teaching a hybrid English 102 course, and a Native American student who had lived on a reservation her entire life reported that she did not have access to the Internet at home. She had to travel to the nearest McDonalds to use its Wifi. After she had missed some of the online assignments, I asked her how things were going and if she needed help. She told me that she had trouble accessing the course and difficulty understanding how to navigate online materials, and these factors had inhibited her from completing parts of the course's online components.

Educational researchers note that ending the digital divide within populations of Native American populations of students has proved particularly difficult because of specific cultural, political, geographic, and economic barriers that have slowed "the adoption of technology both on reservations and in urban Native American communities"(Davis and Trebian 42). Davis and Trebian identify the following barriers: "distrust of new technologies, geographic remoteness, weak economic bases in tribal communities, lack of private investment on tribal lands, poor targeting of specific government policies for improving technology infrastructures in Native American communities, and lack of protection of Native American intellectual property rights over the Internet" (42).

Most college campuses have a number of computer labs and Wifi throughout campus available to students, but students' work/school schedules and how closely they live to campus

will impact their access to technology and the time and convenience of using the selected technology. For instance, commuter students who take online courses often work full time jobs and have families, and as a result, many often report they do the bulk of their school work on the weekends and thus do not have time stay on campus longer to complete homework during the week (Blair and Hoy 38).

Determining Students' Digital Literacies and Access to Technology

As with using print-based modes, the instructor needs to determine students' previous experiences with peer feedback and technological access outside the classroom by assigning introductory writing assignments that discuss these issues or by distributing questionnaires targeting these dimensions. Or the instructor might use a combination of letter/questionnaires. For example, the letter prompt might ask about students literacy practices, their writing processes, and familiarity and perceptions of peer review. Then, the instructor might distribute a brief survey with questions about their digital literacies. An adaptation of the digital literacy background questions noted in Glenn and Goldwaite's guide, like the one provided below, helps the instructor determine this:

Digital Literacy Questionnaire

1. How many years have you used and had access to computers and the Internet?

2. In which places do you most frequently have access to computers and high-speed Internet to complete school work? Home? On campus? Elsewhere?

3. If you responded "On campus" or "Elsewhere" above, approximately how many hours a week do you stay on campus or "elsewhere" to complete school work?

4. How frequently do you have access to computers/the Internet to do school work?
   __every day

   __only on certain days of the week

5. What specific kinds of reading and writing, speaking and listening, viewing/interacting and composition do you do now in computer environments at home? At school? Elsewhere?

6. Have you ever used computer technology to share drafts with peers and comment on each other's writing?

7. If you answered "yes" to the question above, what technology did you use for this purpose?

__email
__discussion board within a course management system (Blackboard, WebCT, etc.)
__through an Instant Messenger or whiteboard discussion
__through video conferencing
__Other:

8. What was your opinion of this mode (or these modes) of doing peer feedback? What were the benefits? What were the drawbacks?

Response data will help the instructor select a mode that will not unintentionally exclude or disadvantage students who report they have limited access to peer feedback. For face-to-face courses, instructors may want to consider using virtual modes in class and providing the technology for students (reserving computer labs or allowing students to check out university lap tops). For online courses, entities such as New Media Extended Learning at the University of New Mexico typically distribute an initial survey inquiring about how many online courses students have taken, the type of computer system and browser they use to access the course, and from what region (locally or otherwise) they are accessing the course. Online instructors could add the additional questions listed above to help determine which peer feedback technologies might be appropriate for the students enrolled in the course. Obviously, for online courses, students are required to have frequent access to a computer and the Internet to take the course, but some students may reveal that they complete course work during certain times of the day or days of the week or some may live in a different time zone, so coordinating synchronous modes of peer feedback among students may prove difficult.

Selecting an Appropriate Virtual Mode

When choosing to use virtual peer feedback modes, instructors need to look for ones that serve a particular pedagogical purpose rather than selecting a technology for the purpose of integrating more technology in the writing classroom. Kittle and Hicks accurately point out that doing this involves distinguishing "between a world that is simply full of more technology and a mindset that encourages participation and collaboration in many new ways" (qtd in Shea 100). As I discuss in chapter 2 and further discuss below, synchronous and asynchronous technologies provide unique rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual advantages and disadvantages, and these should be considered when selecting an appropriate mode within virtual spaces. The subsections below reviews the distinct advantages and disadvantages various asynchronous and synchronous modes offer students and instructors.

Asynchronous Modes

Asynchronous technologies offer several rhetorical advantages to using print-based modes: the medium encourages students to make more specific, directive, thoughtful, and elaborate comments because students have more time and space to do so; students have a written record of the exchange, which makes revisiting peers' comment for revision and editing purposes easier; and unclear handwriting is not an issue. Furthermore, the cultural/social benefits are that computer-mediate exchanges are less face-threatening, students traditionally marginalized/ignored in face-to-face discussions feel more free to speak in computer-mediated settings, student feel less reluctant to give honest feedback, and research shows students are more likely to balance negative with positive feedback through asynchronous media. The linguistic benefits include the fact that non-native English speakers are allowed more time to translate texts and generate comments, and these media offer them opportunities to practice their writing skills.

Conversely, asynchronous modes do not always afford the purported rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic benefits, though. Students may miss out on the opportunity to share effective rhetorical strategies if the author or reviewers fail to post or respond to a draft by the established deadlines, and in some cased, if feedback is not given orally, face-to-face, some students may simply complete the online activity for the grade but fail to read peers' suggestions. The spatial and temporal distances do not allow authors and reviewers to give and get immediate feedback or discuss or clarify comments, and if these comments are not explained, the author may unreflectively incorporate comments without truly understanding the reviewers' suggestions. Furthermore, virtual, asynchronous feedback can actually negatively impact students' social relationships. Asynchronous modes are often impersonal and socially distancing, and many students prefer the immediate interaction and conversation that occur within face-to-face settings. Virtual spaces do not erase perceived differences among students; thus, the virtual time/space differences may not mediate these differences. For example, if students are not trained to practice netiquette, comments can be overly critical/harsh, and because asynchronous media does not allow for verbal and nonverbal cues, communicative misunderstandings can occur. Moreover, L2 writers report they prefer both written as well as oral feedback, but if asynchronous virtual modes are not coupled with oral exchanges, asynchronous modes may not fully suit their needs. Plus, writing more elaborate comments using asynchronous modes requires more time and effort, which means it may take L2 writers longer to complete the activity, which then may diminish the quality of the feedback they are able to give before the deadline.

Email and Discussion Boards Within Course Management Systems

In addition to considering the aforementioned benefits and hindrances, individual technologies such as email, discussion boards, and online peer review systems construct the peer

feedback session in specific ways in terms of accessing the technology, creating peer feedback questions, establishing and maintaining due dates, exchanging drafts, commenting on drafts, teacher intervention, grouping students, students' abilities to easily incorporate peer suggestions, and the instructor's ability to grade the peer feedback session. The use of email and discussion boards within Course Management Systems to coordinate peer feedback allows students to use word processing software such as Microsoft Word to compose drafts, exchange drafts, download and respond to drafts using Word's comment and mark up tools, and send responses as email or message attachments. Students can use these tools to exchange and comment on drafts entirely outside of class, and within face-to-face or hybrid courses to use a multimodal approach: to comment outside of class and orally discuss drafts in class. Email is more accessible than the online peer review systems discussed below because departments, instructors, or students do not have to pay additional licensing fees to gain access to them, and students do not need additional log-ins and passwords. Below I explain how email and discussion boards enable and constrain the peer feedback process.

1. **Creating Peer Feedback Rubrics and Questions:** The instructor (or instructor in collaboration with students) creates the questions and emails students questions or post them within the discussion board forum. Students can also prioritize what they want reviewers to respond to by creating their own questions.

2. **Grouping Students:** The instructor either assigns student groups in class or through the Course Management system. With these methods, double blind reviewing is not possible.

3. **Establishing Due Dates:** The instructor communicates due dates via email (or virtual announcement in online courses) or in class, but with this method, there is no way to limit students from sending late drafts or responses; the Course Management system allows the instructor to establish dues and restrict access after posting due dates have passed.

4. **Reviewing Protocol:** Students use word processing software such as Microsoft Word to compose drafts, exchange drafts, download and respond to drafts using Word's comment and mark up tools, and send responses as email or message attachments.

5. **Instructor Intervention:** With email, it is very difficult for the instructor to monitor postings and respond to email discussion threads. Discussion boards, however, provide a designated space with a designated number of participants, which makes it easier for instructors to monitor students' exchanges and respond to students' drafts as well.

6. **Grading Peer Review and Final Drafts:** With email systems, students must either print hard copies of the reviews and final drafts for a grade or email attachments of these documents to instructor. Course Management systems allow instructors to grade and post grades for reviews, and students can submit final drafts through the Course Management system, which instructor can then grade within the system.

Although as mentioned above, these asynchronous virtual interfaces provide students distinct advantages to face-to-face, print-based modes, email and discussion boards also pose specific practical/logistical problems for students and instructors. Depending on the email interface, emails threads can make it difficult to archive and sort through information. The time lapses between when drafts are sent can create a disorganized archive of drafts and responses, which makes determining who has sent drafts or replied to drafts difficult to sort through. And email systems are not effective at enforcing deadlines because instructors do not have the option of limiting when drafts can be posted, and there is no integrated function for grading reviews. Discussion boards are typically more efficient at organizing and managing workflow, documents, due dates, and grading because coordinating exchanges within discussion boards provides a designated, confined area for this purpose (opposed to the numerous messages a user might receive in his/her email Inbox) thereby making it easier for students and the instructor to sort through posts and responses. Moreover, it is easier for instructors to monitor how students are framing comments and if flaming/potentially offensive comments are being made, and Course Management systems include a gradebook tool. However, neither of these systems generates reports for the instructors that synthesize data for the entire class or individual students in terms of how effectively students' comments align or which dimensions of the assignment may need more attention via class lecture/activities. And email and discussion board systems do

not distribute reports to students with digests of peers' comments, peers' evaluations of their comments, or a tool for creating a revision plan based on instructor and peer feedback, nor do they allow students to rate peers' feedback in terms of perceived usefulness.

Online Peer Review Systems

A third asynchronous system for coordinating and facilitating peer feedback is online peer review systems. These systems provide specialized password-protected interfaces for instructors to organize and implement virtual peer feedback and for students to complete peer feedback. For some of the online systems, the instructor/institution must purchase a licensing fee to use the service, and once they do, they can then create courses, and enroll students who then must log into the system to participate. Michigan State University and the University of South Florida have built their own unique online peer review products that make peer feedback workflow, instructor intervention, and grading more efficient than email or group discussion boards. The section below explains how these systems work and their unique benefits.

Eli Review is an online peer review system developed by a team of new media rhetoric and composition scholars at Michigan State University ("Origins of Eli Review"). Its tools enable students to post and review drafts, but also use instructor and peer feedback to build revision plans and resubmit revised drafts. This system requires users to pay an access fee, and the organization does not have the option of instructors or administrators purchasing class, departmental, or institutional packages. Instead, they sell access on an individual basis, $25 for 6 months or $40 per year, so students and instructors must purchase individual accounts to use the service ("Get Eli Review in Your Classrooms"). This is essentially how the system works:

1. **Creating Peer Feedback Rubrics and Questions:** After purchasing access to the system, instructors can create writing assignments and peer review rubrics. The system offers five general types of reviewing tasks/questions. Instructors can use one or a mixture of these review question types:

- o **Trait Identification**: Instructors can create a checklist of features or traits that should appear in the draft, and reviewers check boxes noting whether the draft under review exhibits these traits.

- o **Rating Scale**: This question type asks students to rate features of the draft in terms of a 0-5 rubric. The system generates reports noting trends for each of these features, reports for individual writers in terms of peer ratings, and it identifies "the most highly-rated writers."

- o **Likert Scale**: These question types include declarative sentences to which students rank how strongly they agree with the declaration. Instructors must create the questions and the scale items. The system reports response trends for review data and for individual writer's performances.

- o **Comments**: These are open-ended questions to which reviewers must supply a written response in a provided textbox, similar to the notes one might write in the margins or at the end of a paper. The comments can be inserted in specific places in the draft.

- o **Final Thoughts:** These question types ask students to make summative statements about the draft, which allows reviewers to focus on general impressions or global issues.

2. **Grouping Students:** The instructor has the option of creating anonymous groups or identifying users' names.

3. **Establishing Due Date:** Once the instructor creates the assignment, review questions, groups, and due dates, students then draft their responses in Eli or upload files to the system.

4. **Reviewing Protocol:** If students use the word processing feature in Eli, review questions are displayed in a frame adjacent to the draft; if students upload documents, the questions appear in a separate window.

5. Authors are able to rate peers' written comments in terms of usefulness, and instructors are able to endorse review comments provided to authors by clicking a "thumbs up" button.

6. **Review Reports-Students:** After students have completed the reviews and received feedback from peers, the system provides quantitative data illustrating how peers rated them in terms of the rating or likert scale questions, and it provides a digest of peers' written responses. Users also receive a digest of the comments they made to peers' drafts, data on how authors ranked their comments, and notifications if the instructor endorsed comments.

7. **Creating a Revision Plan:** Then, students use feedback data from peers and the instructor to build a revision plan. This tool provides users comment boxes for generating notes, paragraphs, or bulleted lists in order to articulate their revision plan. They can also drag and drop review comments into the revision plan application, and the writer is able to modify the comments or add notes to it to explain how they plan to address the comment in their revisions.

8. **Instructor Intervention:** Students can submit the plans to the instructor, and the instructor can add comments to students' review plans. The student can also print a hard copy of the plan.

9. **Resubmitting the Draft for Further Review:** Finally, the system offers the Revise and Resubmit function where students can upload revised/edited drafts for subsequent reviews or submission.

