



GÖTEBORGS
UNIVERSITET

Peer response on writing in a Swedish EFL classroom

A study from a student perspective

Sofia Hansson
Ämneslärarprogrammet



Degree essay: 15 hp
Course: LGEN1A
Level: Advanced level
Term/year: VT2016
Supervisor: Pia Köhlmyr
Examiner: Anne Dragemark Oscarson
Code: VT16-1160-005-LGEN1A

Keywords: Peer response, writing, EFL classroom, student perspective

Abstract

Peer response is a widely researched subject, however, research of it is lacking in the Swedish context, in spite of it being part of the Swedish curriculum for English (Skolverket, 2011a). It has proven to be beneficial for students, but mostly on university level thus far (see for example Zhao, 2014; Min, 2005; Cheng & Warren, 2005). Having taken this into consideration, this study set out to answer how students in one class at a Swedish upper secondary school perceive peer response, as well as if the use of peer response affects their writing. In order to answer these questions a questionnaire was administered to 23 students, and seven interviews were conducted. The students' writing was also collected both prior to, and after having used peer response in order to make an analysis of the changes in their writing possible.

The study shows that the students preferred receiving feedback to giving feedback, but still considered themselves learning much through the act of the latter. Analysis of their writing also indicates that they did learn through using peer response, as both the content and form of their writing showed improvements in their final drafts. Finally, the results of this study indicate that the students did benefit from using peer response, and that they themselves also perceived it as beneficial and were willing to work with it more.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Previous research	4
2.1	Positive aspects	4
2.2	Negative aspects	5
2.3	Effects on students' writing	6
3	Method	7
3.1	Overview	7
3.2	Participants and materials	7
3.3	Procedure	8
3.3.1	Analysis of written texts	10
3.4	Limitations	11
3.5	Ethical considerations	12
4	Results	12
4.1	Giving peer response	13
4.2	Receiving peer response	15
4.3	Opinions on peer response	17
4.4	Students' suggestions for working with peer response	18
4.5	Effects on writing	19
5	Discussion	22
6	Conclusion	26
	References	29
	Appendix A – Questionnaire	
	Appendix B – Permission letter	
	Appendix C – Interview protocol	

1 Introduction

As teachers we want for our students to reach the best possible results and learn as much as possible along the way. For this to become reality students need to have the opportunity to receive feedback on their work before handing it in for grading, so that they can revise and improve in areas where there is such a need. In most instances teachers are the ones to provide this feedback, calling it formative assessment. However, as teachers often have a great number of projects and students to focus on, they might not always be capable of providing the feedback needed for students to develop their texts due to time constraints and work load. One solution to this problem is the use of peer response. This is sometimes also called peer feedback, and these two will be used interchangeably throughout this paper.

Peer response is a type of formative assessment, that is, a type of assessment which focuses on the progress of learning and improving, rather than assigning a summative grade (Hedge, 2000). Peer response is based on students giving each other feedback, which in turn would save the teacher time and at the same time allow the students to receive the much needed feedback. However, the benefits of peer response are not possible to reach unless the students feel comfortable using it.

A growing body of research has already been carried out showing the importance and interest in peer response all over the world. Many researchers have found it to be beneficial for students by for example increasing students' sense of self-regulation, increased awareness of their own writing and improved grammar and organization of their texts (see, for example Min, 2005; Zhao, 2014; Rothschild & Klingenberg, 1990). However, there are also difficulties that need to be addressed in order for peer response to work as efficiently as possible in classrooms. Firstly, students are sometimes concerned that their peers do not possess the language proficiency that it would take to provide useful feedback (Hu, 2005; Rollinson, 2005; Tsui & Ng, 2000). Secondly, researchers have found friendship bias to be a problem among students (Cheng & Warren, 2005; Harris & Brown, 2013; Tang & Tithecott, 1999). Lastly, students sometimes feel uncertain about their own language proficiency and ability to provide helpful comments (Bryant & Careless, 2010; Alstaedther & Doolittle, 2014).

In the Swedish curriculum for English, it is stated in one of the criteria for all English courses in upper secondary school, that students need to be able to improve their own writing and make changes that further that goal (Skolverket, 2011a). This is something that can be achieved through the use of peer response, as students are put in a position where they both

have to read someone else's interpretation of a task, and also have to reflect their own writing when having received feedback on it from a classmate. This claim is supported by the fact that peer response is a part of the assessment support made for Swedish schools (Skolverket, 2011a, p. 22-23), where this kind of activity is claimed to help students develop an understanding of the assessment criteria used in school, as well as it creates a way for students to experience a multitude of ways in which a task can be solved. Finally, peer response is included in the core content of all English courses (Skolverket, 2011b) in upper secondary school, making it an obligatory part of the Swedish EFL classroom.

Much has already been written on peer response in both the EFL and ESL classrooms. However, the research is lacking regarding Swedish school environments, and concerning writing in particular. Berggren (2013, p. 2) concludes that much of previous research on peer response has been conducted on a higher education level, leaving problems as the differences are many compared to secondary school. Among these she lists for example proficiency level of the students and time available to finish a certain task. The aim of the present study is therefore to explore what students in one class in a Swedish upper secondary school think of using peer response, and to explore how it can be improved in order for more learning to take place. This study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What do Swedish upper secondary school students think of giving peer response on a written text?
2. What do Swedish upper secondary school students think of receiving peer response on a written text?
3. What do some students believe that peer response can help them with?
4. How would some students like to work with peer response?
5. Does feedback from peers help students improve their writing? If so, in what ways?

2 Previous research

As mentioned earlier, a substantial amount of research on peer response has been carried out, both concerning students' perceptions, and effects on writing. This section strives to summarize part of the research that has been made, starting with positive and negative aspects of peer response as seen by students, which will be followed by a section on effects on student writing.

2.1 Positive aspects

First of all, the use of peer response rests on the notion that learning happens in interaction with other people, or in this case students, as seen in the sociocultural perspective (Lightbown & Spada, 2013; Tornberg, 2009). That is, when students talk to each other in the classroom, they can help each other forward. What they cannot do on their own, they can often do with the help of a classmate. Furthermore, learning is promoted through thinking about your own learning, so called metacognitive strategies (Cook, 2008). Metacognitive strategies help students reflect on their own learning, and the ways in which they learn (Hedge, 2000), which is something that peer response is thought to promote. Through reading the texts of others, students will hopefully become more aware about their own writing, and discover aspects of their own writing that were not visible to them before. To sum up, sociocultural theory and metacognitive theory are the basis for peer response and its perceived benefits.

Min (2005) conducted a study on university students from Taiwan, and found that the students claimed peer response was beneficial for their vocabulary learning. When trying to provide useful suggestions for their classmates, they needed to look up new words, which led them to learn these and incorporate them in their vocabulary. Moreover, students reported an increased awareness of their own writing and mistakes they made as a consequence of giving feedback.

Similar benefits were found by Zhao (2014) who worked with students at a Chinese university. They stated that it was helpful to read their classmates' writing, as it could work as an inspiration for using both new structures and words. Furthermore, if the text contained errors, this was claimed to help as well, since the same mistakes were sometimes made by themselves. In addition to this, students claimed that their classmates had the ability to detect mistakes that they themselves missed.

Hu (2005) carried out a study including Chinese EFL students during a three-year period. The students worked extensively with peer response, and training was incorporated into the program to make students more confident in their ability to use it. Students later reported several benefits including learning through reading each other's texts as well as through providing suggestions for their peers. Furthermore, the students believed their classmates came up with valuable suggestions for them to use when revising, as well as they felt it motivating that other students were reading their texts. Finally, in similarity to Zhao's (2014) findings, students claimed that their classmates could find mistakes that them themselves were unable to detect.

In a study on the effects of training on peer response, Rothschild and Klingenberg (1990) found positive attitudes among the students, especially after having gone through training. The benefits included improved ideas for writing, improved writing in general as well as improved organization of their texts and improved grammar. Moreover, students perceived the act of giving feedback more helpful than receiving feedback when revising their texts.