10. **Review Reports-Instructor:** The instructor receives a report consolidating peer review activity and feedback for each student, statistical reports noting relevant data for the entire class in terms of review statistics (total number of comments made, average number of comments per reviewer, percentage of comments rated by writers, and average feedback writing of all comments), highest rated reviewers, breakdown of reviewer ratings, and highest-rated comments, and revision plans ("Eli Review User Support").

Clearly this peer review system offers distinct rhetorical and practical benefits for coordinating asynchronous peer review. For instance, the variety of question types enables the instructor to better tailor the review questions to different phases of the writing process, and the commenting tools allow students to make intertextual as well as summative comments, which allows for more specific and elaborate comments. Plus, students are able to rate reviewers' comments, and reviewers are able to determine which of their comments are more or less useful in creating their revision plans. The revision plan tool encourages students to actually read and consider peers' comments and reflect on how they might incorporate them into the revisions and edits. The system also makes it easy for subsequent reviews and for instructors to see progress across drafts with the Resubmit function. Finally, the data reports allow instructors to better coach the entire class or individual students on certain relevant dimensions of the writing task. The instructor is able to more specially intervene in individual students' writing processes by

endorsing peers' comments and adding comments to students' revision plans, and because initial and subsequent drafts, revision plans, and reviews are compiled within the system, it makes grading final drafts and peer review activities much easier than email or group discussion boards. But these benefits come at a price. Students and instructors must pay a fee to access the technology, and students will be less familiar with this technology than email or a Course Management system.

This system is rather new, though, so there is no published empirical research on how this mode of conducting peer feedback (as opposed to other virtual modes or face-to-face, print-based models) impacts the quality of students' reviews, how or if they are more likely to read and use peer feedback, if the quality of their writing improves, or what students' think about the interface's usability and effectiveness. The evidence for its benefits is largely anecdotal in the form of testimonials on Eli Review's website. However, the organization also invites instructors or administrators to conduct research in their institutions using Eli Review, and it offers assistance in research design and gaining Institutional Review Board approval.

MyReviewers, another online peer review system, was created at the University of South Florida Tampa in 2009 by Composition scholar Professor Joe Moxley to help writing program administrators and instructors "make evidence-based curriculum changes, mentor graduate students, and significantly improve the peer-review process" (U of South Florida, "History"). Its website reports that between 2009-2014, USF students have engaged in 84,605 peer reviews ("History"). Since 2013, as many as six different international and domestic institutions of higher education have piloted the system. Additionally, the Conference on College Composition and Communication gave USF's FYC Program the Certificate of Excellence and noted its MyReviewers system as an "innovate use learning analytics to make evidence-based curriculum

changes" ("History"). The MyReviewers website does not provide pricing for the service;

instead, potential clients must contact the site administrators about piloting the interface in their

courses. Its tools are very similar to Eli Review's with the exception of the Community

Comments function.

1. **Creating Peer Feedback Rubrics and Questions:** The system provides template quantitative rubrics, which allow users to rate dimensions on a 0-5 scale, and a discussion rubric, which provides a dialogue box for users to comment on their numerical ratings. However, the instructor can also create customized questions and rubrics.

2. **Establishing Due Dates:** The instructor establishes due dates for students to post drafts and respond to peers.

3. **Assigning Groups:** The instructor can opt for the system to randomly assign students or choose to group students.

4. **Reviewing Protocol:** Students can create drafts using the word processing tool or upload text documents or PDFs.

5. **Commenting Tools:** Once students post a draft, they can click on and review peers' drafts. The system provides tools for making intertextual comments, highlighting and circling areas, or inserting "community comments."

   o **Community Comments** is an archive of commonly used comments students can quickly select and use, or they can create their own and add to the community comment archive. Additionally, the Community Comments functions provides hyperlinks to pages, videos, or activities that help the writer revise or edit issues of focus, format, evidence, organization, style, or grammar. Reviewers are able to insert these links as footnotes in applicable areas.

6. **Instructor Intervention:** The instructor also has the option of commenting on the student drafts.

7. **Review Reports-Students:** Writers receive peer and teacher comments and markups, ratings, and suggested resources, and the system lists revision and edit suggestions in terms of most suggested/commented on to least suggested/commented on dimensions. Students also receive "learning analytics" reports that graphically organize feedback data in terms of the peer feedback criteria; thus, students are able to see which dimensions they need to focus on in their revisions.

8. **Revision Plans:** Next, the writer is able to use feedback data to create a revision plan. This tab requires students to summarize what reviewers stated about their drafts, write

analyses of these comments, and state what their overall revision plan are. Students then submit the plan through the system.

9. **Grading Peer Review:** Instructors can also grade the plan and give students feedback on their revision plans.

10. **Review Reports: Instructors:** Instructors can access learning analytics for each student as well as the course, easily grade reviews, better assess students learning/writing, and more specifically intervene in the writing process before the paper is due.

This system offers pretty much the same benefits as Eli Review, with the exception of the Community Comments feature. The Community Comments function allows user to better learn meta-language for commenting on one another's drafts, and this feature allows the instructor and students to collaboratively generate comments. The resources links helps students better under why and how they need to revise and edit specific parts of their drafts. One particularly problematic feature of this system is associated with access. It is unclear what the fee is for students and instructors to access the technology, and, as with Eli Review, students will be less familiar with this technology than their email systems or University-provided Course Management systems.

Researchers at the University of South Florida have collected significant data comparing the system's use in workshop, face-to-face, and online settings, but they are still in the process of analyzing this information and publishing research on the system. Although the *MyReviewers* website lists works in progress, to date, there is very little current published empirical research regarding *MyReviewers'* impact on the quality of peer review and improved writing. However, the website states that instructors and administrators at USF have "noticed dramatic improvements in the quality of students' reviews." Interviews with students and instructors have thus far revealed the following: 1) Students find the Community Comments help them give "more useful feedback," 2) Teachers reported that digests of in-text and endnote comments make

grading peer reviews easier, and 3) Students like having the ability to rate reviewers' comments ("Peer Review").

Synchronous Modes

As I mention in Chapter 2, the research surrounding synchronous modes such as Instant Messaging and web conferencing interfaces can provide students the best of both face-to-face and virtual modes because students are able to give and get immediate oral and written feedback, and students typically find the interface more interesting/engaging than either face-to-face or asynchronous modes, and as the literature review in Chapter 2 shows, students are more likely to incorporate revision/editing suggestions when using web conferencing tools. In fact, one study showed that "students using web conferencing technology (to collaboratively write) were just as satisfied with their session as those meeting face-to-face" (Melkun 137). Depending on the web conferencing product selected, students can see and hear each other as well as share and read files, produce audiovisual recordings of the sessions, and simultaneously make comments on the same document. Plus, as students are discussing drafts, they can look up and virtually share resources, and since these sessions are typically not confined by classroom time, students have more time to comment and thereby offer more developed responses. For example, Any Meeting web conferencing software allows up to six users to video conference either via telephone or computer; users can share and view documents simultaneously, produce audiovisual recordings of the entire meeting, and create meetings minutes within the shared space as the meeting takes place, which the system can email to all meeting participants. This company offers free versions of the software (ads are included with this version). Blackboard Learn also enables students and the instructor to video conference using its Collaborate tool. This platform, like Any Meeting, includes a whiteboard function that all participants can see and interact with; participants can

teleconference, web conference, or chat; and these meetings can be recorded and saved for later use. Cheryl Melkun's article "Working with Groups Online: Collaborating with Web Conferencing" lists some useful tips for selecting an appropriate web conferencing for peer review.

- Locate educational and industry research that compares different platforms to see which ones might best your students' needs and fulfill pedagogical goals.

- Develop a list of common features web conferencing platforms offer and determine which are a priority for fulfilling pedagogical goals and students' needs:

    o Voice chat
    o Video chat
    o Text chat
    o Multimodal discussions
    o Guided web browsing
    o Interactive whiteboard
    o Polling and quizzing
    o Multimedia presentation
    o Application sharing
    o Emoticons
    o Breakout rooms
    o Record and playback
    o Password secured
    o Cross-platform functionality (compatible with Macs and PCs).

But synchronous modes are not necessarily a peer feedback panacea. The turn-taking within synchronous modes can be confusing/chaotic and therefore negatively impact social relationships, and if more than two students are participating in the video conference, if a predetermined protocol for exchanges is not determined, exchanges can be chaotic and some students may be left out of the conversation. And some students may "resent the intrusion of video into their home" (Melkun 138). Additionally, synchronous modes require more time and effort coordinate peer feedback, which can influence students to make less reflective/meaningful comments, and synchronous modes can be difficult to coordinate with students living in different time zones or who have conflicting schedules. Plus, issues of access can particularly become an

issue with web conferencing. Students need required hardware (headset, web cam), high speed Internet, and the abilities to know how to use the interface's tools and troubleshoot potential problems. And if Wifi is running slowly, there can be major lags among users. Moreover, grading peer feedback within synchronous mode can pose logistical issues. Students can send the instructor a recording of the exchanges and submit drafts and peer feedback (either in digital or hard copy, depending on the classroom setting), but sorting through and grading all of these files makes it difficult to intervene during the writing process and grade peer review sessions.

Both asynchronous and synchronous modes offer students and instructors specific affordances and constraints in terms of enacting peer feedback, using peer feedback to either make revisions/edits or intervene in the process, and grading peer feedback sessions. Plus, some modes are more accessible to students and the instructor than others. Email and asynchronous or synchronous modes embedded in Course Management systems are more accessible to students than online peer review systems or independent web conferencing platforms because these modes do not require an additional log-on and password, students are typically more familiar with how to use and access email and Course Management systems, and instructors and students do not have to pay an additional fee to gain access to them. However, some of the less accessible modes such as online peer review systems and web conferencing tools provide benefits that can make the peer feedback more useful. The online systems offer a greater variety of commenting tools and functions, generate useful aggregate reports, enable students to create useful revision plans, facilitate instructor intervention throughout the writing process, and make grading reviews much simpler. And web conferencing platforms in many ways simulates face-to-face feedback sessions because students are able to immediately give and get oral and written feedback from peers. There isn't an ideal virtual mode for enacting peer feedback; the most suitable mode will

be dependent on the classroom setting (face-to-face, hybrid, entirely online), students' digital literacy practices, technological flexibility, and the instructor's pedagogical goals. As I further discuss below, in many cases, it is effective to switch modes depending on the purpose of the peer feedback sessions. But it is important to take student feedback into consideration when selecting an appropriate mode. After instructors have reviewed the initial digital literacy questionnaires, s/he should also discuss the benefits and hindrances of each mode and discover (either through class discussion or through surveys) which students would prefer using as well. For new instructors or instructors who are teaching a number of writing courses, it may be more efficient to determine student access, select the appropriate mode, and then garner student feedback after students and the instructor have had the opportunity to use the selected technology. Use of computer-mediated modes to complete peer feedback in face-to-face classrooms may be used throughout the entire semester or as a way of adapting to students' needs. For example, after completing peer feedback in print-based modes, students may report that they needed more time to complete the session, could not read peers' handwriting, or that they felt timid about critiquing peers' papers face-to-face. In these cases, the instructor might choose to have students respond to one another using asynchronous or synchronous computer technology. The key take-away point is that there are a number of factors to consider when selecting a virtual peer feedback mode, and instructors should do this in a way that includes the mode most suitable for each classroom of students and their pedagogical goals. Lui and Sadler conclude in their study exploring the effectiveness of face-to-face versus computer-mediated modes within L2 composition classrooms that students benefited from a mixture of face-to-face and computer-mediated modes; thus, "L2 writing instructors must be familiar with multiple types of peer review in both traditional and technology-enhanced modes" (222).

Adapting Train, Enact, and Reflect System to Mode

Once the appropriate mode is selected for a particular peer feedback session, training, enacting, and reflecting activities should be adapted to suit the virtual mode and classroom setting (face-to-face or online). Moreover, these train, enact, reflect system should consider the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields of interpretation.

Training Students to Participate in Virtual Peer Feedback

As with face-to-face, print-based modes, instructors should try to cultivate a classroom community so that students get to know each other and position themselves as a community of writers within the peer feedback sessions rather than the writing teacher. Breuch argues that building "interpersonal relationships" in virtual asynchronous spaces can take longer, though, because of the temporal and spatial differences (44).

Some of the strategies mentioned in Chapter 4 for building community to prepare students to give face-to-face, print-bases feedback can be useful for this purpose and adapted to suit online writing courses. In face-to-face courses, instructors can use in-class icebreaker activities, assign low-stakes group activities, out-of-class outings, and discuss students' previous experiences with peer feedback.

I've modified some of these activities in my own courses to better suit the online writing environment. For example, virtual icebreakers can consist of having students participate in a first-week "Introduce Yourself" discussion forum and create and share online bios. I also have discussion groups discuss and analyze sample papers and respond to prompts that ask about their previous experiences with online peer review.

Beyond the initial "Introduce Yourself" activity, I divide students into smaller groups so that discussions are easier to manage (for students and for me) and consolidate general group

responses regarding sample papers or peer feedback experiences through video lectures or short announcements. Instructors can also set up a virtual lecture through a whiteboard tool to which students can join and comment on synchronously through IM chats, and even if some students may not be able to attend the virtual class session at the designated time, the instructor can record the lecture and discussion and save the file for these students to view when convenient. This method could certainly exclude some student voices and opinions if they cannot attend or they have difficulty accessing or using the associated technological tools, so using a mixture of asynchronous discussions and synchronous classroom sessions is a more inclusive method for building classroom community.