A study by Tsui and Ng (2000) that was carried out in a Chinese secondary school reported benefits as expressed by the students. Ownership of text was something that the students learned to develop, which means that they themselves felt responsible to make decisions about their own writing. In addition to this, students became more aware of their own writing through giving feedback, as well as they appreciated having classmates read their writing as they were positive this could help them improve.

Tang and Tithecott (1999) conducted a study at a Canadian university with international students. The benefits found in the study were an increased self-confidence and language awareness, as well as reading their texts out loud helped students detect mistakes in their writing. Lastly, students provided each other with scaffolding when working with peer response. This means that they gave and asked for clarifications, instructed each other and restated information to show that they had understood what was being said.

Finally, according to Finch (2014) and Berggren (2013) peer response has the potential to help students with for example organization of their texts, inspiration, grammar and writing as a whole.

2.2 Negative aspects

Cheng and Warren (2005) carried out a study at a Chinese university to investigate students' perceptions of peer response, and found that so called friendship bias was a problem. Students

claimed to not wanting to hurt their friends, which in turn led them to assign unfair marks when put in a position to provide peer response for a close friend. Moreover, the students did not feel competent enough in the English language to provide valid and helpful feedback. Tang and Tithecott (1999) found student opinions of the same kind in their study.

Much like Cheng and Warren (2005), Harris and Brown (2013) found friendship bias in their study. In addition to this, they found that students were worried about their own ability to accurately assess their classmates. Students in the study also tended to rate teacher response higher than peer response, which might have been affected by the fact that the students were concerned that their classmates would mark their writing inaccurately. In addition to this, students who rate teacher response higher than peer response might sometimes be unwilling to use the feedback provided by their classmates (Hu & Lam, 2009).

As already seen above, students are sometimes afraid that the comments produced by their classmates will not be valid. Even if the students would succeed in providing helpful and valid comments, the students were not certain of their ability to distinguish between comments that were of use and ones that were not, and would therefore not use any of them in their revisions (Hu, 2005). Similar results were found by Tsui and Ng (2000) whose participants were sometimes of the opinion that since they could not trust their classmates to give valid comments, they could not even take the comments into consideration. If they already knew they would not be useful, they did not want to bother with them. Finch (2014) found this as well, as his participants felt that peer response was not helpful due to their classmates' lacking language proficiency.

Bryant and Careless' (2010) study in a primary school in China showed that students were concerned that their classmates would be upset if faced with feedback that was critical. In addition to this, students who did not value their own proficiency highly would assume that their more proficient classmates were correct in their writing, and would therefore not comment on it. Similar results were found by Alstaedter and Doolittle (2014), where students felt uncertain about their language proficiency and in turn felt unsure that they were proficient enough to give correct suggestions for revision.

2.3 Effects on students' writing

Berggren's (2013) study at a Swedish lower secondary school concerning giving feedback, showed that students learn from this in numerous ways. Firstly, giving feedback prompted students to think about how they could use paragraphing in their writing. Secondly, the

content as such was affected, as reading the texts of others worked as inspiration for the students. Thirdly, students borrowed words and grammatical patterns from their classmates' texts, which might indicate understanding and learning.

Tang and Tithecott (1999) found that the participants in their study were helped and changed their writing after having received feedback. For instance, clarifications were made in the texts after classmates had stated that they did not entirely understand. The same phenomenon was showed by Tsui and Ng (2000). In their study, students claimed to have been made aware of their texts with the help of their classmates, which made them want to make revisions to further explain words and trains of thought.

Changes in writing were found to mostly concern grammar, content and vocabulary (Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998) among Puerto Rican college students. The students used peer response mostly to correct mistakes, but also to improve already correct language.

3 Method

Below follows information on this mixed methods study, the methods used and the participating students, followed by limitations of the study and ethical considerations that have been made in the process.

3.1 Overview

In order to answer the research questions, an explanatory mixed methods approach was used. The first part consisted of a questionnaire asking for the students' attitudes and opinions regarding peer response. The second part was semi-structured individual interviews with questions based on information from the students' questionnaires. Lastly, texts from the students were analyzed. The analysis then added in depth information to that already provided by the questionnaires and the interviews.

3.2 Participants and materials

The data collection took place during my teacher training practice at an upper secondary school, making the participating students a sample of convenience. The students studied at the social studies program, and they were in their first year of upper secondary school. 17 students (74%) in this study had worked with peer response in school prior to the study. They

were 16-17 years old and 28 students participated. I was the teacher in English for this group during an eight-week period.

The data collection consisted of a questionnaire (see Appendix A) adapted from Finch (2013) and Alstaedter and Doolittle (2014), which was handed out in paper form and filled in by 23 students. The questions concerned feelings and attitudes towards both receiving and giving feedback to classmates. In addition to this, questions on pros and cons with using peer response were included. The questionnaire was written, and answered, in Swedish to make sure all students understood the questions and would be willing to answer them in as much detail as possible.

Interviews were also conducted, in which 7 students participated. The interviews were carried out in Swedish and the students volunteered to participate (Appendix C). They were semi-structured, one-on-one interviews to make sure as best as possible that the students felt safe to express their honest feelings and opinions. Since the peer response had been done in pairs it was desirable to let the student talk about their experience without other students listening, as I did not want to risk anyone saying something that might upset another student. Furthermore, this way the students hopefully felt they could provide truthful answers, as no one but me would hear them. The 12 students who had volunteered through stating this in the questionnaire were narrowed down and chosen on the basis of their attitudes as expressed in the questionnaire. The questionnaires of the volunteering students were divided into two piles, one with students who were more positive towards peer response and one with students who were more skeptical. From there, eight questionnaires were randomly chosen, so that the selection would not be affected by my knowledge and opinions of the students. However, only seven interviews were carried out due to time constraints. This whole procedure was done so that both positive and negative aspects of using peer response could be included.

Lastly, the students' writing was collected. Three samples from each participating student were collected; one first draft, one second draft, as well as a final draft. The feedback they gave and received was also collected.

3.3 Procedure

This study is based on a short story project that was introduced to the students, which they later worked with during a five-week period. The project consisted of reading three short stories and then writing your own short story based on one of the ones we had read. Each

lesson was devoted to different criteria specific for short stories, and the students were to use every lesson to work on their texts. Furthermore, an explanatory sequential mixed methods design (Creswell, 2014) was used, since both quantitative and qualitative data was collected. Moreover, the students' answers from the questionnaires were analyzed and used in designing the interview questions, so as to make it possible to ask for clarifications and explanations.

The students were informed about the study and how they could contribute. I explained on several occasions that it was voluntary to participate, as well as it was confidential. It was also pointed out multiple times that participation in the study would not affect their grade on the assignment in any way. Notes were sent home to the students' parents to sign (see Appendix B), as the students were not of legal age. All consent forms were not handed in as some of the students lost them on several occasions and/or forgot to give them to either their parents or me. As no information of sensitive character was to be asked for in neither the questionnaire nor the interviews, I decided to ask the students' principal for permission to carry out the study. They saw no problem with this and gave their permission.

After two weeks of talking about, as well as writing, short stories, we had our first peer response session. This session was mainly focused on content and not form as this was to be brought up during the second peer response session. Criteria was presented on which to base the feedback on, and the students had the opportunity to practice giving feedback in pairs on a paragraph constructed by me. Training before using peer response has been deemed important by multiple researchers (see for example Rothschild & Klingenberg 1990; Hu, 2005; Lam, 2010; Widiati, 2003), however, due to time constraints this could not be carried out as thoroughly as was desirable. The students were divided into groups of two to three people and then they discussed what kind of feedback would be appropriate to give in order to improve the text presented to them. After 10 minutes the groups presented the feedback they had come up with and it was briefly discussed by the rest of the class. Lastly, it was explained to the students that the feedback was supposed to be given constructively and how to mark in each other's texts. The students were asked to mark the texts digitally as the class had computers which they always worked with. They were encouraged to write questions and explanations in each other's texts, and they were allowed to talk to each other afterwards to discuss and explain the feedback. Feedback groups were assigned by their regular teacher based on seating in the classroom and friend groups as interpreted by her.

Two weeks later it was time for the second peer response session. This time it was focus on form and grammar, and four aspects were chosen for the students to focus on when providing feedback. These were subject-verb agreement, consistent verb tense, prepositions

and to avoid starting sentences with “and”. These were problem areas pointed out by their regular English teacher, and therefore seemed valuable to put focus on. However, the students were told that they were still allowed to comment on content if anything showed up that needed addressing.

During the last class of the project, the questionnaire was handed out to the students who were present. They were informed once again that it was voluntary to participate and that it was confidential. The word confidential was also explained to ensure that all students felt safe and that they knew what was going to happen with the information they provided.

Lastly, the interviews with the seven students who had volunteered were conducted using the interview protocol in Appendix C. The interviews took place during a lesson, hence, the students were not required to put in extra time to participate. Each interview was audio recorded and lasted for approximately eight minutes. The design and implementation of the interviews were made with the help of McKay (2006) and Brinkmann and Kvale (2015).

After having collected the questionnaires, the data was analyzed through the use of SPSS. When constructing the questionnaire, the students were not asked to fill in their gender. However, after the first analysis was made it was clear that it might be interesting to look for gender differences. Since I had spent so much time with the students, I felt fairly comfortable with assigning each student a gender. Nonetheless, there is always a slight risk that someone was assigned a gender they do not identify with.

Finally, the students’ short stories and questionnaires were anonymized and numbered to avoid researcher bias.

3.3.1 Analysis of written texts

During the study, and short story project, the students’ writing was collected on three different occasions. Their texts were collected both before and after each peer response session, and their final drafts were sent in as well. Furthermore, the feedback that each student provided and received was written in each document, making it possible to have access to that too. Having all this material at hand made it feasible to analyze the students’ texts in order to see if any changes had been made in them with the help of feedback from a classmate.

Even though it is possible to detect revisions in their texts, it is not certain that these changes have come from the actual feedback provided. We might say it is probable in cases where exact suggestions have been adopted, but we cannot know without a doubt that the student would not have come up with that suggestion themselves if given time.

The writing of 28 students was gathered. However, not all students were present at both peer response sessions, which made it impossible to have a complete set of texts from them. Due to this, 9 student texts were chosen and analyzed. These were chosen because they were considered most interesting, because they had all three parts, and because six of them had participated in both interviews and in answering the questionnaire.

3.4 Limitations

Even though much work has been put into this study in order to guarantee as far as possible that it is valid and reliable, there is a number of aspects that might hinder this.

Firstly, the study was conducted during my teacher training practice. Consequently, I was both the teacher and the researcher in the group, possibly making it difficult to be objective. However, since this is something I am aware of, hopefully it will not be a problem when analyzing the data. Related to this is the fact that the students knew me when they filled in the questionnaire, which in turn might have made them feel like they wanted to make me happy in saying that the project had been beneficial. The questionnaire did however show very different views on the subject, making it less likely that they felt obligated to answer a certain set of alternatives.

Secondly, there was no time to carry out a pilot study, which in turn had the consequence that the questionnaires were not tested very thoroughly before they were used. However, they were proof read by the supervisor of the project and constructed according to Dörnyei's (2010) principles regarding what makes a reliable questionnaire. Furthermore, the students were asked during the interviews to have a look at the questionnaire, which was followed by a discussion concerning potentially unclear or difficult passages in the questionnaires. Provided that the students were truthful when answering, there seem to be no problems with the questions.

Thirdly, the results are not generalizable. Due to the sample being so small, one cannot generalize the results and believe them to be true for all students in the investigated age group. However, they might provide a hint regarding the opinions of students when it comes to using peer response, as well as it can provide ideas for future research. In addition, it can provide useful information that will benefit this particular group.

Lastly, when it comes to the investigation of the students' drafts and final versions of their writing, it is not completely possible to discern what changes were brought about by the feedback from peers, and what changes would have occurred even without the help from a

peer. In spite of this, it is an interesting aspect to investigate. Moreover, if a suggestion has been made by a peer, and then been used in a later draft or final version, one might assume that it has at least something to do with the received feedback.

3.5 Ethical considerations

Some ethical considerations were made in the process of working with this project in order to guarantee the best possible outcome and result for the students, as well as reliability and validity of the study.

The students participating in this study are 16 years old, which means that they have not yet reached legal age. Because of this, the students' parents were asked for permission to let their children participate in the study. Of course the students were also asked, and if they wished not to participate, they did not have to, which was made clear to them on several occasions. The parents were asked permission through a letter (see Appendix B) which was written in both Swedish and English to guarantee to the greatest possible extent that all parents would understand it. They were asked to sign the letter and send it back to school with their child. In spite of several reminders, all students did not return the letters with a signature from their parents. To be able to proceed with the study, the principal was asked for permission as well. Since no sensitive information was to be asked from the students, this was a possible solution (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002).

Another consideration that had to be made was concerning the interviews. These were conducted individually, as opposed to in groups, in order to avoid friendship bias. This was also done to guarantee as far as possible that the answers provided in the interviews would be truthful. In doing this, the students hopefully felt safe in saying exactly what they felt, and they did not need to take their classmates' feelings or opinions into consideration when answering the questions.

4 Results

The results are presented in the order of the research questions. That is, first students' opinions on giving peer response are presented (4.1), followed by students' views on receiving peer response (4.2). In addition to this, students' opinions on peer response as a whole (4.3) as well as their ideas on how to work with peer response (4.4) are included. Lastly, the ways in which students changed their texts after having received peer response

(4.5) will be found. Data from both questionnaires and interviews are included in this part. There were 23 students filling in the questionnaire, and seven students participating in interviews.

4.1 Giving peer response

This section contains the results from both questionnaires and interviews in regards to students’ opinions on giving feedback. An overview of these results can be found in table 1, and is followed by an analysis of the results. In the questionnaire the students were asked to what extent they agreed with a certain statement, their answers are presented in both frequency and percentage.

Table 1 Student opinions on giving feedback

	Much	Rather much	A little	Not at all	Missing	Total
Like to give feedback to classmates	0	8 (35%)	15 (65%)	0	0	23 (100%)
Worried about hurting classmates	1 (4%)	6 (26%)	8 (35%)	8 (35%)	0	23 (100%)
Make my classmate happy by writing nice things	1 (4%)	9 (39%)	9 (39%)	4 (17%)	0	23 (99%)
Confident of ability to point out strengths and weaknesses	1 (4%)	13 (57%)	7 (30%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	23 (99%)
Uncertain of ability to provide feedback	1 (4%)	3 (13%)	15 (65%)	4 (17%)	0	23 (99%)

Note. The total percentage is sometimes 99% due to rounding of figures.

Students were asked to what extent they like to give feedback to their classmates, to which 8 of them (35%) answered that they liked it *rather much*, and 15 of them (65%) answered that they liked it *a little*. At first sight, peer response does not seem to be something students are interested in using more in school.

When asked if they were worried that they would upset their classmate with their feedback, 6 students (26%) stated that they did so *rather much*, and 1 student (4%) stated that they worried *much*. Of the remaining 16 students, half (35%) worry *a little*, and half (35%) do *not worry at all*. However, during the interviews five out of seven students claimed that they were worried about upsetting their classmates when providing feedback. One students put it

this way “You are afraid that you will cause a conflict. You don’t dare to correct properly because they might be angry, you don’t want to make someone sad. You know that they are not the best at English, but you don’t want to fill their whole paper with corrections” (00:38). Another student said “it’s like, you’re a little scared that you’ll make someone feel sad, or that you’ll make them feel stupid if they’ve made many mistakes” (01:38).