Table 27: Community-Building Strategies Prior to Enacting Virtual Peer Feedback

Face-to-Face Courses	Online Writing Courses
In-Class Icebreakers	Virtual Icebreakers
Low or No-Stakes In-Class Group Activities	Graded Group Activities
Out-of-Class Outings	Virtual Synchronous Lecture and Discussion
Discussing Previous Peer Feedback Experiences	Discussing Previous Peer Feedback Experiences within a group or class forum

Appropriate training methods will also depend on whether the class meets face-to-face or entirely online and which peer feedback technology has been selected. Some of the training methods outlined in Chapter 4 can be adapted to virtual peer feedback. Training should not only include how to use the selected technology but also how to give specific and useful comments, how to engage in polite virtual exchanges, and how to evaluate and use peer feedback. As I have argued throughout this dissertation, students need the opportunity to learn and adapt to both written and spoken peer feedback genres since students do not enter the classroom space with aligned expectations or similar strategies for engaging in peer feedback. Thus, in order to offer peers feedback and evaluate the usefulness of peers' suggestions, students need to learn genre

moves for writing the assignment under review and metalanguage for discussing parts of the paper.

Instructing students in appropriate netiquette and polite ways of participating in online environments is also critical for successful peer feedback to occur. Ware and Kramsch's study of "learners of German in the U.S. and learners of English in Germany" using asynchronous online telecollaboration tools found that because students "were not equipped with appropriate ways of communication," miscommunication and misunderstandings occurred (qtd in Bradley 82). Bradley's research on review sessions between U.S. and Swedish students found that after learning some intercultural communicative strategies, students understood the importance of tailoring their comments for readers in terms of cultural expectations and cross-cultural rhetorical moves (Bradley 89). But the training should avoid providing reductive rules of thumb for making culturally sensitive and appropriate remarks; instead, students should be included on the conversation about what constitutes appropriate and inappropriate exchanges in online environments so that the rules and expectations represent their lived experiences rather than decontextualized, reductive tips for making polite comments to peers. The following section explains how to help students understand the purpose of peer review and ways to do it effectively prior to reviewing one another's drafts.

Discussing Peer Feedback-Related Media

I typically begin the peer feedback training session discussing why students are being assigned to do it. In both face-to-face and online courses instructors can assign students to read or view media that explains the purpose of peer feedback (examples of professional peer review, short theoretical articles, case studies, or brief videos). The Writing Commons website offers a number of excellent videos depicting instructors explaining the purpose of peer feedback and

students discussing their experiences using particular modes. In my Fall 2014 online courses, I posted a video embedded in the Writing Commons website entitled "Why Peer Review?" MIT's Tech TV website also published "No One Writes Alone: Peer Review in the Classroom, A Guide For Students," which is also really useful for explaining why giving and receiving peer feedback is useful.

Modeling Virtual Peer Feedback

To help them understand and learn the genre moves for commenting in appropriate ways, instructors can also adapt the mock peer feedback session so that students learn how to use the selected peer feedback technology and how to offer helpful and polite feedback within this mode. In a face-to-face course, it's fairly easy to adapt the mock peer feedback session if conducted in a computer lab. For example, if instructors and students decide to use video conferencing software, the instructor can set up a virtual classroom session in the lab, and students and the instructor can comment on a sample virtual paper. A similar strategy could be adapted to email exchanges as well as online peer review systems. In other words, the mock peer feedback session takes place using the selected interface and the genre of writing and the review questions students will use within their peer feedback sessions. This way, students can learn the tools in a supported environment as well as learn and share strategies for effectively giving peer feedback.

Since such mock peer feedback sessions may not be possible to coordinate within online courses, though, because of students' conflicting schedules. For my Fall 2104 online courses, I used a multimodal approach to modeling peer feedback. First, I had students discuss a sample draft in small group discussion forums, and (after students' had finished commenting) I jumped in to each discussion and added my evaluations of the drafts and responded to students' posts. I

then created audiovisual presentations that discussed the sample papers in ways that consolidated students' and my comments, which validated students' comments. Furthermore, I created a video illustrating how to provide specific and useful comments using a sample draft and the peer review questions.

Discussing Netiquette

Dimensions of the peer feedback modeling sessions should also emphasize appropriate virtual exchanges. Matthew Strawbridge's *Netiquette: Internet Etiquette in the Age of the Blog* gives helpful tips on appropriately conversing in online environments. The instructor might assign students to read portions of it and discuss the book's suggestions in class or through virtual discussion boards, but it is also important to discuss students' notions of appropriate commenting. A method for doing this is to distribute sample asynchronous exchanges and have students rate them in terms of perceived appropriateness. A list like the one Liu and Hansen provide in their guide can be really useful for this purpose (See Table 24 in Chapter 4). It is interesting to find out students' various readings of the same comment. Some may read the tone of the same exchange very differently. The class can also discuss hedging strategies (coupling positive and negative comments), the importance of summarizing unclear parts before criticizing it (i.e., In this part, you say . . ., but), avoiding using all capital letters (which denotes yelling), and other strategies students suggest. These types of discussions can be coordinated in online courses using the asynchronous discussion boards.

Finally, instructors can also show models of how to incorporate peer feedback by analyzing and discussing changes across sample drafts. For entirely online courses using discussion boards, the instructor could create an audiovisual presentation in which she comments on the draft or organize a whole-class web conference where the instructor and students are able

to discuss revisions across drafts. This method is greatly facilitated within the online peer review systems because students build revision plans based on peers' comments, which does not mean they are going to know exactly how to use comments, but analyzing samples with specific and vague comments and showing how or why the suggestion was not incorporated into the final draft emphasizes the importance of providing specific feedback.

Table 28: Summary of Virtual Peer Feedback Training Methods

Activity	Advantages	Disadvantages
Discussing PF-Related Media: readings, videos, articles.	**Cultural/Rhetorical** • Introduces students to the purpose of this practice and gives them rhetorical terms for conceptualizing it. • Exposes students to research on the topic: theory, pros, cons, etc. • Illustrates that academics and professionals have their work reviewed by one another.	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Does not model verbal/nonverbal aspects of the PF session. • **May not** model how to in/effectively complete it: use of comments across drafts. Depends on selected media. • **Practical**: Requires more outside reading than the other methods.
Mock Peer Feedback Session Using Selected Mode	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Models how to in/effectively complete it: helpful comments, politeness, communication style. • Students learn teacher's and classmates' notions of effective & ineffective writing.	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Does not model how to incorporate comments into writing.
Discussing politeness and conversational styles within virtual spaces	**Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic** • Helps students think about culturally-informed communicative differences, especially when watching dramatizations.	**Cultural/Rhetorical** • Does not model how to incorporate comments into writing. • Does not model how to in/effectively complete it.

Illustrate Revisions Across Drafts	Cultural/Rhetorical • Models how to effectively give and receive comments. • Models how to incorporate suggestions.	Cultural/Rhetorical/Linguistic • Does not model verbal/nonverbal aspects of the PF session.

Grouping Students

Chapter 4 discusses the advantages and disadvantages of using student-selected groups, teacher-selected groups, or stable vs fluid group, and number of students per group for face-to-face, print-based exchanges, but instructors must also consider other factors in grouping students for virtual peer review. For example, for synchronous or asynchronous modes used within courses that also meet face-to-face, instructors might also group students based on their work/life schedules so that students are grouped with peers who are available to review at similar times of the day. Melkun also recommends including at least one moderately tech savvy student in each group to help others troubleshoot technological problems (137). The digital literacy surveys distributed at the beginning of the course can help instructors make this determination. Moreover, it is important to limit the number of students per group (no more than 4) since coordinating schedules can be very difficult and the logistics of participating in web conferencing can be even more complicated with more participants. It is also important to remember that L2 writers prefer smaller groups, so groups larger than two may not meet their needs, especially if drafts are rather lengthy.

For entirely online courses, new media scholars recommend keeping students in stable groups throughout the semester so they have time to get to know each other (Breuch 45; Olson-Horswill 192). Breuch even recommends allowing each group to determine its peer feedback protocol and method: whether to use synchronous or asynchronous modes, when meetings

should take place or drafts should be posted and replied to, and which available software to use. This method certainly gives students more agency and freedom in determining peer feedback protocol, but if each group selects a different technology, intervening and grading peer reviews can prove difficult. Plus, the drop rate for online courses is rather high, so the instructor may have to end up shifting stable groups. Online peer review systems allow for double blind review, and if this option is selected, to conserve the confidential nature of the review, some of these other grouping factors may not come into play.

Virtual Peer Feedback Enactment Strategies

Once students have been trained to participate in peer feedback and to use the selected technology, as with print-based reviews/face-to-face reviews, prior to enacting peer feedback, the instructor needs to tailor the virtual peer feedback session to help students focus on dimensions relevant to where they are in the writing process. If students are just beginning the paper, the questions should address HOCs (topic, focus, key intended readers, use of evidence), or if they are nearing the end of the writing sequence, the questions should focus on LOCs (organization, editing, and proofreading). However, students and the instructor can use various strategies to collaboratively create the questions based on the focus of the review. Instructors can generate the questions and leave space for the author to include his/her own, or the instructor might present the questions to students and revise them based on student feedback, or the entire question-generating process could be completely collaborative where the instructor and students construct all the questions together. The level of collaboration that occurs depends on students' familiarity with generating questions relevant to the writing assignment's prompt and rhetorical situation. For example, for the very first review in a Freshman Composition course, students may not yet be aware of what kinds of questions they need to be asking about the draft under review, but that

does not mean they aren't able to generate questions; in this case, it would be best for the instructor to generate questions and leave space for the author to insert a few of his/her own. Furthermore, L2 scholars urge writing instructors working with international students who have never been assigned peer feedback to be very directive with peer feedback questions and protocol because the process may be completely foreign to these students; thus, instructors may want to use the same strategy.

The mode of peer feedback and the classroom setting in which it is conducted also impacts the ways students and instructors might collaborate on the peer feedback criteria. The aforementioned strategies can all be easily achieved in a face-to-face courses, whether the class is using email to exchange drafts, online peer review systems, discussion boards, or web conferencing because the class can discuss the peer feedback questions face-to-face prior to the instructor creating the questions in the online peer review system or to students exchanging drafts. However, the process is hindered somewhat within entirely online courses because of the spatial and temporal distances among students and the instructor, but some student-student and student-instructor collaboration can occur. For example, students can collaboratively generate their questions through a discussion forum, or the instructor can provide the questions but also encourage the author to post additional questions s/he would like readers to respond to.

Research comparing different synchronous and asynchronous modes of peer feedback shows that certain modes are more suited for addressing HOCs while others are more suited for addressing LOCs. For example, two studies comparing modes of feedback discovered that synchronous modes such as IM chat were better suited for discussions of HOCs, for brainstorming topics, or for determining a reader's overall impression of the piece since students tend to make more general comments using this medium (Honeycutt 51; DiGiovannie and

Nagaswani 268; Anderson 191). However, for sessions where the reviewer needs to make specific intertextual comments on LOCs, using technologies with mark-up tools such as those in available in MS Word, Eli Review, or MyReviewers is more effective (Liu and Sadler; Honeycutt). Thus, it may be more useful for students to select different modes of feedback throughout the writing process. But in frequently switching modes, the instructor must consider students' level of facility with peer review in general and with the selected technologies, as well as their access to technology in choosing to frequently switch modes. If students are fairly unfamiliar with peer review in the first place, it may complicate matters if the mode is being continually switched.

Virtual Peer Feedback Reflection Strategies

Virtual modes can be particularly useful in having students reflect on how well the peer feedback sessions are going, how they plan to use peers' suggestions, and how well the selected technologies are enabling them to give and received feedback. Asking students to reflect on these dimensions not only helps them consider peers' comments but it also gives the instructor insights for how peer feedback protocol needs to be adapted or if further training is necessary. There are three different ways students might create and submit their reflections. In Chapter 4, I list three specific methods of assigning reflection: through revision plans completed post feedback session, through written reflections submitted with the final draft, and through post-submission questionnaires. These can each be adapted for virtual technologies, but the classroom context and asynchronous or synchronous mode selected can make these reflections activities more or less efficient for students to complete and for instructors to grade. The questionnaires can be adapted rather easily within computer-mediated sections because the instructor can create online survey tools through the Course Management System, which generates reports in Excel, so the

instructor gets consolidated data for each question and can then rather quickly assess student feedback.

But building revision plans using email and discussion boards requires students to review multiple files containing peers' comments to create the plan. And for synchronous modes, students may need to review audiovisual files of the web conference or save IM transcripts and sort through the exchanges for peers' comments. These modes also make it more difficult for instructors to sort through students' drafts to compare changes across drafts and compare drafts to revision plans when grading reviews and determining how peer feedback mode and protocol may need to be adapted. The online peer review systems are the most efficient at helping students reflect on peers' comments and generate plans because they send students aggregated reports of peer and instructor feedback and have designated tools for creating revision plans. Instructors also receive reports for individual students in terms of their review activities and peers' comments of their drafts as well as overall review trends for the entire class. Plus, instructors can comment on students' revision plans as they are making revisions/edits to their papers. Access to this aggregate data within a central system enables instructors to better determine how they may need to adapt peer feedback protocol or further train students in certain dimensions. Using online peer feedback systems also makes it easier for students to draft post-submission reflections because they can use the aggregate reports and their revision plans to reflect on which suggestions they implemented.

It is important to couple mid-sequence reflection with post-submission reflection so that students are made to consider peer feedback in their revision plans, but it is also important to ask students questions about how the technology is supporting and enhancing (or not) the peer feedback process or if students are experiencing interpersonal conflicts with group members for

some reason or another. So, coupling revision plans with questionnaires encourages students to reflect on their writing process as well as interpersonal dimensions and technological affordances and constraints.

Strategies for Adapting Virtual Peer Review

Using student reflections data coupled with the instructor's observations of students' performances using the selected mode and her evaluations of drafts and final submissions is necessary for determining how to adapt peer feedback protocol for the following session or if further training is necessary. The following scenarios illustrate how the instructor might use reflection data (both the students' and her own) to adapt peer feedback protocol:

Table 29: Methods for Adapting Virtual Peer Feedback

Scenario 1: A number of students are not implementing useful peer suggestions in their final drafts.	• The instructor might create a mini-lesson on how to interpret peer comments and incorporate changes across drafts.
Scenario 2: Students report their peers' comments were vague or unhelpful.	• The instructor might select exemplary examples of peer feedback and discuss them with the class, or for online courses, the instructor might create a video presentation explaining how the review is useful to the author.
	• The instructor can hold an additional mock peer feedback session prior to students engaging in another session.
	• The instructor might select a mode more suited for making intertextual comments.
Scenario 3: Students report they are having trouble accessing or navigating the selected technology.	• The instructor might provide further tutorials or select a different mode.