To solve the issue of worrying about making your classmates upset or sad, several of the students suggested giving both positive and constructive feedback. They were also aware that the way the feedback is worded makes a difference. Instead of saying something is bad, they proposed saying that it can be improved.

The students were also asked if they wanted to make their classmates happy by writing nice comments. To this 10 students (43%) answered that they did this either *rather much* or *much*, while 13 students (57%) answered that they did this either *a little* or *not at all*. A gender difference was found here, 57% of the girls stated that they wanted to make their classmates happy either *much* or *rather much*. This was true for only 22% of the boys. 43% of the girls answered that they did so *a little*, while 78% of the boys answered that they only wanted to make their classmates happy with nice comments either *a little* or *not at all*. None of the girls in the study chose to answer *not at all*, which shows that it is important to all the girls to at least some extent. This was strengthened in the interviews, where it was mainly the girls who suggested that both positive and negative aspects should be brought up when giving feedback.

The third question on the questionnaire asked students to what extent they feel confident that they have the ability to find strengths and weaknesses in the texts of others. A majority of the students (57%) answered *rather much*, while 7 of them (30%) answered *a little*. Only 1 student answered *much*, and only 1 student answered *not at all*. Their confidence in finding strengths and weaknesses in texts seem to have no correlation with the way they assess their own knowledge of English. Students who claimed their knowledge of English to be *very good* did not claim to feel confident to a greater extent than did other students when it comes to assessing their classmates’ texts.

Next the students were asked if they felt uncertain of their ability to give feedback on the texts of others. 15 students (65%) responded that they felt *a little* uncertain. Only 4 students (17%) claimed to not feel uncertain at all, and the rest (4 students, 17%) felt so *rather much* or *much*. In an interview one student shared these thoughts “I never find as many mistakes as the others. There might only be a couple of small grammar mistakes. I feel like I’m not helping the other person, it feels like I’m not trying hard enough to help the other person” (02:33). Furthermore, on an open ended question about how it felt to give feedback in English, one

student wrote “A little difficult since you’re not really sure that the things you point out are actually wrong”. Similar opinions were expressed by several other students, and they all seemed to worry that they did not know what was right and wrong. There was a notion that they did not have enough knowledge to provide “correct” feedback.

When asked if they felt that providing feedback helped them develop and think about their own texts, 21 students (91%) answered *yes*. The remaining 2 students (9%) answered *no*. In addition to this, when the students were asked to describe how it felt to give feedback in English, several stated that it was a positive experience because it helped them with their own texts. For example, they suggested that discovering mistakes in someone else’s text would help them avoid making the same mistakes themselves. One person also claimed that providing feedback helped them improve their grammar. Moreover, the students felt that it was positive to read their classmates’ texts, because this gave them ideas for their own writing. To conclude, giving peer response seems to have helped the students both creatively and with grammar.

4.2 Receiving peer response

This section contains the results from both questionnaires and interviews in regards to students’ opinions on receiving feedback from their classmates. For an overview of the results, see tables 2 and 3.

Table 2 Student opinions on receiving feedback

	Much	Rather much	A little	Not at all	Missing	Total
Like to receive feedback from classmates	6 (26%)	12 (52%)	4 (17%)	0	1 (4%)	23 (99%)

Table 3 Student opinions on classmates’ suggestions

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Never	Missing	Total
Trust suggestions from classmates	5 (22%)	14 (61%)	3 (13%)	0	1 (4%)	23 (100%)
Use suggestions from classmates	5 (22%)	14 (61%)	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	0	23 (100%)
Are comments from classmates useful?	6 (26%)	14 (61%)	3 (13%)	0	0	23 (100%)

Students were asked to answer to what extent they like to receive feedback from their classmates. When answering, 6 students (26%) chose *much*, 12 students (52%) chose *rather much*, and only 4 students (17%) chose *a little*. No student chose *not at all*. Hence, receiving feedback from peers seems to have been a positive experience. This was further supported through the interviews where one student said “I like getting feedback actually. Like, if someone says that something I have written doesn’t have any mistakes I feel like they’re not telling the truth. It’s not perfect, there’s always something to improve. I like when people tell me there’s something to improve” (04:14). Several other students agreed with this view and talked about the new perspective they can gain from a classmate. They also seemed to appreciate the chance the peer response created to correct mistakes before the teacher saw their texts.

The students were also asked if they trusted the feedback provided by their classmates, to which 5 students (22%) answered *always*. A majority of 14 students (61%) answered *often* and 3 students (13%) answered *sometimes*. None of the students claimed to *never* trust the feedback they received. However, one student expressed concern in an answer to an open ended question on how it felt to receive feedback in English. They were worried that their classmate would be offended if they chose not to use their suggestions if they were wrong. Furthermore, several students seemed to be worried that their peers did not know what was right and would suggest changes that were not correct. One student stated in an interview “they’re not a teacher, so should I listen to them or should I listen to myself” (03:03), and another student said “actually, I think it’s only correct if the teacher corrects it” (04:01). To conclude, it seems like even though many of the students do trust the feedback they receive, some of them have doubts regarding the correctness and knowledge of their peers.

Next on the questionnaire followed questions on the usefulness of their classmates’ suggestions, as well as if they actually used the suggestions they received. On both questions, 14 students (61%) answered that they *often* used the suggestions and that they *often* were useful. 3 students (13%) answered that this occurred *sometimes*. 6 students (26%) and 5 students (22%) respectively answered *always*. Only one student answered *never* when asked if they used suggestions from their classmates. No students answered *never* when asked if their classmates’ suggestions were useful.

In the questionnaire the students answered who they turned to for help in improving their writing. 11 students (48%) stated that they turned to their teacher for help, while 12 students (52%) claimed that they did not do this. The students were also asked if they turn to their classmates for help, to which 9 students (39%) answered *yes* and 14 students (61%) answered

no. In addition, only 3 students (13%) claimed to use grammar books for help, and 7 students (30%) answered that they used their own knowledge when wanting to improve their writing. However, 16 students (70%) answered that they do not use their own knowledge for this. This might for example mean that they proof read their texts or double check difficult words. Since there is no way of knowing exactly how this question was interpreted by the students, it is difficult to discern what it is that they do or do not do when it comes to this matter. The students were asked during the interviews if all questions had been clear, but no specific interpretation of this question was brought up.

4.3 Opinions on peer response

It was important to try to find out what students believe that peer response can help them with, if anything. Therefore, they were asked about grammar, paragraphing, content and writing in general. Regarding grammar, 14 students (61%) believed that peer response would help them with this, while 9 students (32%) answered *no*, they did not believe peer response to be helpful when it came to grammar. The students were generally not of the opinion that feedback from classmates could help them improve their paragraphing, here 5 students (22%) answered *yes*, and 18 students (78%) answered *no*. When asked if they thought peer response could help them improve the content of their writing, 11 students (48%) answered *yes*, and 12 students (52%) answered *no*. Last but not least, a majority of 15 students (65%) were of the opinion that peer response can help them improve their writing in general. 8 students (35%) did not agree with this.

In an open ended question (question 12) in the questionnaire students were asked to answer what the advantages of using peer response can be, and several of them wrote that it is good because it can be used to detect errors. It can only be assumed here that the errors the students referred to are grammar bound, or maybe connected to spelling. One student also wrote “You can get more ideas on how to develop your text”. Furthermore, the students who were interviewed were asked if they thought that peer response can be helpful. One of these students said “they can correct careless mistakes and stuff like that that you might not notice yourself. And you get inspired, and you get suggestions from different people as well” (06:55). The students also commented that they could learn from reading their classmates’ texts, and they believed that through finding someone else’s mistakes they could avoid making the same mistakes themselves in the future. They also commented that getting inspiration from their classmates’ texts was a big part of the advantages. However, one of the

interviewees suggested that peer response can help with grades but not with knowledge. This is of course an interesting aspect to consider as a teacher wanting to use this, as the ultimate goal surely must be learning in some form. To sum up, students were overall positive to the learning benefits of peer response and thought it to be valuable when working with writing in English.

Lastly, it did not seem to matter if the students had used peer response before when it came to how much they enjoyed giving as well as receiving feedback. That is, students who has used peer response before did not enjoy using it more than student who had not used it before.

4.4 Students' suggestions for working with peer response

During the interviews with the seven students, there was an opportunity to ask them what they feel is most important when working with peer response in the classroom. They had many ideas, and here is a compilation of those ideas and opinions.

Firstly, several students felt that the most important aspect of peer response was to do it with a friend that you are close to. They agreed that when working with someone you know well, it is easier to be completely honest, which in turn will help their classmate more than if they have to hold certain opinions back. The students were not afraid to sound rude if they had the possibility to work with a close friend, which several of them felt was a risk if they did not know the person as well. However, one student highlighted that in "real life" you might not always have the possibility to choose who you work with, and therefore thought that the teacher should sometimes assign other groups.

Secondly, diverging opinions arose when it came to who should decide what groups to work in and how those groups should be assigned. One student believed it was best to have the teacher assign randomized groups, as they felt that working with friends sometimes was not taken seriously enough. They said "really, it should not be a friend, it is a little messy sometimes, and you might be too nice or too mean. Really, it should be done through some kind of lottery, then you are really forced to give that person something" (05:04). They claimed that when you do it with someone you are not close friends with, you will work harder to give them useful feedback. In contrast to this, another student claimed that they would rather help someone they know well, and work hard to help them than to help someone they do not know as well. In addition to this, one student wanted the teacher to divide them into groups so that no one is left alone, but still take into consideration who are friends and

put them in the same groups. Another student was really decisive that students should get to decide on groups or pair themselves.

Thirdly, two students brought up the idea of using anonymous peer response. This is not something that was used during this study, but something they both felt would make the use of peer response more comfortable. One of them said “could you maybe do it anonymously somehow? [...] then maybe people would feel more comfortable giving the peer response that they want to give without having to worry that the other person will be offended” (06:16).

Lastly, it was brought up by one student that it is important that the teacher goes through all aspects that the students are supposed to look at when giving feedback. This way all students can be prepared and give useful feedback to their classmates. In addition to this, it was brought up that it is of importance that the students working together should have around the same level of English. However, here one student claimed that similar levels was important, but being with a friend was even more important.

4.5 Effects on writing

An analysis of students’ suggestions on each other’s texts and the changes they made were made on nine student texts, and students have been assigned letters from A to I to tell them apart. The first peer response session focused on content and will now be called peer response one, and the second peer response session focused mainly on form and will now be called peer response two. An overview of the results can be found in table 4 below. The table shows the amount of suggestions each student received on peer response 1 and peer response 2 respectively, as well as how many of those suggestions were used in their final drafts.

Table 4 Received suggestions and used suggestions on peer response 1 and peer response 2

	Peer response 1	Used suggestions from PR1	Peer response 2	Used suggestions from PR2
Student A	3	1	1	1
Student B	5	0	6	5
Student C	2	2	1	1
Student D	4	4	24	23
Student E	3	3	1	0
Student F	3	3	8	6
Student G	3	1	3	3
Student H	4	0	1	0
Student I	3	3	12	11

Student A received 3 marks on peer response one and 1 mark on peer response two. In the final draft, 2 of the suggestions had been used, one of which was from peer response one and the other came from the second one. This student was interviewed and expressed during the interview that they had not been very happy with the peer response during this period, and said “this period I have felt that I didn’t end up with the right person, because they haven’t noticed my mistakes. They were not on the same level as me, and couldn’t correct my mistakes” (05:27). However, overall this student showed a positive attitude towards peer response and felt that it could be helpful, they had used peer response before.

Student B received 5 marks on peer response one and 6 marks on peer response two. For the final draft 5 of the suggestions had been used, all of which came from peer response two. For example, the word “free” had correctly been changed to “freely” from the second to the final draft. This student also showed a positive approach to peer response and often felt that the suggestions they received were helpful. The suggestions that were not used in the final draft regarded for example to further explain why the main character did what they did, as well as making the introduction clearer.

Student C received 2 marks on peer response one and 1 mark on peer response 2, all of them were used in the final draft of the short story. It was suggested that they changed the word “said” to vary the text a little more, which was done and it was changed to “muttered” and “begged” respectively. In addition to this, the word “smushed” was changed to “quite ruined”. This student was positive towards peer response and claimed it was helpful, but that it was difficult when you did not agree with the person providing the feedback. In spite of this, all suggestions, even though they were few, were used.

Student D received 4 marks on peer response one and 24 marks on peer response, all were used but one in the final draft. In this student’s text, many of the mistakes that were corrected had to do with the fact that the tense had been changed in the middle of the story and needed to be changed back. In addition to this, there were suggestions concerning word changes such as “ambulance ride” instead of “ride with the ambulance”, and “noticing” instead of “knowing”. All revisions that were made improved the text and made it more consistent. This student stated in an open-ended question that the feedback was needed, and they were happy to make their text better.

Student E received 3 marks on peer response one and no mark on peer response two. All feedback was used, however, this student did not receive any feedback at all between the first and final draft. In spite of this, the student reported that they were happy using peer response

and that it has helped them. The student giving the feedback claimed not to like the act of providing feedback, but did rate their own ability to point out strengths and weaknesses in the texts of others highly. The question is why this did not come out in the peer response session.

Student F received 3 marks on peer response one and 8 marks on peer response two. Out of these 11, 9 were used. Feedback that was given to this student included “avoid starting sentences with and” and “smelled like what?”, among suggestions to change verb tense and faulty verb conjugations. This student was very positive towards peer response both in the interview and when answering the questionnaire. Problems that could arise were claimed to be that you needed to be one the same level, otherwise it would not help, which it seemed to have done here. Feedback that was not used was a suggestion to change the word *stopped* and the word *to* where they were used correctly.

Student G received 3 marks on peer response one and 3 marks on peer response two, 3 in total were used for the final draft. The suggestions that were used were adding descriptions, changing *the new year* to *New Years* and changing a faulty verb conjugation. Not used were proposals to add descriptions and information. Student G did not like receiving feedback from classmates according to the questionnaire, and they did only trust the comments on their text *sometimes*. Furthermore, they did only find the comments from classmates useful *sometimes*. In the interview, they also said that it was difficult to accept feedback they knew was wrong, and they were worried that their classmate would take offence if they did not use all suggestions provided.

Student H received 4 marks on peer response one and 1 mark on peer response two. They did not use any of the feedback they were given. Four out of five comments asked for clarification and more descriptions and information about different aspects in the short story. The fifth comment suggested including a short dialogue. This student answered in the questionnaire that they both trusted and used the feedback they received to a great extent, as well as claiming it to be useful. Given that information, it is surprising that none of the feedback they received was used. In the interview they talked about peer response being a very useful way of working and that they were used to it from having used it before.

Student I received 3 marks on peer response one and 12 marks on peer response two. In the final draft, 14 of them were used. Suggestions that were used included clarifications, descriptions, more dialogue, as well not starting sentences with *so* and changing *he's* to *his*. The one suggestion that was not used was changing a correctly used *their*. This student was very positive to the use of peer response and answered in the questionnaire that they *often*

used the comments and suggestions from classmates, which seems to be true based on the analysis.

In conclusion, the peer response sessions seem to have been helpful in improving the students' texts, both with content and aspects pertaining to form, such as grammar. However, it is unfortunately not possible to detect what kind of changes might have come from providing feedback, as the texts were only analyzed on the basis of the feedback that was received.

5 Discussion

The analysis of the questionnaires, interviews and student texts have provided insights concerning students' perceptions when it comes to giving and receiving feedback, as well as it has shown how many, and what kind of, changes were made in the students' writing. These aspects will now be discussed to discern possible contributions and pedagogical implications. The research questions below will work as a basis for the discussion, but are not addressed in this exact order.