As evidenced in this chapter, there is not an ideal mode for coordinating and conducting

peer feedback in virtual spaces. Asynchronous and synchronous methods offer distinct

benefits and hindrances for students to give and get feedback from their peers and to review peer

feedback for revision and editing; the mode impacts the types of feedback students are able to

give and receive and influences the quality and quantity of feedback as well as how easily

students can revisit and use peers' comments. And using a multiple mode peer feedback

approach throughout the process may enhance the effectiveness of feedback at various stages in

the writing process. Thus it is important for instructors to be familiar with the benefits and

hindrances of a range of virtual modes so they can collaboratively constructive a peer feedback

gamebook with their students, or collaboratively construct the peer feedback adventure. But the

instructor needs to also make sure all students are included in the adventure. Discovering student

accessibility prior to selecting mode through survey questions or introductory writing

assignments and gauging accessibility throughout the process via students' reflections will help

instructors determine which mode ensures all students are able to use and access the selected

peer feedback mode.

Chapter 6: A Peer Feedback Hermeneutic Pedagogy: Implications for Writing Program Administrators, Instructors, and Students

Rhetorical theorist Kenneth Burke accurately points out that we grow so accustomed to cultural commonplaces that we become blind to them; they become part of our "congealed" epistemologies (1300). It is necessary to frequently analyze our congealed pedagogical practices in light of the shifting cultural and social landscapes taking place around us, break them up, and refigure them to align with these shifts. Current immigration policies, college admissions policies, the economic climate, and new technologies are creating more culturally and therefore sociolinguistically diverse classrooms and workplaces within the United States. The 2000 Census indicated that racial and ethnic minorities will outnumber non-Hispanic whites by the year 2050. In addition, a November 2014 article published in the *U.S. News and World Report* states that during the 2013-2014 academic year, U.S. colleges and universities admitted "a record-breaking number of international students" with a total of "886, 052 undergraduate and graduate students" (Haynie). The United States has increased international student recruitment by "72 percent since 2000," and most of the students come from China, India, and South Korea (Haynie). Moreover, the current economic decline has created a tight labor market and encouraged many non-traditional students to attend or return to college, and open admissions policies have allowed historically underserved populations of students greater access to higher education. Finally, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, relying on George Kuh's research on high-impact education strategies, identifies collaborative learning as a practice that has "been widely tested and. . .shown to be beneficial for college students from many backgrounds" (Association of American Colleges and Universities); however, the AACU also notes that "on almost all campuses, utilization of active learning practices is unsystematic." Classrooms are increasingly

becoming more linguistically and culturally heterogeneous, and collaborative learning

pedagogies are becoming more widely endorsed in order to help a range of students learn, but it

in order to serve diverse populations, writing instructors must diversify their approaches to

coordinating peer feedback in the writing classroom.

Particular subfields of Composition Studies are well aware of this growing diversity and

the pedagogical benefits of collaborative learning. To more effectively teach and learn from

diverse populations of students, rhetorical, multilingual writing scholars, and second-language

writing scholars have urged composition instructors to create and adopt philosophies,

pedagogies, and modes of discourse that allow for authentic, respectful, and inclusive means of

talking across cultural differences, and strategies that value the diverse literacy practices students

bring to the classroom (Horner, Lu, and Matsuda; Villanueva; Royster; Kells; Guerra; Zamel;

Leki; Edlund and Griswold). From 2000-2014 the TA training guides gradually added more

chapters and readings that call for incorporating pedagogical approaches that better serve

culturally and linguistically diverse populations of students. For example, Lindemann's *A

Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*, which was published in 2000, does not contain a chapter on

working with second-language writers, but the more recent handbooks, *Concepts in Composition*

(2009), *The St. Martin's Guide to Teaching Writing* (2012), and *Composition Pedagogies* (2014),

include multiple chapters and articles on working with linguistically diverse groups of students.

But mainstream Composition Studies has been slow to incorporate these theories into peer

feedback pedagogical practice. The historical peer feedback theoretical base maps designed to

orient and guide new writing instructors and their students need to be redrafted to help them

navigate classroom cultural contact zones.

Over the past forty years, composition scholars have published numerous articles citing empirical and anecdotal evidence illustrating the benefits and hindrances of peer feedback, practical guidebooks for orchestrating collaborative learning, and institutional websites with print-based and virtual materials to help instructors improve how they design and implement peer feedback. Second-language writing scholars have actively published empirical studies and practical guides over the past twenty years on coordinating peer feedback among second-language writers, particularly within virtual modes. And new media scholars have published extensive empirical research on how virtual technologies such as email, Course Management Systems, web conferencing, and online peer review systems have enhanced and challenged students' abilities to give and use peer comments on their writing. What we do not see, however, is scholarship that brings peer feedback scholarship published across mainstream Composition journals, second-language writing journals, and new media journals into conversation with each other and that offers readers a principled but adaptable method for using this information.

This dissertation furthers scholarly conversations about peer feedback because it helps writing program and administrators reconceptualize peer feedback in terms of its hermeneutic or interpretive nature and offers them a principled but adaptable approach to coordinating peer feedback with diverse groups of students within face-to-face and virtual classroom settings. Conceptualizing the hermeneutic nature of peer feedback draws attention to the liminal spaces of interpretation and communication within these contexts, and attends to the needs of a wider population of students. Understanding how the complex interplay between the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic and contextual fields of interpretation influence how one conceptualizes and performs within peer feedback activities helps explain why using the same peer feedback training and enactment methods within every classroom isn't always effective. Peer feedback is a

complex genre system comprised of the written genre being reviewed and the written and spoken genres of discussing writing. Students do not bring a typified response to these contexts or the same skill sets for adapting genre moves in coordinated ways. The rhetorical strategies available to participants derive from their previous educational experiences, cultural affiliations, and linguistic backgrounds; thus, within culturally and linguistically heterogeneous classrooms, students bring an array of interpretations of peer feedback and rhetorical toolboxes for engaging in peer feedback contexts. It's important to attend to the diverse interpretations and concomitant rhetorical strategies students bring to peer feedback practices, and in order to do this, instructions need to be trained to take a principled but adaptive approach to coordinating peer feedback activities to more effectively teach and work with culturally and linguistically diverse groups of students.

This dissertation uniquely synthesizes scholarly conversations about collaborative learning, rhetorical instruction, second-language writing, intercultural communication, and new media studies to create a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy. This pedagogy is informed by and responds to the interpretive nature of peer feedback because it highlights the need for instructors to engage students in peer feedback metadiscourse in order to unpack their conceptions of peer feedback prior to doing it and to learn of their conceptions of it as they develop as writers and reviewers throughout the semester, align peer feedback training and enactment methods to suit each unique classroom of students, and to collaborate with students to determine the best methods for enacting or adapting peer feedback if or when necessary.

The current strategies for training new writing instructors, as evidenced in the most widely-used writing instructor handbooks, fail to adequately emphasize the importance of adapting to the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields of interpretations. All the

handbooks I analyzed emphasize the need to prepare students to review each other's papers because they include grouping schemes and recommend the groups practice working together through low-stakes group assignments prior to engaging in peer feedback; the handbooks also offer some useful strategies for scaffolding peer feedback through their train, enact, and reflect systems so that the instructor can facilitate the process of students aligning their peer feedback conceptions and learning effective rhetorical strategies for giving and using peer feedback, but some of the systems, as in the case of *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*, are top-down systems rather than collaborative: the instructor's task is to align students' conceptions of peer feedback with her own instead of teasing out or capitalizing on the peer feedback rhetorical strategies students bring to the classroom. The *St. Martin's Guide* recommends a more collaborative approach by including training methods that engage students in peer feedback metadiscourse and value the rhetorical strategies students bring to the peer feedback contexts. The authors also acknowledge that interpretative lenses such as an individual's personality, gender, cultural, and educational backgrounds can complicate peer feedback because these factors impact students' expectations for appropriately phrased feedback and "preferences for the kinds of response they find useful" (78), but Glenn and Goldwaite do not specifically recommend how to emphasize these dimensions to students or explain how these dimensions are considered in their training or enacting methods. Instead of offering initial assignments or training activities that emphasize how cultural and linguistic fields of interpretation impact students' interpretation and performance in peer feedback genres, their system relies on students reporting that cultural or linguistic differences have somehow hindered their participating in peer feedback genres after the fact. Glenn and Goldwaite recommend instructors garner student feedback through student conferences in order to determine how/if linguistic/cultural dimensions may be inhibiting peer

feedback, but their peer feedback system is unclear how instructors might use student feedback to adapt training or enactment methods. The suggested peer feedback systems in all of the analyzed texts are essentially linear rather than recursive, as they suggest training, enactment, and reflective methods but do not provide suggestions for instructors to use reflection data to adapt peer feedback collaboratively with students or an array of training methods for addressing specific identified hindrances. Plus, some of the recommended strategies are not clearly explained.

The lack of pedagogical approaches within these handbooks that target the cultural and linguistic interpretive fields is particularly unhelpful to instructors that work with a significant number of Generation 1.5 students, those who immigrated to the United States at a young age and attended middle or high school here, or international students. The handbooks include distinct sections on working with multilingual writers, but, as in the case of published scholarship, these handbooks do not bring segments about linguistic diversity and working with non-native speakers of English into conversation with sections on training students to engage in peer feedback.

Additionally, the handbooks do not adequately integrate segments on using new media to teach writing into sections where print-based peer feedback is mentioned. The handbooks discuss some useful concepts for deciding whether to use new media technologies in the writing classroom and overall benefits and hindrances of using certain asynchronous and synchronous technologies to orchestrate group discussions and peer feedback, but the handbooks do not integrate discussions of using technology in the service of peer feedback within the print-based train, enact, reflect systems. It is crucial that instructors understand how virtual peer feedback technologies impact the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic interpretive fields, and how the

rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic fields impact how students understand and use the selected technology. Furthermore, instructors who teach online courses are left wondering how to adapt some of the recommended systems to suit their online classrooms. The handbooks left me asking the following questions: What are some useful methods of adapting the recommended print-based training methods to suit online writing courses? How might instructors use available asynchronous and synchronous technologies to adapt to the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic fields of interpretation within virtual spaces? What are some methods for aligning students' conceptions on virtual peer feedback, for collaboratively generating virtual peer feedback ceremonials and norms, and for engaging students in peer feedback metadiscourse? My analysis of the selected training materials concludes that although they provide some useful strategies for coordinating peer feedback, these strategies may not work as successfully with culturally and linguistically diverse groups of students or in virtual spaces.

Writing program administrators who teach TA practica and conduct in-service training should go beyond discussing quick rules of thumb included in new instructor handbooks. New writing instructors interpret why it's useful to assign collaborative pedagogies such as peer feedback and how to do it through their previous personal experiences with peer feedback and their TA training. Before I began researching peer feedback, my assumption was that coordinating it involved creating the questions, telling students what to do, and then they do it. I was familiar with the cognitive and social epistemic theories behind peer feedback and saw how, in theory, it could/should help students engage in a writing process, gain greater audience awareness and other perspectives on their writing, and learn rhetorical strategies from each other. But I was unsure why some groups just weren't getting it. If TA training fails to go beyond discussion of theory or handbook rules of thumb, this is the assumption many new teachers may

have. It's important to plan practica classes, in-service training sessions, or segments of courses in multimodal composition that introduce teachers to a range of peer feedback strategies so they will have a store of menu items available to them for teaching a variety of student populations in both face-to-face and online writing courses. Two of the most common questions I receive from experienced instructors is, "How can I improve the way I assign peer review in my online classes?" and "How do I train non-native English speakers to do peer review?" New and experienced instructors need instruction focused on working with multilingual writers whose cultural, educational, and linguistic backgrounds may differ widely from students born and educated in the United States. Because of their cultural and linguistic backgrounds, many students feel uncomfortable, ill-prepared, or self-conscious about discussing their writing with native speakers. And for some international students, collaborative pedagogies are completely foreign to them. And as with the example from my grammar course, native English speakers may inaccurately position non-native speakers as less credible reviewers because of their perceived English speaking and writing abilities. However, as I point out in Chapter 2, non-native English learn English under very different circumstances and for different purposes, so it is important that instructors not categorize students as simply native/non-native speakers and that they teach their students not to ascribe inaccurate identities to their classmates. Non-native speakers' educational and circumstantial differences impact how familiar they are with American pop cultural references, Standard American Editing English conventions, and the types of non-standard features they exhibit in their writing. Writing program administrators need to create or coordinate in-service sessions that focus on training culturally and linguistically diverse groups of students to engage in peer feedback.

For example, a session or workshop might begin by discussing some of the issues and questions instructors have about coordinating peer feedback—to tease out their conceptions of how cultural and language diversity impact peer feedback. Then, discussing concepts from Reid's article "'Eye' Learners and 'Ear' Learners: Identifying the Language Needs of International Students and U.S. Resident Writers" and Valdes' "Bilingual Minorities and Language Issues in Writing: Toward Professionwide Response to a New Challenge" will help participants understand the educational, cultural, and linguistic diversity among non-native English speakers and how these dimensions impact how they participate in peer feedback contexts. The session could then culminate with the session leader introducing instructors to a menu of items they might select from to construct a peer feedback gamebook when working with multilingual writers: ***preparatory methods*** (the introductory letter, language background surveys), ***community building strategies*** (group outings, group genre analyses), ***training methods*** (peer feedback metadiscourse: discussing previous experiences with peer feedback, discussing conversational styles, discussing appropriate/inappropriate comments, and modeling how to use metalanguage), ***grouping methods***, (few students per group) ***enactment methods*** (giving students explicit instruction, allowing them to take notes in their native languages, encouraging them to look up unfamiliar vocabulary, focusing on only a few questions or only a short segment of a draft per session, using in-class/out-of-class method to allow students more time to read and respond), ***reflection methods*** (post-feedback session reflections, post submission reflections), and ***methods of adapting*** peer feedback based on student feedback and instructor observations. And as I mentioned in Chapter 2, peer feedback instruction and practice must emphasize to students the situated nature of "correct" usage and that the purpose of peer feedback is not merely error hunting based on an objective language standard but to respond to

various dimensions, Higher Order Concerns as well as Lower Order Concerns, in terms of the piece of writing's context. The goal of the session or workshop is to offer instructors resources for teasing out students' conceptions of peer feedback through metadiscursive practices, norming peer feedback protocol and ceremonials through training, selecting an appropriate enactment method, and garnering student feedback so that the instructor can initiate further training or adapt peer feedback protocol appropriately.

Administrators teaching TA practica, in-service training, or courses on multimodal composition also need to make instructors aware of how new media technologies such as Course Management Systems, web conferencing, and the newest online peer review systems can enhance students' abilities to give and use peer feedback within both face-to-face and online courses. However, these sessions or courses also need to highlight the accessibility and technological flexibility factors associated with each of these technologies so instructors can avoid disadvantaging certain populations of students and so they are cognizant of the pedagogical advantages and disadvantages of each mode. A training session or class period might introduce instructors to the various benefits and hindrances of using technologies such as email, discussion threads, web conferencing, and online peer review systems. For example, distributing and discussing a handout such as Table 4: Summary of Benefits and Hindrances to Using Virtual Peer Feedback Modes located in Chapter 2 or assigning students in a multimodal composition course to complete research on this topic and share it with the class would be useful pedagogical strategies for accomplishing this goal. Furthermore, discussing the importance of determining students' digital literacy practices helps instructors realize the need to determine student access to and familiarity with technology: distributing the digital literacy questionnaire located in Chapter 5 or suggesting online instructors add relevant questions to the initial survey

distributed to their online students would be useful resources for instructors. To further emphasize how the rhetorical, cultural, and linguistic fields impact students' interpretations of and performance in virtual peer feedback, the instructor training session could also offer online *community building methods* (creating profiles, engaging students in low-stakes discussion threads), *strategies for adapting training method to the selected asynchronous or synchronous technology* (readings and discussions on netiquette, discussions or instructor presentations on giving useful and specific feedback, and uploading Writing Commons and MIT peer feedback videos), *grouping students* in online settings (stable versus fluid), *reflection methods*, and *using student feedback to adapt virtual peer feedback protocol*.

These training and workshop sessions could also be used in Writing Across Curriculum and Writing in the Disciplines faculty development programs. Zawacki and Cox's 2014 edited collection *WAC and Second-Language Writers: Research Towards Linguistically and Culturally Inclusive Programs and Practices* presents research discussing ways writing instruction across academic disciplines might account for and value L2's writers' educational, cultural, and linguistic diversity. Research anthologized in this collection showed faculty across disciplines acknowledged that students who exhibit non-standard American Edited English in their writing were often denied access to graduate programs in their fields, and some of the interviewees felt they had a responsibility for helping second-language writers enrolled in their courses, but they were unsure exactly how to respond to student writing or help them learn to improve their writing skills (Ives, Leahy, Leming, Pierce, and Schwartz). Ives et al's research reported that the faculty members across disciplines "seemed genuinely concerned with the success of all of their students, regardless of language background, even as they seem to be at a loss as to how to work most effectively with non-native speakers of English" (225). As the Association of American

Colleges and Universities noted and as the literature cited in Chapter 1 illustrates, collaborative learning such as peer feedback can be a useful strategy for helping students learn effective course material and writing strategies from each other, but faculty members need methods for teaching students how to engage in peer feedback, and students enrolled in their courses need to be trained how to give and use peer feedback. Thus, the workshops I outline above on working with culturally and linguistically diverse groups of students and using virtual technology in the contexts of peer feedback would offer faculty across disciplines and/or writing fellows working in writing intensive programs useful strategies for helping non-native speakers improve their writing in the disciplines. The use of virtual peer feedback such as online peer review systems or discussion threads in a Course Management system may be especially attractive modes for faculty across disciplines because many claim they do not have the class time to allow students complete in-class peer feedback. I taught several learning communities during my tenure at the University of New Mexico and worked with professors as a writing fellow at UNM's Anderson School of Management, and when I would suggest that the faculty members I worked with in these contexts have their students read and respond to one another's writing prior to submitting their final drafts, the common response was that peer feedback seemed like a good idea in theory, but the faculty member was unsure how to coordinate these activities and/or simply did not have the class time to dedicate to these activities. However, if faculty development workshops or learning community training emphasized the benefits of collaborative learning, taught instructors how to do it, and presented them with various practical options for doing it (as the suggested workshops outlined above do), they might be more likely to adopt these pedagogies in their classrooms. Seeing the need for such a workshop, I designed and conducted faculty workshops on collaborative learning pedagogies such as team writing at Anderson during the 2013-2014

academic year (since their students do a good bit of collaborative writing). I presented my
research on the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields students use to interpret and
perform in group projects, and I created a Wiki that contained resources for helping instructors
improve how they assign group projects (videos, handouts, links to free Wiki websites). The
instructors in attendance found the information quite informative and the materials quite useful.

      I am not suggesting that instructors have to significantly alter every peer feedback session
every other class because doing so may confuse students even further since each the classroom
needs time to develop norms and learn the rules of play for participating in peer feedback genres.
As Vgostksy's theory of the zone of proximal development argues, if the learners lack
experiential overlap with new material and if too much new information is introduced too
quickly, they may have a difficult time gaining new knowledge. Learners must have time to
process new information incrementally. Nor am I arguing that instructors must use all of the
suggested strategies for the plan, enact, and reflect stages outlined in Chapters 4 and 5. Doing so
would be impossible and inefficient, especially for instructors and adjuncts who are teaching five
writing courses in a given semester. And new writing instructors are being acculturated into the
academic discourse community of Composition Studies and are therefore being introduced to a
number of new composition theories and practices in their TA practica and struggling to balance
teaching and completing graduate coursework. The plan, enact, and reflect methods presented in
Chapters 4 and 5 represent possible story lines or menu items instructors can adapt to suit their
and students' needs rather than a linear sequence of activities or a straight path that must be
followed to achieve peer feedback success in their classrooms. Instructors need to be familiar
with multiple strategies for planning peer feedback strategies, training students to do it
effectively, enacting it, and having students reflect on it so that they can tailor peer feedback in

ways that consider the rhetorical, cultural, linguistic, and contextual fields. Even as important, instructors need to garner feedback from students themselves to discover their respective perceptions of peer feedback's usefulness and ways it might need to be improved. This information can be used to make minor or even major adaptations through continued training or adjustment of medium or mode. A hermeneutic pedagogy requires resisting the notion that a monolithic mode of peer feedback exists and espousing the notion that an adaptive, fluid method collaboratively constructed with students makes for more inclusive and relevant peer feedback sessions, and this is the teacherly habit of mind this dissertation endorses.

Furthermore, a hermeneutic approach to peer feedback will not make every session totally successful. The systems I provide in Chapters 4 and 5 cannot possibly account for and respond to every interpretive frame or factor that might inhibit effective peer feedback sessions. The training methods will not prepare all students to get along, give excellent feedback, and use feedback to edit and revise their drafts. No peer feedback system can fully account for all interpersonal conflicts, miscommunications, or misunderstandings that might occur within a given session. The truth is, no amount of training will be able to address all of the reasons why peer feedback isn't successful. For example, personality conflicts, a student's personal issues unrelated to the class, or a student's unwillingness to participate can diminish peer feedback's success, and the training and adaptive strategies provided in this dissertation will not solve these problems. And no matter how an instructor coordinates or students conduct peer feedback, some students will simply go through the motions to get participations points or a peer feedback grade without really reflecting on how they might use their peers' suggestions. And even though the instructor attempts to engage students in metadiscourse about their peer feedback experiences, because of their cultural or educational backgrounds, some students may not feel comfortable

contributing to classroom discussions about their previous experiences or sharing their reflections with the instruction. In such cases, this lack of participation on these students' parts excludes them from constructing the peer feedback gamebook and therefore from the collaborative process.

Moreover, the dissertation does not address how adapting peer feedback for students with cognitive or psychological disabilities. Hewett's study of students using multimodal peer feedback (through video conferencing and IM chats) reports that one of the students with a significant reading disability found using the selected technologies challenging, and Hewett concluded that peer feedback research needs "to better understand the role peer-group talk media might play for students with certain types of learning disabilities" (273). I came to a similar conclusion when I had a student enrolled in one of my face-to-face course who suffered from anxiety and social disorders, for which UNM stated he needed accommodations; however, the campus Accessibility Resource Center did not stipulate anything about the student being dismissed from collaborative learning activities. I was unaware how profound his conditions were until he began missing class on peer feedback days and then came to my office to explain that he was unable to participate in peer feedback sessions for these reasons. This was the first time in my ten years of teaching that I had encountered this situation, so I was a little unprepared for it. I, of course, told him he could forego the peer feedback sessions and come to my office to get feedback from me. Luckily, he felt comfortable enough to report this issue to me, but some students with similar conditions may not report them to the instructor. Cognitive and psychological disabilities are certainly factors that impact a student's interpretation of and performance in peer feedback, and it would be worthwhile to research how a hermeneutic pedagogy might adapt to students with special needs as well.

Even though a peer feedback hermeneutic pedagogy cannot possibly account for all interpretive fields and adapt to all potential conflicts or issues that may arise within peer feedback sessions, it helps instructors adapt peer feedback training and enactment methods in ways that attend to the needs of a greater population of students and classroom settings than using the same training, enactment, and reflective methods for every classroom.

My argument throughout the dissertation has been that the instructor and students need to collaboratively create peer feedback norms and protocol to suit the classroom of writers using them, that communal ceremonials, rules, and available strategies should be formed organically with each new classroom of students, but these same rules and protocol may not be appropriate in every context. If this is the case, what knowledge or habits of mind might students transfer to other peer feedback contexts?

Elizabeth's Wardle's study analyzing how or if students apply writing instruction beyond the First Year Composition (FYC) found that many of the written genres taught in these courses constitute "mutt genres" or "genres that do not respond to rhetorical situations requiring communication in or to accomplish a purpose meaningful to the author" ("Mutt Genres," 777); in other words, students write in FYC simply to respond to the writing prompts within those courses and to get a passing grade, and the selected genres within those courses do not prepare students to write effectively beyond the course or help them learn epistemologies or genres used in other academic disciplines. She explains: ". . .the assignments given in FYC may not constitute genres at all - or rather, they may exist as genres for the teacher but appear only as arbitrary assignments for the students" (777). Wardle argues that for knowledge transfer to occur, students must be taught "general and flexible principles about writing," and instructors should "discuss similarities between new and previous writing assignments" (770).

Wardle argues that certain pedagogical practices can encourage students to transfer knowledge about effective writing from one context or classroom to the next:

- Encouraging students to abstract principles from a situation and apply them to new situations.

- Cultivating a sense of mindfulness, or a generalized state of alertness to the activities one is engaged in and to one's surroundings, in contrast with a passive reactive mode in which cognitions, behaviors, and other responses unfold automatically and mindlessly. (771).

In order for students to be encouraged to transfer effective peer feedback practices in other classes and other professional contexts, it is important to emphasize to students that peer feedback situations are rhetorical situations to which they need to adapt, that each new feedback situation presents different purposes, reviewers (who may have different language and cultural backgrounds), written genres, power differentials, or available technologies for enacting peer feedback. Teaching peer feedback strategies such as pointing to specific parts of a draft, using metalanguage to comment on writing, offering specific strategies for revision and editing, and framing comments in appropriate and polite ways are general principles that can transfer to other academic and professional peer feedback contexts. Moreover, having students reflect on how the enactment medium and mode enable and constrain the process and how they intend to use feedback can encourage them to be mindful of these elements in other peer feedback contexts in order to adapt modes and evaluate the usefulness of feedback within other contexts. Adopting and adapting a hermeneutic peer feedback pedagogy not only helps students capitalize on the benefits of peer feedback within the writing classroom in which the pedagogy is used but also helps them transfer relevant principles and habits of mind to peer feedback contexts beyond the composition classroom.

Appendices

Appendix A: Introductory Letter Prompt

Prompt: It is important to me to learn as much as I can about each student's writing history; therefore, I am asking you to write a letter to me utilizing the following questions as a guide concerning your writing history. **Directions: Do not merely answer each guide question as a short answer; instead, unite your ideas into a cohesive letter.** In other words, the letter should have a main point about your history as a writer. Address the questions below as a means of expounding upon your main point, but do not feel that you must limit yourself to these questions. Any additional information will help me understand your writing history and your writing abilities.

Please be frank and honest. For example, if you dislike writing or have had negative writing experiences, say so, but search your memory in an attempt to figure out why you feel the way you do about writing. In other words, provide me concrete examples to help me understand why.

- What writing courses have you had in the past? Include high school and college courses. What were these courses like? What did you like most about them? What did you like the least?

- How has previous writing instructions influenced the way you write?

- What are your greatest strengths as a writer? Are there particular kinds of writing that you do well (such as writing letters, memos, creative writing, etc)?

- What do you see as your weaknesses as a writer? What strategies have you employed to overcome these weaknesses? Do you need help in finding better strategies?

- What kinds of writing do you read on a regular basis (e.g. magazines, books, articles, on the web, etc.)?

- How do you begin writing? For example, what environment do you set up (e.g., silence, background noise, clothing, food/drink, temperature, necessary pens or paper, time of day, etc)?