1. What do Swedish upper secondary school students think of giving peer response?
2. What do Swedish upper secondary school students think of receiving peer response?
3. What do some students believe that peer response can help them with?
4. How would some students like to work with peer response?
5. Does feedback from peers help students improve their writing? If so, in what ways?

The results clearly show that the students prefer receiving feedback as opposed to giving feedback, where a majority of the students claimed to like it *a little*. Furthermore, many of the students worried that they would upset their classmates with their comments, which is in agreement with for example Cheng and Warren (2005) and Tang and Tithecott (1999). Students tried to counteract this feeling by the want of writing nice things to their classmates to make them happy. However, it was also brought up in the interviews that one should bring up positive aspects as well as areas of improvement when giving feedback, which has also been proposed by Topping (2009) to reduce anxiety and make students feel more comfortable with feedback. Therefore, it is not certain it must be a problem that the students want to write nice things, it is only a problem if that is the only thing they write.

The students claimed that they felt certain of their own ability to find strengths and weaknesses in the texts of others to a certain extent, but it was also clear in both the

interviews and the open-ended question on the matter that they were worried that they would point out things to be incorrect when they were in fact correct, as well as worried that they would not find any mistakes in their classmates' texts. These results are in line with the findings of Harris and Brown (2013) and Alstaedther and Doolittle (2014), as well as this can explain why the students did not appreciate giving feedback to the same extent as receiving feedback.

In spite of feeling insecure about providing feedback in a helpful way, the students generally claimed they found it helpful to read the texts of others, and they stated that it helped them find mistakes in their own writing as well as it gave them inspiration. Berggren's (2013) study showed this as well, proving that the students are probably correct in their assumptions. Furthermore, this can be seen as the students developing into more autonomous learners (Hedge, 2000; Villamil & De Guerrero 1998), in the way that they take their own responsibility for their learning and that they are not relying on someone else to point out their mistakes. Having stated that, it is still important to give them support and feedback, but it is also interesting to acknowledge that peer response might have the power to help students develop into more independent learners, learners who find improvement areas in their own texts as well as in those of others.

Even though the students learned through reading the texts of others, they also improved after having received feedback. The results indicate that the students improved both when it came to content, for example clarifying confusing pieces of writing as well as adding information that the story benefitted from, and when it came to form. The students helped each other use correct verb conjugations, consistent verb tense and to form grammatically correct sentences. These findings are in line with those of Tang and Tithecott (1999). Another aspect was that students did not use all the suggestions they received, which might point to a sense of ownership of their texts (Tsui & Ng, 2000), which was not something pointed out by the students, but can be seen through the analysis. This is also an aspect that can help students foster learner autonomy, since it makes them think about their own text and make decisions for themselves and their own writing.

Friendship bias is a common problem in studies conducted in Asia, but is something that was not found in this study. Rather, the results indicate the opposite, that the students claimed to produce more faire and thoroughly worked through comments if put in the same group as a close friend. The difference found here might be explained by cultural differences, but also maybe by the fact that the class in the study all were at least relatively good friends (Azarnoosh, 2013), and most had the opportunity to work with a close friend during the

project. However, differences between comments between close friends and students who were just classmates were not investigated in this study, therefore there is no certain way of knowing if there would be a difference. In addition to this, one student did not have the opportunity to work with a close friend (student A), and was not very happy with the results of the peer response. This however, can also be connected with the fact that they did not feel their classmate competent enough to correct the mistakes made in their text. The question is if the lack of friendship bias is only true in the group at hand, or if it is generally true for Swedish upper secondary school students.

Just like student A above, several students in the study worried that their classmates were not proficient enough to give useful feedback, which is something that also has been found by Cheng and Warren (2005) and Tang and Tithecott (1999). In addition to this, the results show that multiple students trust only their teacher, or trust their teacher more than they trust their classmates. It is not clear from the results if this might have made students prone to ignoring feedback from peers because of fear they might be wrong, but there is a possibility (Hu & Lam, 2009). Moreover, the students did not receive any teacher feedback at all in this study, except for answers to questions during classes, which is an aspect that might have added to the uncertainty. If the students would have known they were to receive teacher feedback as well before final hand in, their feelings might have been different as they would have known that they did not have to depend on their classmates only. Furthermore, it is the normal case to have the teacher read the drafts as well, making the new way of working a possible source of anxiety.

In addition to being uncertain about peers' abilities to provide useful comments, the students were worried about their own, which is in line with the findings of Harris and Brown (2013) among others. Multiple students did not receive much feedback on their writing (student A, student C, student E and student H), which might have had to do with the fact that the feedback givers were uncertain if they were actually correct, or that they just did not find anything to comment on. This is of course a problem since peer response is supposed to be a helpful tool, and something needs to be done so that all students feel comfortable with that way of working. Either, more peer response training would have been needed to fully make the students comfortable with that way of working, or maybe a different type of feedback should have been asked for (Nilson, 2010), instead of asking for corrections of grammar. A different kind of feedback would be to ask the students to ask questions about each other's work, which some already did, or to highlight unclear passages, which some students also did, but not all. Moreover, it has been shown that giving feedback is more beneficial than

receiving feedback (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009), which might further encourage teachers to bring students to work thoroughly with providing feedback for each other.

When asked during the interviews how they wanted peer response to work, five out of seven students said that they wanted to either work with a close friend, or with anyone from the group as long as the teacher assigned them a partner. However, two students expressed a wish to work anonymously with peer response. That is, they did not want to know who they gave feedback to, and they did not want the person who received the feedback to know that it was from them. For them, this was a way to avoid possibly hurting their classmates' feelings with their feedback. Although this might potentially work, it takes out the element of scaffolding (Cook, 2013; Tang & Tithecott, 1999) when discussing the feedback, which is a missed learning opportunity. Moreover, if the feedback is hard to understand, there will not be a chance to have it explained. However, in Berggren's (2013) study, the students provided feedback in groups, which might also create scaffolding opportunities as they will have to discuss what kind of feedback should be included, and this could be done anonymously. If it should be done anonymously is a stance each teacher has to take. As some students claimed they would not try as hard to give useful feedback if the receiver was not a friend, it might be a problem not to know who the receiver is at all.

Students background knowledge of working with peer response might have affected the results, as 17 students (74%) stated that they had used peer response prior to the start of the project. It is not known how or to what extent they were familiar with it, or if they were in any way more competent than their classmates who had not used it. However, the possible competence that might have come with working with peer response before might have affected the results. First of all, it is possible that the students already familiar with the concept gave more extensive feedback than those who were not, which might have made the recipients of their feedback more inclined to develop positive attitudes. Secondly, it might be likely that students who had already tried peer response felt more at ease working with it than a group with no experience at all. This would possibly lead to more positive results than would normally occur in a group of the same age, which could lower the generalizability of the results.

The results can be considered to be both reliable and valid to the context in which they were carried out, but they are not generalizable to a bigger group due to the low number of participants. Furthermore, a sample of convenience was used, and no pilot was made of the questionnaire before it was used. Other aspects which can be limiting are the length of the study as well as the assignment which was used during the study. The students were asked to

write a short story, an assignment which is creative and somewhat flexible and free when it comes to form. The use of a different assignment and text type might have created different student attitudes and results.

Lastly, students believed feedback can help them with grammar, content and their overall writing, but more research is needed as to whether they are helped with these things through giving or receiving feedback. Most likely, there is a mix of both these ways of working, and it is often difficult, if not impossible, not to include both parts.