- Have you ever received instruction in peer editing and revision techniques? If so, do you find this activity helps you improve your writing? Why or Why not?

- In what modes have you previously done peer review? Using printed papers? Using email? Using peer review software?

- Do you have any fears or frustrations about taking this course? If so, what are they?

An effective letter will do the following:
- address the prompt (mostly),

- have a sense of organization and some development,

- follow letter-writing conventions (have a salutation [i.e., Dear Mellisa,], distinct body sections, closing, and signature [i.e., "Sincerely, Jane Smith"),

- use clear and appropriate word choice, and

The letter should be approximately 500-750 words. It's okay if it's longer, though.

Submission Format: Please type the letter and print a hard copy.
Due Date: The beginning of class, Thursday, August 29

This assignment is worth 25 participation points.

Appendix B: Language Background Questionnaire

Is English your second (or third or fourth) language?

What is your first language?

List your previous schooling

- **In your first language**: grade_____ through grade_____ total years_____

- **In English**: grade_____ through grade_____ total years_____

Did you graduate from a U.S. high school?

If no,	If yes,
TOEFL Score_____	**High school attended**_____
TOEFL Section Scores:	**Graduated in what year**_____
Listening:	ESL classes taken ____ hours each week
Structure/Written Expression:	In grades ____to_____
Reading:	**Was your first language schooling interrupted**?
TWE:	Yes/No
Full-time English study Yes/No	If yes, how long_____
If yes, where?	Fluency in first language (high, medium, low):
How long?	

How did you learn English?				
	A Lot	**Some**	**A Little**	**None**
Studying grammar				
Listening to English speakers				
Practicing with language tapes				
Reading English literature				
Watching U.S. movies/television				
Other:				

How would you evaluate your English language proficiency?				
	Excellent	**Very good**	**Average**	**Poor**
Speaking				
Listening				
Reading				
Writing				
Grammar				

Appendix C: Example Student-Generated Master List

CHALLENGES	REWARDS

Social/Cultural
• Telling relative strangers what is "wrong" with their writing is weird.
• Accepting a review from someone you don't like is difficult.
• Some reviewers have a hard time relegating their comments to the prompt or question.
• Not everyone knows how to politely give criticism.
• Some people like to play teacher.
• It makes you vulnerable to let others read your writing. It's intimidating.
• Reviewer may try to transform the draft to mimic his or her voice and not yours.
• Reviewer and author may not have the same views.
• Reviewer may not understand your angle.
 	
Rhetorical
• Framing criticism in a helpful, not offensive way can be difficult.
• Finding the right words to express what isn't working in a draft can sometimes be difficult.
• Identifying anything good or effective in the draft.
• Accepting that what you thought was working in the draft is not.
 	
Different levels of experience with and investment in peer review
• Reviewers may not know how to edit a paper properly. *I don't always trust peers' feedback.*
• The reviewer may not really be invested in helping improve my work and therefore write just anything down to finish the review.
• Some peers are not as critical as a teacher is.
 	
Different levels of writing skills and expectations
• Reviewers might make your paper unintentionally worse.
• Some reviewers fail to provide any helpful advice.
• Reviewers may overlook mistakes.
 	
Authorship Issues
• Sometimes reviewers use your ideas in their papers.
	Social/Cultural
	• It gives you an opportunity to get advice from others in the same position as you—peers taking the same class.
	
	• A bad peer review is easier to handle than a bad teacher review.
	
	• It's a good feeling when you've helped improve someone's writing and his/her grade.
	
	• They might give you suggestions or praise that boosts your confidence.
	
	• You get the chance to interact with people you don't like and try to overcome that.
	
	Rhetorical
	• The review gives you a better sense of an audience's perception of your writing.
	
	   o Realize mistakes you may have overlooked.
	   o Readers might offer more effective ways of phrasing your ideas.
	   o They could possibly suggest a new or interesting angle to your paper.
	
	• You gather different opinions and viewpoints about your writing.
	   o You can mix their ideas with your own.
	• You're exposed to different ways of responding to the writing assignment.
	
	• My writing has consistently become better over time as I allow others to give me feedback about it.

Appendix D: Self-Assessment Discussion Style Worksheet

Self-Assessment: Discussion Style

Each item in the following assessment reflects something that a person might say or think. For each item, indicate how well this statement describes you **when you are interacting with teammates**. Use the following scale:

> 1 = never (not at all like me)
> 2 = rarely
> 3 = sometimes
> 4 = frequently
> 5 = always (very much describes me)

1. When I get a good idea during a team meeting, I say it as soon as possible, even if I have to interrupt to do so. ___

2. I am careful to wait for my teammates to finish speaking before I jump into a team discussion. ___

3. My teammates sometimes accuse me of not listening. ___

4. I nod or agree with teammates while they are talking. ___

5. I hate feeling as though I have to wait my turn to talk during a team discussion. ___

6. If I keep getting interrupted during team meetings, I generally give up on trying to talk. ___

7. I talk over (talk at the same time as) teammates who are trying to speak. ___

8. I prefer to listen carefully to what my teammates have to say before I form my own opinion. ___

9. I enjoy challenging my teammates' ideas. ___

10. If I need to express criticism, I am always careful to avoid hurting my teammates' feelings. ___

11. When a teammate expresses a new idea, my first instinct is to point out the flaws. ___

12. When a teammate expresses a new idea, my first instinct is to ask questions. ___

13. I always say what's on my mind during team meetings. ___

14. I think it is rude when my teammates never stop to ask me about my opinion. ___

Add up your responses to the odd-numbered statements. If your score is greater than 25, you exhibit many characteristics of a **competitive discussion style**.

Add up your responses to the even-numbered statements. If your score is greater than 25, you exhibit many characteristics of a **highly considerate discussion style**.

Note: The self-assessments here focus on styles that sometimes come into conflict and are by no means comprehensive. You may find that you score low on both scales or that you exhibit some characteristics of both the competitive and highly considerate discussion styles. In that case, simply choose the description that seems to fit you the best.

Appendix E: Sample Peer Feedback Rules List

Things to Remember about Responding to Other's Writing:

- Writing is personal and reflects writer's values and beliefs. (Trim)

- Reviewers do not need to agree with the writer's ideas in order to provide good feedback; instead, the reviewer's job is to help the writer more clearly convey his/her ideas, not write in a way that always agrees with the reviewer's perspective (Trim)

- Respond with the intended audience of the piece in mind. (Trim)

- Don't hesitate to respond as a reader, especially early in the review process, for example,
    - I got confused here.
    - I saw your point clearly here.
    - I was convinced by your example or analogy or argument.(WAC Clearinghouse)

- If you disagree with the comments of another peer reviewer, say so. Not all readers react the same ways, and divergent points of view can help writers see options for revising. (WAC Clearinghouse)

- Keep in mind the effective communicative styles and politeness strategies we discussed in class as you respond to writing and listen to your peers' comments.
- Make comments in the spirit of helpfulness. Take comments in the spirit of helpfulness. (WAC Clearinghouse)

- Always point out strengths as well as elements that need more work. (WAC Clearinghouse)
- Try to attend to larger issues first (audience, purpose, organization, detail, etc.). Talk about sentences, word choices, punctuation only late in the peer feedback process. (WAC Clearinghouse)

- Be specific and focus on one item at a time. Point to particular places in the draft where revision will be helpful (WAC Clearinghouse).

- Make comments accessible and usable. (Trim)

- Make comments tidy (if face-to-face written feedback) and readable. (Trim)

- **Other rules the class established.**

Things to Remember About Incorporating Feedback:

- Remember, you make the final decision about your writing and will be assigned the final grade, so use peers' comments judiciously.

- Weigh reviewers' comments against what you're trying to do/say in the paper and the writing prompt, but you are not obligated to use/incorporate every peer suggestion. (WAC Clearinghouse)

- If two or more reviewers offer the same revision/editing suggestion, it indicates more than one reader was stumped or confused, so consider revising/editing that portion. (WAC Clearinghouse)

- If two peers disagree or you disagree with a reviewer, seek a third, credible opinion: writing center tutor or the writing instructor.

- **Other rules/suggestions the class generated during the preparatory exercises.**

Appendix F: Methods for Adapting Peer Feedback Workshop Design

Early Drafts

Writer Reads Draft Aloud: No Reader Response
Writer reads draft aloud to listeners for their enjoyment and to hear how the writing sounds, but readers do not respond (Elbow and Belanoff 1).

Readers Respond to Higher Order Concerns
"What are your thoughts on my topic, now that I've read preliminary draft?" Useful at early stages of writing process (Elbow and Belanoff 2).

Readers Summarize and Say Back What They Read
Useful at any stage of the writing process to ensure readers are receiving the piece in intended manner. (Elbow and Belanoff 2)

Developed/Revised Drafts

Readers Summarize and Say Back What They Read
Useful at any stage of the writing process to ensure readers are receiving the piece in intended manner. (Elbow and Belanoff 2)

Movies of the Mind
Ask readers to tell you honestly and in detail what is going on in their minds as they read your words. There are three powerful ways to help readers give you this kind of response: (a) Interrupt their reading a few times and find out what's happening at that moment. (b) Get them to tell you their reactions in the form of a story that takes place in time. (c) If they make "it-statements" ("It was confusing"), make them translate these into "I-statements" ("I felt confused starting here about . . . "). (Elbow and Belanoff 3)

Believing and Doubting

Believing: "Try to believe everything I have written, even if you disagree or find it crazy. At least pretend to believe it. Be my friend and ally and give me more evidence, arguments, and ideas to help me make my case better."

Doubting: "Try to doubt everything I have written, even if you love it. Take on the role of enemy and find all the arguments that can be made against me. Pretend to be someone who hates my writing. What would he or she notice?" (Elbow and Belanoff 4)

Skeleton Feedback: "Please lay out the reasoning you see in my paper: my main point, my subpoints, my supporting evidence, and my assumptions about my topic and about my audience." Descriptive outline: "Please write 'says' and 'does' sentences for my whole paper and then for each paragraph or section." A says sentence summarizes the meaning or message, and a does sentence describes the function. (Elbow and Belanoff 4)

Criterion Based Feedback:
Ask readers to give you their thoughts about specific criteria that you are wondering about or struggling with: "Does this sound too technical?" "Is this section too long?" "Do my jokes work for you?" "Do you feel I've addressed the objections of people who disagree?" And of course, "Please find mistakes in spelling and grammar and typing." You can also ask readers to address what they think are the important criteria for your piece. You can ask too about traditional criteria for essays: focus on the assignment or

task, content (ideas, reasoning, support, originality), organization, clarity of language, and voice. (Elbow and Belanoff 4)

You ask for criterion-based feedback when you have questions about specific aspects of your piece. You can also ask for it when you need a quick overview of strengths and weaknesses. This kind of feedback depends on skilled and experienced readers. (But even with them you should still take it with a grain of salt, for if someone says your piece is boring, other readers might well disagree. Movies of the reader's mind are more trustworthy because they give you a better picture of the personal reactions behind these judgments.) (Elbow and Belanoff 4)

Works Cited

Anderson, Daniel. "Web-Based Peer Review: An Opportunity for Conversation." In

    Teaching/Writing in the Late Age of Print. Eds. Jeffrey Galin, Carol Peterson Haviland,

    and J. Paul Johnson. Creskill: Hampton Press, 2003. 185-198. Print.

Any Meeting. 2014. Web. 5 November 2014 <https://www.anymeeting.com/ways-to-use/>.

Anson, Chris, Lee-Ann Kastman Breuch, and Thom Swiss. *Teaching Writing Using Blogs,*

    Wikis, and Other Digital Tools. Christopher-Gordon Publishers, 2009. Print.

Armstrong, Sonya L. and Eric J. Paulson. "Whither 'Peer Review'?: Terminology Matters for the

    Writing Classroom." *Teaching English in the Two-year College*. 35.4 (2008): 398-407.

Artemeva, Natasha and Susan Logie. "Introducing Engineering Students to Intellectual

    Teamwork: The Teaching and Practice of Peer Feedback in the Professional

    Communication Classroom." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 6.1 (2003):

    62-85. Print.

Association of American Colleges and Universities. "High-Impact Educational Practices." Web.

    19 January 2015. <https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips>.

Bamberg, Betty. "Revision." 79-99. In Clark.

Bazerman, Charles. "Speech Acts, Genres, and Activity Systems: How Texts Organize Activity

    and People." In *What Writing Does and How It Does It*. Eds. Charles Bazerman and Paul

    Prior. Mawhah, New Jersey: Erlbaum, 2004. Print.

Barnard, Ian. "Whole-Class Workshops: The Transformation of Students Into Writers." *Issues in*

    Writing 12.2 (2002): 124-43. Print.

Bawarshi, Anis. "The Challenges and Possibilities of Taking Up Multiple Discursive Resources

    in U.S. College Composition." In Horner, Lu, and Matsuda. 196-203. Print.

Bawarshi, Anis and Mary Jo Reiff. *Genre: An Introduction to History, Theory, Research, and Pedagogy.* West Lafayette: Parlor Press, 2010. Print.

Beach, Richard and Tom Friedrich. "Response to Writing." *Handbook of Writing Research*. Eds. Charles MacArthur, Steve Graham, and Jill Fitzgerald. New York, Guilford P, 2006. 222-234. Print.

Bean, John. *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*. 2nd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011. Print.

Beaudin, Andrea, Steven J. Corbett, and Ilene W. Crawford. *Peer Pressure, Peer Power: Toward Systematic Collaborative Peer Review in the Composition and Writing Across the Curriculum Classroom.* Department of English, Southern Connecticut State University. <http://peer-review-as-primary-response.wikispaces.com/file/view/WPAgalleryfinal.pdf>. 9 February 2014.

Bedore, Pamela and Brian O'Sullivan. "Addressing Instructor Ambivalence About Peer Review and Self Assessment." *The Journal of Writing Program Administration* 34.2 (2011): 11-36. Print.

Belcher, Lynne. "Peer Review and Response: A Failure of the Process Paradigm as Viewed from the Trenches." *Reforming College Composition: Writing the Wrongs.* Eds. Ray Wallace, Alan Jackson, and Susan Lewis Wallace. Westport: Greenwood P, 2000. 99-122.

Berg, Catherine. "The Effects of Trained Peer Response ESL Students' Revision Types and Writing Quality." *Journal of Second Language Writing 8.3* (1999): 215-241. Print.

---"Preparing ESL Students For Peer Response." *TESOL Journal* 8.2 (1999): 20-25. Print.

Berlin, James. "Contemporary Composition: The Major Pedagogical Theories." In Ed. Victor

    Villanueava. *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*. NCTE: Urbana, 2003. 255-270.

    Print.

Bishop, Wendy. "Helping Peer Writing Groups Succeed." In Glenn and Goldwaite. 309-317.

Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times*

    to the   Present. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. Print.

Bizzell, Patricia. "Cognition, Convention, and Certainty: What We Need to Know About

    Writing." PRE/TEXT 3.3 (1982): 213-243. Print.

Brady, Laura. "Fault Lines in the Terrain of Distance Education." *Computers and Composition*

    18 (2001): 347-358. Print.

Bradley, Linda. "Peer-Reviewing in an Intercultural Wiki Environment: Student Interaction and

    Reflections." *Computers and Composition* 34 (2014): 80–95. Print.

Brammer, Charlotte and Mary Rees. "Peer Review From a Students' Perspective: Invaluable or

    Invalid?" *Composition Studies* 35.2 (2007): 71-85. Print.

Broad, Bob. *What We Really Value: Beyond Rubrics in Teaching and Assessing Writing*. Logan:

    Utah State UP, 2003. Print.

Brooke, Collin. "New Media Pedagogy." 177-193. In Tate, Taggart, et al.

Brown, Norman. *Hermes The Thief*: *The Evolution of a Myth*. Madison: U of Wisconsin Press,

    1947. Print.

Brown, Penelope, Steven Levinson, and John Gumperz. *Politeness: Some Universals of*

    Language Use. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

Bruffee, Kenneth. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind.'" In

    Victor Villanueva (Ed.) *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*. Urbana: NCTE,

    2003. 415-436. Print.

Bump, Jerome. "Radical Changes in Class Discussing Using Networked Computers." *Computers and Humanities* 24.1/2 (1990): 49-65. Print.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. In Bizzell and Herzberg. 1298-1324.

Burnham, Chris and Rebecca Powell. "Expressive Pedagogy: Practice/Theory, Theory Practice." In Tate, Rupiper Taggart, Schick, and Hessler. 111-127. Print.

Byland, Heather. "Educating Students About Peer Response." *Young Scholars in Writing: Undergraduate Research in Writing and Rhetoric* 2 (2004): 56-67. Print.

Carson, Joan and Gayle Nelson. "Chinese Students' Perceptions of ESL Peer Response Group Interaction." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 5 (1996): 1–19. Print.

Chang, Ching-Fen. "Peer Review Via Three Modes in an EFL Writing Course." *Computers and Composition* 29 (2012): 63–78. Print.

Chisholm, Richard. "Introducing Students to Peer Review of Writing." *The WAC Journal* 3.1 (1991-92): 4-19. Print.

Clark, Irene. *Concepts in Composition: Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing*. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge, 2012. Print.

Cohen, Andrew and Marilda Cavalcanti. "Feedback on Compositions: Teacher and Student Verbal Reports." *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom* (1990): 155-177.

Conference on College Composition and Communication. "A Position Statement of Principles and Example Effective Practices for Online Writing Instruction." 2013. Web. 6 December 2014. < http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/owiprinciples>.

Connor, Ulla and Karen Asenavage. "Peer Response Groups in ESL Writing Classes: How Much Impact on Revision?" *Journal of Second Language Writing* 3.3 (1994): 257-276. Print.

Corbett, Edward P.J., Nancy Myers, and Gary Tate. *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook*. 4th ed.

New York: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.

Corbett, Steven, Michelle LaFrance, Teagan Decker. "CFP: Peer Pressure, Peer Power:

Collaborative Peer Review and Response in the Writing Classroom." *International*

Writing Centers Association. 29 September 2012. Web. 9 Feb. 2014.

<http://writingcenters.org/2010/09/cfp-peer-pressure-peer-power-collaborative-peer-

review-and-response-in-the-writing-classroom/>.

Corbett, Steven. "CFP: Peer Review and Response Essay Collection." *Council of Writing*

Program Administrators WPA-L Archives. 30 September 2010. Web.

https://lists.asu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind1009&L=WPA-L&F=&S=&P=640516

Crank, Virginia. "Asynchronous Electronic Peer Response in a Hybrid Basic Writing

Classroom." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 30.2. (2002): 145-55. Print.

Crusius, Timothy. *A Teacher's Introduction to Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Urbana: NCTE,

1991. Print.

Council of Writing Program Administrators. "The WPA-L Listserv." 15 January 2015. Web.

< http://wpacouncil.org/wpa-l>.

Fernsten, Linda. "Peer Response: Helpful Pedagogy or Hellish Event." *The WAC Journal* 17

(2006): 33-42. Print.

Freadman, Anne. "Anyone for Tennis?" In *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. Ed. Aviva Freadman

and Peter Medway. London: Taylor & Francis, 1994. Print.

Edgington, Anthony. "Bringing a New Perspective to a Common Practice: A Plan for Peer

Review." In Hunzer. 17-29.

Davis, Thomas and Mark Trebian. "Shaping the Destiny of Native American People by Ending

the Digital Divide." *Educause Review* 36.1 (2001): 38-46. Print.

DiGiovanni, Elaine and Girija Nagaswani. "Online Peer Review: An Alternative to Face-to-Face?" *ELT Journal* 55.3 (2001): 263-272. Print.

Drawbridge Incorporated. *Eli Review*. 2014. Web. 4 December 2014 <http://elireview.com/>.

---"Get Eli Review in Your Classrooms." <http://elireview.com/buy/>. Web 4 December 2014.

---"Eli Reviewer User Support." <http://elireview.com/support/guides/instructor/tasks/review/>. Web 4. December 2014.

---"Origins of Eli Review." <http://elireview.com/about/>. Web. 4 December 2014.

Edlund, John and Olga Griswold. "Non-Native Speakers of English." In Clark. 317-338. Print.

Faigley, Lester. "Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal." *College English* 48.6 (1986): 527-542. Print.

Falchikov, Nancy and Judy Goldfinch. "Student Peer Assessment in Higher Education: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Peer and Teacher Marks." *Review of Educational Research* 70 (2000): 287-322.

Fox, Thomas, "Race and Gender in Collaborative Learning." In Reagan et al. 111-121. Print.

Ferris, Dana. *Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Flynn, Elizabeth. "Re-Viewing Peer Review." *The Writing Instructor*. December 2011. <http://www.writinginstructor.com/30review> Web. 26 September 2013.

Freadman, Anne. "Anyone for Tennis?" In Aviva Freadman and Peter Medway. 43-66. Print.

Freadman, Aviva and Peter Medway. Eds. *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1994. Print.

Garagalza, Luis. Translated by Michael Marder. "In The Footsteps of Hermes: The Meaning of Hermeneutics and Symbolism." *Parrhesia* 16 (2013): 1-13. Print.

Garrison, Kevin. "Web Conferencing and Peer Feedback." In *The Plugged-In Professor: Tips and Techniques for Teaching With Social Media*. Oxford: Chandos Publishing, 2013. 73-79. Print. Edited by Sharmila Pixy Ferris and Hilary Anne Wilder. Cambridge UK Press.

Gere, Anne Ruggles. *Writing Groups: history, theory, and implications*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1987. Print.

Glenn, Cheryl and Melissa Goldthwaite. *The St. Martin's Guide to Teaching Writing.* 7th ed. Boston, Bedford/St. Martins, 2014. Print.

Guerra, Juan. "Transcultural Citizenship: A Cultural Ecology Model" *Language Arts* 85. 4 (2008): 296-304. Print.

Guardardo, Martin and Shi, Ling. (2007). ESL Students' Experiences of Online Peer Feedback. *Computers and Composition*, 24(4), 443–461. Print.

Guthrie, W.K.C. *Greeks and Their Gods.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1955. Print.

Harklau, Linda. "From the 'Good Kids' to the 'Worst': Representations of English Language Learners Across Educational Settings." In Matuda, Cox, Jordan, and Ortmeier-Hooper. 103-130. Print.

Haswell, Richard. "NCTE/CCCC's Recent War on Scholarship." *Written Communication* 22.2 (2005): 198-223. Print.

Hawisher, Gail and Cynthia Self. "The Rhetoric of Technology and the Electronic Writing Class." In Corbett, Myers, and Tate. 129-138. Print.

Haynie, Devon. "Number of International College Students Continues to Climb." *U.S. News and World Report*. 14 November 2104. Web. 7 December 2014. <http://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/articles/2014/11/17/number-of-international-college-students-continues-to-climb>.

Hedgcock, John and Natalie Lefkowitz. "Feedback on Feedback: Assessing Learner Receptivity to Teacher Response in L2 Composing." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 3.2 (1994): 141-163. Print.

Henry, Jim and Lehua Ledbetter. "Teaching Intellectual Teamwork in WAC Courses Through Peer Review." *Currents in Teaching and Learning* 3.2 (2011): 4-21. Print.

Hewett, Beth. "Characteristics of Interactive Oral and Computer-Mediated Peer Group Talk and Its Influence on Revision." *Computers and Composition* 17 (2000): 265–288. Print.

Hicks, Troy and Kristen Hawley Turner. "No Longer a Luxury: Digital Literacy Can't Wait." *English Journal* 102.6 (2013): 58–65. Print.

Ho, Mei C., and Sandra L. Savignon. "Face-To-Face and Computer-Mediated Peer Review in EFL Writing." *CALICO Journal* 24.2 (2007): 269–290. Print.

Honeycutt, Lee. "Comparing E-mail and Synchronous Conferencing in Online Peer Response." *Written Communication* 18.1 (2001): 26-60. Print.

Horner, Bruce, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Kei Matsuda. *Cross-Language Relations in Composition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2010. Print.

Hoy, Cheryl and Kristine Blair. "Paying Attention to Adult Learners Online: The Pedagogy and Politics of Community." *Computers and Composition* 23 (2006): 32–48. Print.

Hunzer, Kathleen. Ed. *Collaborative Learning and Writing: Essays on Using Small Groups in Teaching English and Composition.* Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland and Company, 2012. Print.

Hyde, Michael and Craig Smith. "Hermeneutics and Rhetoric: A Seen But Unobserved Relationship." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 65.4 (1979): 347-363. Print.

Ives, Lindsey, Elizabeth Leahy, Anni Leming, Tom Pierce, and Michael Schwartz. "'I Don't Know If That Was the Right Thing To Do': Cross-Disciplinary/Cross-Institutional

Faculty Respond to L2 Writing." In *WAC and Second-Language Writers: Research Towards Linguistically and Culturally Inclusive Programs and Practices*. Eds Terry Myers Zawacki and Michelle Cox. Anderson, South Carolina: Parlor Press, 2014. 211-232. Print.

Jarratt, Susan. *Rereading the Sophists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991. Print.

Jin, Li and Wei Zhu. "Dynamic Motives in ESL Computer-Mediated Peer Response." *Computers and Composition* 27.4 (2010): 284–303.Print.

Johnson, Donna and Duane Roen. "Complimenting and Involvement in Peer Reviews: Gender Variation." *Language in Society*, 21.1 (1992): 27-57. Print.

Johnson, Thomas "A Comment on 'Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind'" *College English* 48.1 (1986): 76. Print.

Kastman Breuch, Lee-Ann. *Virtual Peer Review: Teaching and Learning About Writing in Online Environments*. State U of New York P, 2004. Print.

Kells, Michelle Hall. "Writing Across Communities: Deliberation and the Discursive Possibilities of WAC." *Reflections* 11.1 (2007): 87-108. Print.

Kennedy, Krista and Rebecca Moore Howard. "Collaborative Writing, Print to Digital" In Tate, Rupiper, Schick, and Hessler. 37-54. Print.

Kent, Thomas. *Paralogic Rhetoric*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1993. Print.

Kurtz, S. & Connor, U. M. "Exploring the Dynamics of Cross-Cultural Collaboration in Writing Classrooms." *The Writing Instructor 10* (1990): 19-28. Print.

Lauer, Claire. "Contending with Terms: 'Multimodal' and 'Multimedia' in the Academic and Public Spheres." In *Multimodal Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed Clarie Lutkewitte. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin, 2014. 22-41. Print.

Leki, Ilona. "Meaning and Development of Academic Literacy in a Second Language." In Glenn and Goldwaite. 436-448. Print.

Leverenz, Carrie Shirley. "Peer Response in the Multicultural Composition Classroom: Dissensus—A Dream (Deferred)." *Journal of Advanced Composition* 14.1 (1994): 167-86.

Lindemann, Erika. *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*. 4th ed. New York, Oxford UP, 2001. Print.

Liu, Jun and Jette Hansen. *Peer Response in Second Language Writing Classrooms*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2002. Print.

Liu, Jun and Randall Sadler. "The Effect and Affect of Peer Review in Electronic Versus Traditional Modes on L2 Writing." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 2(2003): 193–227. Print.

MacLeod, Laura. "Computer-Aided Peer Review of Writing." *Business Communication Quarterly* 62.5 (1999):87-94. Print.

Mangelsdorf, Kate. "Peer Review in the ESL Composition Classroom: What do the Students Think?" *ELT Journal* 46 (1992): 274-284. Print.

"Map, Base." *World Atlas*. "Glossary of Cartography and Map Terminology." Web. 8 January 2015. <http://www.worldatlas.com/mapterms.htm>.

Matsuda, Paul Kei, Michelle Cox, Jay Jordan, and Christina Ortmeier-Hooper. *Second-Language Writing in the Composition Classroom: A Critical Sourcebook*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2006. Print.