To sum up, most students enjoy and deem it helpful to receive feedback from their classmates, in addition to this, they use the feedback they receive to make improvements in their writing. Although somewhat hesitant towards giving feedback, a majority of the students in this study perceived reading the texts of others as helpful and enlightening, even though they also saw some drawbacks. The biggest drawback of using peer response was for these students that they might hurt their classmates, and that they and their classmates were not proficient enough to provide good feedback. In conclusion, it does not seem like peer response is a difficult classroom activity to have the students enjoy, but it is clear that teachers need to work with their students and practice giving useful feedback, as well as they need to come up with a way of working that will reduce anxiety. Through showing the students that they all have the same goal, and that they all want to learn, it is hopefully possible to achieve efficient learning opportunities with the help of peer response.

6 Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to elicit what Swedish upper secondary school students think of using peer response in the classroom, both as givers and receivers, as well as investigating if such use can help them improve their writing. In order to answer these questions, the students' writing was collected at three different occasions, a questionnaire was distributed to 23 students at the end of the study, and interviews were held with 7 students. Lastly, the research questions were answered with the help of the collected and analyzed data.

The first and second question were answered with the help of the questionnaires and interviews, and the result supports previous research. Students do not typically enjoy giving feedback, and they are worried that they will hurt their friends. Furthermore, they were somewhat confident that they had the ability to find strengths and weaknesses in the texts of others, but also a little uncertain. In spite of this, a majority of the students claimed to learn from giving feedback. When it came to receiving feedback, more students were positive, and

many of them trusted the feedback they received from their classmates. Moreover, students stated that they often use the feedback received from classmates.

The third and fourth question were answered partly with the help of the questionnaires, and mostly with information from the interviews. The students believed that peer response can help them with grammar and their writing in general. They also saw that using peer response can have advantages such as being inspiring when reading classmates' texts, as well as it can help them detect errors. Many students claimed that working with a friend is most beneficial when it comes to peer response, but anonymous peer response was also brought up as an alternative.

In relation to the fifth question, the results indicate that the use of peer response does help students improve their writing, both when it comes to content and form. Generally, students commented more on content than on form, with a few exceptions, and some students did not comment on form at all when providing feedback. The students used most of the suggestions they received, and these often helped improve their texts.

Even though this study was carried out with a relatively small group and the results are not generalizable, there are pedagogical implications to be drawn from the results that might be of value for other groups as well. Firstly, there is worry and insecurity linked to the act of giving feedback, making it something worth practicing extensively. Hopefully such practice would help students feel more comfortable and competent. Secondly, the students in this study enjoyed receiving feedback, and they were of the opinion that it could help them improve their writing. This gives peer response potential to target specific problem areas in the group when it comes to for example grammar. Thirdly, it seems to be of great importance what kind of groups the students are divided into when working with peer response. Therefore, every teacher should discuss with their groups how to best work with peer response with them, as all students and groups are different. To sum up, students were generally positive towards using peer response, which can be used to its advantage, and with more practice than was possible in this study, students will be able to develop more competence, making the use of peer response even more effective.

In conclusion, more research is needed to get a full image of what Swedish upper secondary school students think of peer response, as well as how they would like to use it. The inclusion of more students would be desirable, and the use of different text types as well. From this study alone, it is naturally not detectable how students perceive the use of peer response when writing more formal texts. It is unclear if such a study should use anonymous feedback or not, but it would be interesting to get a more in depth picture of the ways in

which friendship can affect the use of peer response, both positively and negatively, so as to discern how it should be used to best favor or students. I hope that this is just the start of more peer response research in the Swedish context, and that this has contributed to that.

References

- Alstaedther, L. L., & Doolittle, P. (2014). Students' perceptions of peer feedback. *Argentinian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 60-76. Retrieved from: [http://www.faapi.org.ar/ajal/issues/202/AltstaedterAJALVol2\(2\).pdf](http://www.faapi.org.ar/ajal/issues/202/AltstaedterAJALVol2(2).pdf)
- Azarnoosh, M. (2013). Peer assessment in an EFL context: attitudes and friendship bias. *Language Testing in Asia* 2013, 3(11). <http://www.languageestingasia.com/content/3/1/11>
- Berggren, J. (2013). *Learning from giving feedback: insights from EFL writing classrooms in a Swedish lower secondary school* (Licentiate thesis). Stockholm: Stockholm University. Retrieved from <http://su.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?searchId=1&pid=diva2%3A679555&dswid=9227>
- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Bryant, D. A., & Carless, D. R. (2010). Peer assessment in a test-dominated setting: Empowering, boring or facilitating examination preparation? *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 9(1), 3-15. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/61806263?accountid=11162>
- Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (2005). Peer assessment of language proficiency. *Language Testing*, 22(1), 93-121. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/0265532205lt298oa>
- Cook, V. (2013). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research. Construction, administration, and processing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Finch, A. (2014). Participant Perceptions of Peer Editing in an EFL Freshman English Program. *Studies in British and American Language and Literature*, 133(6), 299-326. Retrieved from: <http://www.finchpark.com/arts/Peer-editing-perceptions.pdf>
- Harris, L. R., & Brown, G. T.L. (2013). Opportunities to consider when using peer- and self-assessment to improve student learning: Case studies into teachers' implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 36(11), 101-111. Doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2013.07.008
- Hedge, Tricia. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with chinese ESL student writers. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(3), 321-342. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1362168805lr169oa>
- Hu, G., & Lam, S. T. E. (2010). Issues of cultural appropriateness and pedagogical efficacy: Exploring peer review in a second language writing class. *Instructional Science*, 38(4), 371-394. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9086-1>
- Lam, R. (2010). A Peer Review Training Workshop: Coaching Students to Give and Evaluate Peer Feedback. *TESL Canada Journal*, 27(2), 114-127. Retrieved from: <http://www.teslcanadajournal.ca/index.php/tesl/article/viewFile/1052/871>
- Lightbown, P., M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 30–43.
- McKay, Sandra. (2006). *Researching Second Language Classrooms*. New York: Routledge.
- Min, H. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 33(2), 293-308. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/61925306?accountid=11162>
- Nilson, L. B. (2003). *Improving student peer feedback*. Washington, DC: Heldref Publications. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/61995828?accountid=11162>
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/62075697?accountid=11162>
- Rothschild, D., & Klingenberg, F. (1990). Self and peer evaluation of writing in the interactive ESL classroom: An exploratory study. *TESL Canada Journal*, 8(1), 52-65. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/62988338?accountid=11162>
- Skolverket. (2011a). *Kunskapsbedömning i skolan - praxis, begrepp, problem och möjligheter*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Skolverket. (2011b). *Läroplan, examnesmål och gymnasiegemensamma ämnen för gymnasieskola 2011*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Tang, G. M., & Tithecott, J. (1999). Peer response in ESL writing. *TESL Canada Journal*, 16(2), 20-38. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/62485258?accountid=11162>

- Topping, K. J. (2009). Peer assessment. *Theory into Practice*, 48(1), 20-27. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/61905397?accountid=11162>
- Tornberg, U. (2009). *Språkdidaktik*. Malmö: Gleerups.
- Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147-70.
- Vetenskapsrådet (2002). *Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet. Retrieved from <http://www.codex.vr.se/texts/HSFR.pdf>
- Villamil, O. S., & de Guerrero, M. C. (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 491-514. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/62479888?accountid=11162>
- Widiati, U. (2003). Trained Peer Response to Develop EFL Students' Positive Attitudes toward Peer Response. *TEFLIN Journal*, 14(1), 123-139. Retrieved from: <http://journal.teflin.org/index.php/journal/article/view/178>
- Zhao, H. (2014). Investigating teacher-supported peer assessment for EFL writing. *ELT Journal*, 68(2). Doi:10.1093/elt/cct068

Appendix A

Kamratbedömning

Information

Den här våren skriver jag mitt examensarbete på Göteborgs Universitet. Mitt arbete handlar om kamratbedömning, något som innebär att elever ger varandra feedback inför inlämningar. Kamratbedömning nämns i ämnesplanen för engelska på gymnasienivå och ska därför användas. Följande enkät ger mig möjlighet att undersöka vad gymnasieelever tycker om att använda sig av kamratbedömning, både att ge och att ta emot.