Matsuda, Paul. "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. Composition." In Glenn and Goldwaite. 449-462. Print.

Matsuda, Paul and Matthew Hammill. "Second Language Writing Pedagogy." In Tate, Rupiper, Taggart, Schick, and Hessler. 266-282. Print.

McGroarty, Mary and Wei Zhu. (1997). "Triangulation in Classroom Research: A Study of Peer Revision." *Language Learning* 45 (1997): 605–655. Print.

Melkun, Cherly. "Working With Groups Online: Collaborating With Web Conferencing." In Hunzer. 130-141. Print.

Mendonca, Cássia and Karen Johnson. "Peer Review Negotiations: Revision Activities in ESL Writing Instruction." *TESOL Quarterly* 28. 4 (1994): 745-769. Print.

Mezeske, Barbara. "How I Conquered Peer Review." In *More Ways to Handle the Paper Load: On Paper and Online*. Ed. Jeffrey Golub. NCTE, 2005. 57-62.

Miller, Carolyn. "Rhetorical Community: the Cultural Basis of Genre." In Aviva Freadman and Peter Medway. 67-78. Print.

Miller, Susan K. "Using Group Conferences to Respond to Essays in Progress." In Roen et al. 307-318.

Min, Hui-Tzu. "The Effects of Trained Peer Review on EFL Students' Revision Types and Writing Quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 15(2006): 118–141.Print.

MIT Tech TV. "No One Writes Alone: Peer Review in the Classroom, A Guide For Students." 2011. Web. 9 December 2014. <http://techtv.mit.edu/videos/14629-no-one-writes-alone-peer-review-in-the-classroom-a-guide-for-students>.

----. "No One Writes Alone: Peer Review in the Classroom, A Guide for Instructors." 2011. Web 9 December 2014. <http://techtv.mit.edu/videos/14628-no-one-writes-alone-peer-review-in-the-classroom-a-guide-for-instructors>.

Miller, Carolyn. "Rhetorical Community: the Cultural Basis of Genre." In Aviva Freadman and Peter Medway. 67-78. Print.

Moran, Michael and Michelle Ballif. Eds. *Twentieth-Century Rhetorics and Rhetoricians: Critical Studies and Sources*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2000. Print.

Moss, Beverly J., Nels P. Highberg, and Melissa Nicolas. Eds. *Writing Groups Inside and Outside the Classroom*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004. Print.

Mumma, John. "What Works For Me." *TETYC* (2002): 427-428. Print.

Murphy, James. *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Modern America*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001. Print.

NCTE Commission on Composition. "Teaching Composition: A Position Statement." *College English* 46 (1984): 612-14. Print.

Nelson, Gayle, Joan Carson, Ned Danison, and Linda Gajdusek. "Social Dimensions of Second-Language Writing Instruction." In *Composing Social Identity in Written Language*. Ed. Donald Rubin. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995. 89-110. Print.

Nelson, Gayle and Joan Carson. "ESL Students' Perceptions of Effectiveness in Peer Response Groups." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7 (1998): 113-132. Print.

Newkirk, Thomas. "Direction and Misdirection in Peer Response" *CCC* 35.3 (1984): 301-311. Print.

Oetzel, John. *Intercultural Communication: A Layered Approach*. New York: Pearson, 2009. Print.

Olson-Horswill, Laurie. "Online Writing Groups." *TETYC* (2002): 188-197. Print.

Palmer, Richard. "The Liminality of Hermes and the Meaning of Hermeneutics." 2001. Web. 15 October 2014. <http://www.mac.edu/faculty/richardpalmer/liminality.html>.

Paton, Fiona. "Approaches to Productive Peer Review." In Eds. Roen, Duane, Veronica Pantoja, Lauren Yena, Susan Miller, and Eric Waggoner. Eds. *Strategies for Teaching First-Year Composition*. Urbana: NCTE, 2002. 290-307. Print.

Paulus, Trena. "The Effect of Peer and Teacher Feedback on Student Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8.3 (1999): 265-289. Print.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Art of the Contact Zone." *Profession* (1991): 33-40. Print.

Rehling, Louise. "Writing Together: Gender's Effects on Collaboration." *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 26.2 (1996): 163-76.

Rehling, Louise. "Improving Teamwork Through Awareness of Conversational Styles." *Business Communication Quarterly* 67.4 (2004): 475-482. Print.

Reid, Joy. "'Eye' Learners and 'Ear' Learners: Identifying the Language Needs of International Students and U.S. Resident Writers." In Matsuda, Cox, Jordan, Ortmeier-Hooper. 76-88.

Reid, Shelley. "Peer Review: Successful From the Start" *The Teaching Professor* 20.8 (2006): 3. Print.

Richards, Daniel. "Why Peer Review?" *Writing Commons*. 2013. Ed. Joseph Moxley. Web. 15 November 2014. <http://writingcommons.org/open-text/collaboration/peer-review>.

Roen, Duane. "A Possible Sequence of Peer-Group Responses to a Student's Emerging Text: Autobiographical Essay." In Roen et. 318-324.

Roen, Duane, Veronica Pantoja, Lauren Yena, Susan Miller, and Eric Waggoner. Eds. *Strategies for Teaching First-Year Composition*. Urbana: NCTE, 2002. Print.

Roskelly, Hephzibah. "The Risky Business of Group Work." 123-128. In Corbett, Myers, and Tate. Print.

Rothschild, Dennie and Felicia Klingenberg. "Self and Peer Evaluation of Writing in the Intensive ESL Classroom." *TESL Canada Journal* 8.1(1990): 52-65.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones Royster. "When the First Voice You Hear is Not Your Own." In Glenn and Goldwaite. 401-411. Print.

Rubin, Lois. "'I Just Think Maybe You Could . . .': Peer Critiquing Through Online Conversations." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 29.4 (2002): 382-92. Print.

Ruecker, Todd. "Analyzing and Addressing the Effects of Native Speakerism on Linguistically

    Diverse Peer Review." 91-106. In *Peer Pressure, Peer Power: Theory and Practice in*

    Peer Review and Response for the Writing Classroom. Eds Steven Corbett, Michelle

    LaFrance, and Teagan Decker. Southlake, TX: Fountainhead Press, 2014. Print.

Sadri, Houman and Madelyn Flammia. *Intercultural Communication: A New Approach to*

    International Relations and Global Challenges. New York: Continuum International

    Publishing Group, 2011. Print.

Salahub, Jill. "Peer Review." Colorado State University. *Writing@CSU. 2014.*

    http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/pdfs/guide43.pdf. Web. 9 February 2014.

Schendel, Ellen, Michael Neal, and Cecilia Hartley. "Toward a Theory of Online Collaboration."

    In Eds. Jeffrey Galin and Carol Peterson Haviland.195-208. Print.

Schiappa, Edward. *Protagoras and Logos: A Study in Greek Philosophy and Rhetoric*.

    Columbia: University of South Carolina P, 2003. Print.

Schreiber, Evelyn. "Muddles and Huddles: Facilitating a Multicultural Workforce

    Through Team Management Theory" *The Journal of Business Communication* 33.4

    (1996): 459-473. Print.

Selfe, Cynthia. "Technology and Literacy: A Story About the Perils of Not Paying Attention."

    College Composition and Communication 50.3 (1999): 411–436. Print.

Shea, Kelly. "Keeping Up with the Future: Using Technology to Facilitate Small-Group

    Collaboration in the Writing Classroom." In Hunzer. 99-108. Print.

Shirley, Sue. "Modeling Peer Review Techniques Through Group Conferences." *Teaching*

    English in the Two-Year College 24.1 (1997): 63. Print.

Sirc, Geoffrey and Tom Reynolds. "The Face of Collaboration in the Networked Writing

    Classroom." *Computers and Composition* 7.3 (1990): 53-70. Print.

Smith, D.W. "Some Difficulties With Collaborative Learning." *JAC* 9 (1989): 45-58. Print.

Spear, Karen. *Sharing Writing: Peer Response Groups in English Classes*. Portsmouth, NH:

    Boyton/Cook Publishers, 1988. Print.

Spigelman, Candace. *Across Property Lines*: *Textual Ownership in Writing Groups*. Carbondale:

    Southern Illinois UP, 2000. Print.

Stewart, Donald. "Collaborative Learning and Composition: Boon or Bane? *Rhetoric Review* 7.1

    (1988): 58-83. Print.

Strawbridge, Matthew. *Netiquette: Internet Etiquette in The Age of the Blog*. Software

    Reference, 2006. Print.

Strenski, Ellen, Caley O'Dwyer-Feagin, and Jonathan Singer. "Email Small Group Peer Review

    Revisited." *Computers and Composition* 22 (2005): 191–208. Print.

Tang, Gloria and Joan Tithecott. "Peer Response in ESL Writing." *TESL Canada Journal.* 16.2

    (1999):20-38.Print.

Tannacito, Terry. "Teaching Professional Writing Online With Electronic Peer Response."

    Kairos: A Journal for Teachers of Writing in Webbed Environments 6.2 (2001). Web. 18

    November 2014.

    <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/6.2/binder2.html?coverweb/de/tannacito/Index.htm>.

Tannen, Deborah. *That's Not What I Meant: How Conversational Styles Make or Break*

    Relationships. New York: Harper Collins, 1986. Print.

---. *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends*. Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

Tate, Gary, Amy Rupiper, Taggart, Kurt Schick, and H. Brooke Hessler. *A Guide to Composition*

    Pedagogies. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford UP, 2014. Print.

Taylor, Todd. "The Persistence of Difference in Networked Classrooms: Non-Negotiable

      Difference and the African American Student Body." In Corbett, Myers, and Tate.

      113-122. Print.

Ting-Toomey, Stella and John Oetzel. *Managing Intercultural Conflict Effectively*.

      Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2001. Print.

Trim, Michelle. *What Every Student Should Know About Practicing Peer Review*. New York:

      Pearson/Longman, 2007.

Trimbur, John. "Consensus and Difference in Collaborative Learning." *College English* 51. 6

      (1989): 602-616. Print.

Tsui, Amy and Maria Ng. "Do Secondary L2 Writers Benefit From Peer Comments?"

      Journal of Second Language Writing, 9.2 (2000): 147-170. Print.

U. S. Census Bureau. "Characteristics of People by Language Spoken at Home." 14 December

      2010. Web. <http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/STTable?_bm=y&-qr_ name=ACS

      _2009_5YR_G00_S1601&-geo_id=01000US&-ds_name=ACS_2009_5YR_G00_&-

      _lang=en&-redoLog=false&-CONTEXT=st>

University of South Florida. *MyReviewers*. 2014. Web 4 December 2014.

      <http://myreviewers.com/about/peer-review/>.

--- "History." 4 December 2014. <http://myreviewers.com/about/>

---"Peer Review." 4 December 2014. <http://myreviewers.com/about/peer-review/>

Valdez, Guadalupe. "Bilingual Minorities and Language Issues in Writing: Toward

      Professionwide Response to a New Challenge." In Matsuda, Cox, Jordan, and

      Ortmeier-Hopper. 31-70. Print.

Vatalaro, Paul. "Putting Students in Charge of Peer Review." *The Journal of Teaching Writing*

      9.1 (1990): 21-29. Print.

Villanueva, Victor and Kristin L. Arola *Cross-Talk in Composition Theory*. 3rd edition. NCTE,

> 2011. Print.

Villanueva, Victor. "'*Memoria*' Is a Friend of Ours: On the Discourse of Color." *College English*

> 67.1 (2004): 9-19.

Vie, Stephanie. "Digital Divide 2.0: 'Generation M' and Online Social Networking Sites in the

> Composition Classroom." *Computers and Composition* 25 (2008): 9-23. Print.

Volz, Tracy and Ann Saterbak. "Students' Strengths and Weaknesses in Evaluating Technical

> Arguments as Revealed Through Implementing Calibrated Peer Review in a

> Bioengineering Laboratory." *Across the Disciplines 6*. 2009. Web. 14 September 2013.

> <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/technologies/volz_saterbak.cfm>.

Vygotsky, L.S. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*.

> Cambridge, Mass: Harvard U P, 1978. Print.

Wardle, Elizabeth. "'Is This What Yours Sounds Like?' The Relationship of Peer Response to

> Genre Knowledge and Authority." In *Multiple Literacies for the 21st Century*. Eds. Brian

> Huot, Beth Stroble, Charles Bazerman. Creskill, NJ*:* Hampton Press, 2004. 93-193

---. "'Mutt Genres' and the Goal of FYC: Can We Help Students Write the Genres of the

> University?" *College Composition and Communication* 60.4 (2009). 765-789. Print.

Wirtz, Jason. "Writing Courses Live and Die by the Quality of Peer Review." In Hunzer. 5-16.

Wolfe, Joanna. *Team Writing: A Guide to Working in Groups*. Boston: Bedford/St Martin, 2010.

> Print.

----. *Team Writing: A Guide to Working in Groups*. 2010. Accessed 18 February 2015.

> <http://bcs.bedfordstmartins.com/teamwriting1e/default.asp?s=&n=&i=&v=&o=&ns=0

> &u id=0&rau=0>. Web.

Woods, Peggy. "Moving Beyond 'This is Good' in Peer Response." In *Practice in Context:*
Situating the Work of Writing Teachers. Eds Cindy Moore and Peggy O'Neill.
Urbana, NCTE. 2002. 187-195. Print.

Zamel, Vivian. "Strangers in Academia: The Experiences of Faculty and ESL Students Across
the Curriculum." In Corbett, Myers, and Tate. 100-112. Print.

Zhang, Shuqiang. "Rexamining the Affective Advantage of Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing
Class." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 4 (1995): 209-222. Print.

Zhu, Wei. "Interaction and Feedback in Mixed Peer Response Groups." In Matsuda, Cox,
Jordan, and Ortmeier-Hooper. 186-209. Print.