För att komma fram till välgrundade resultat är dina svar viktiga för mig, och jag uppskattar verkligen att du tar dig tid att svara. Det finns inga svar som är rätt eller fel, var så ärlig som möjligt när du svarar. Enkäten är konfidentiell och ditt namn kommer att tas bort så snart jag har parat ihop enkäter med den feedback ni har givit och fått. Dina svar på enkäten kommer inte på något sätt påverka ditt betyg på uppgiften.

Att ge feedback (återkoppling)

Här kommer nu följa några frågor på hur du upplevde att ge feedback till din/dina klasskompisar när vi arbetade med det. Ibland överensstämmer alternativen inte helt med känslan man har, men välj då det alternativ du upplever vara närmast sanningen. Ringa in det alternativ som stämmer bäst in på dig.

1. Tycker du om att ge feedback på din text från klasskompisar?
a) Mycket b) Ganska mycket c) Lite d) Inte alls
2. När du ombads ge feedback till en av dina klasskompisar, hur kände du då?
Oroad för att göra personen ledsen med mina kommentarer
a) Mycket b) Ganska mycket c) Lite d) Inte alls
Jag ville göra personen glad genom att skriva snälla saker
a) Mycket b) Ganska mycket c) Lite d) Inte alls
Själsäker att jag hade förmågan att peka ut textens styrkor och svagheter
a) Mycket b) Ganska mycket c) Lite d) Inte alls
Osäker på min förmåga att ge respons på min klasskompis text
a) Mycket b) Ganska mycket c) Lite d) Inte alls
3. När du ger någon annan feedback, hjälper det då dig att utveckla och tänka på din egen text?
a) Ja b) Nej

4. Hur kändes det att ge feedback på engelska?

Att få feedback (återkoppling)

Här kommer nu följa några frågor på hur du upplevde att få feedback av din/dina klasskompisar när vi arbetade med det. Ibland överensstämmer alternativen inte helt med känslan man har, men välj då det alternativ du upplever vara närmast sanningen. Ringa in det alternativ som stämmer bäst in på dig.

5. Tycker du om att få feedback på din text från klasskompisar?

- a) Mycket b) Ganska mycket c) Lite d) Inte alls

6. När du fick feedback från dina klasskamrater, litade du då på de kommentarer du fick?

- a) Alltid b) Ofta c) Ibland d) Aldrig

7. När du fick feedback från dina klasskamrater, använde du deras förslag då?

- a) Alltid b) Ofta c) Ibland d) Aldrig

8. Var kommentarerna du fick från dina klasskamrater användbara?

- a) Alltid b) Ofta c) Ibland d) Aldrig

9. Vem tar du hjälp av för att förbättra ditt skrivande?

- a) Lärare b) Klasskompis c) Grammatikbok d) Dig själv

10. Hur kändes det att få feedback på engelska?

Åsikter om kamratbedömning

Här är jag intresserad av att lära mig vad du tycker om kamratbedömning som verktyg i klassrummet. Därför följer här några frågor om vad kamratbedömning kan vara bra för.

11. Vad kan kamratbedömning hjälpa till med enligt dig?

- a) Grammatik b) Styckesindelning c) Innehåll d) Förbättra ditt skrivande

12. Vad är fördelarna med kamratbedömning enligt dig?

13. Vad är nackdelarna med kamratbedömning enligt dig?

Personlig information

Namn:

Ålder:

14. Hade du använt kamratbedömning innan vi gjorde det under fan fiction-projektet?

- a) Ja b) Nej

15. Hur skulle du bedöma dina egna språkkunskaper i engelska?

- a) Mycket bra b) Bra c) Medel d) Inte särskilt bra

16. Vilket är ditt modersmål?

17. Skulle du kunna tänka dig att ställa upp på en intervju och prata om kamratbedömning med mig?

- a) Ja b) Nej

Appendix B

Permission letter

2016-02-18

Dear parents,

My name is Sofia, and I am student teaching at XX Gymnasiet right now, and I will stay until week 12. Normally I study at the University of Gothenburg, and I am currently in my fifth year of the Teacher program.

During my teaching practice at XX, I will be teaching your child, along with NN, their regular teacher of English. I will also start collecting material for my degree project, in which I will write about peer response. I am going to look at students' perception of peer response, and investigate if it helps them develop and improve their texts. I am writing in for the purpose of getting my teaching degree this summer, and I believe that it is an important and interesting subject to research.

I am writing to you because I want to ask if it is okay if your child participates in the project I am working on. It is of course voluntary participation, strictly confidential and will not in any way affect the students' grades. Your child will be asked to fill in two questionnaires, as well as to send me their texts from English class. A few of the students will also be asked to participate in an interview, which is also voluntary.

I am hoping that you will agree to this and help me with my project. If you are okay with your child participating in this project, please sign this and send it back to school with your child.

Thank you in advance!

Sincerely,
Sofia Hansson

I am okay with my child participating in your project on peer response.

Parent/guardian signature

Kära föräldrar,

Jag heter Sofia och jag har min lärarpraktik på XX Gymnasiet just nu, och jag kommer att vara kvar till och med vecka 12. Vanligtvis studerar jag på Göteborgs Universitet, och jag är nu inne på mitt femte år på Ämneslärarprogrammet.

Under min praktik på XX kommer jag att undervisa ditt barn tillsammans med NN, klassens ordinarie engelsklärare. Jag kommer under denna period också börja samla in material till mitt examensarbete, i vilket jag kommer att skriva om kamratbedömning. Jag kommer att titta på elevers upplevelse av kamratbedömning, samt undersöka om det hjälper dem att utveckla och förbättra sina texter. Jag skriver mitt examensarbete för att få min lärarexamen den här sommaren, och jag tycker att det är ett både viktigt och intressant ämne att forska om.

Jag skriver till dig därför att jag skulle vilja fråga om det är okej att ditt barn deltar i mitt projekt. Det är självfallet frivilligt att delta, och elevernas uppgifter kommer att behandlas konfidentiellt. Elevernas deltagande kommer inte på något sätt påverka deras betyg. Ditt barn kommer att besvara två frågeformulär, samt ombes skicka mig de texter vi arbetar med under engelsklektionerna. Några av eleverna kommer jag också att fråga om de vill ställa upp på en intervju, vilket också är frivilligt.

Jag hoppas att ni ska tycka att detta är okej, det skulle hjälpa mig mycket med mitt projekt. Om ni ger ert samtycke, var snäll och skriv under den här lappen och skicka tillbaks den till skolan med ert barn.

Tack på förhand!

Med vänliga hälsningar,
Sofia Hansson

Det är okej att mitt barn deltar i ditt projekt om kamratbedömning.

Målsmans underskrift

Appendix C

Intervjuprotokoll

Tänk på

- Gör det så "bekvämt" som möjligt i rummet, så att det känns inbjudande att prata avslappnat. Så att det inte känns som ett förhör.
- Introducera syftet med intervjun.
- Förklara att intervjun kommer att spelas in, men att allt är konfidentiellt. Inget kommer veta namn utom jag, och inspelningen kommer att tas bort så snart jag är klar med den för mitt projekt.
- Finns det några frågor?
- Genomför intervjun (tänk på att ha ett öppet kroppsspråk och var avslappnad).
- Avslut: fråga om det finns några frågor, fråga hur intervjun kändes. Tacka för personens medverkan!

Frågor

- Vad tycker du om att använda kamratbedömning?
- Vad tycker du om att ge feedback?
- Vad tycker du om att få feedback?
- Tror du att kamratbedömning kan hjälpa dig med engelskan?
Om ja, på vilket sätt?
Om nej, varför inte?
- "Rädd att såra..." Vad tror du skulle kunna motverka den känslan?
- Hur skulle du vilja använda kamratbedömning i undervisningen så att det blir så bra som möjligt?
- Fråga om enkäten, hur den uppfattades.
- Jag har inga fler frågor, är det något du har tänkt på som du vill ta upp eller fråga om?