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Abstract

Peer review is a complex collaborative activity, which may engage English language learners in reading, writing, listening, and speaking and carry many potential benefits for their language learning (Hu, 2005). While many research studies focused on peer review practices of adult language learners in academic settings in the USA or abroad in language classes (Grami, 2010; Zhao, 2010), little attention was paid to adolescent L2 writers participating in peer review in face-to-face K-12 and online contexts. This multiple case study aimed at describing and explaining peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts from the ecological perspective. In particular, I aimed at exploring (a) four adolescent ELLs’ perceptions of peer review in face-to-face and online contexts, (b) affordances they chose to employ during peer review in face-to-face and online contexts, and (c) revisions the participants chose to make due to peer review in face-to-face and online contexts.

The multiple observations, semi-structured interviews, researcher’s and participants’ e-journals, and written artifacts yielded data for within-case and cross-case analysis. The findings of the study afforded situating adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices in the face-to-face and online contexts as a part of L2 literacy, redefining L2 literacy and peer review in L2, and discussing the important role of peer review in adolescent ELLs’ literacy development. The implications of the study provided teachers with suggestions on how to enhance adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices. Further, I
elaborated on the lessons learned about technology use for peer review in K-12 contexts.

Finally, I addressed possible future research directions based on the findings of the study.
Chapter One

The number of immigrants in the United States is constantly growing (Valdés & Castellón, 2010). According to the Census Bureau's 2009 American Community Survey, the US immigrant population constituted 12.5% of the total US population (about 38,517,234 people; Batalova & Terrazas, 2010). Between 2008 and 2009, there was an increase in the number of foreign-born living in the United States by 1.5% (about 556,000 people). Though such an increase may seem slight and unimportant, the last decades are characterized by the sharp increase of immigrant population (about one million per year; “2009 American Community Survey,” 2011). Though such tendency brings in some positive changes, the increase in the number of immigrants also creates many challenges in terms of legal issues, religion, national security, immigrants’ adaptation, acculturation, and so forth (Valdés & Castellón, 2010). The educational sphere is not an exception.

The U.S. educational system has faced many debates on how to accommodate immigrants and provide them with equal opportunities for education (Valdés & Castellón, 2010). Despite the attention this issue draws in the society and all the attempts being made to improve the situation, the problem still exists. For example, there was an increase of 13% (10,509,231 people) in the number of immigrants with less than a high school diploma between 2000 and 2009 (“The United States,” 2011). In 2009, out of 32.5 million of immigrants, 25 years old or older, 32.3% did not have a high school diploma while out of 169.4 million native born adults of the same age range, only 11.4% lacked a
high school diploma (“The United States,” 2011). Thus, such numbers raise the question about reasons, which may explain the gap in education attainment between native-born and foreign-born persons in the United States and about the necessity to find solutions and address the problem.

One of the reasons underlying the immigrants’ failure in obtaining the high school diploma in the United States is the lack of or low language proficiency in English as a Second Language (ESL; “English-Language Learners,” 2011). According to the 2009 American Community Survey and Census Data on the Foreign Born by State, out of 38.3 million foreign-born persons age 5 or older, 52% were "limited English proficient" (LEP) that is, persons who do not speak English as their first language (L1) and whose ability to read, write, speak, or comprehend English is limited (“FAQ. Limited English,” 2012). Moreover, among native and foreign-born households in the United States, 4.7% were linguistically isolated which means that all persons per household age 14 and above were LEP (“The United States,” 2011). Among a variety of foreign languages spoken in the USA, the most common are Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, French, Vietnamese, German, Korean, Russian, and Arabic and have gaps in their literacy in ESL (Batalova & Terrazas, 2010). Many kids who come from non-English speaking homes need help with literacy development, which is the key to progress in any academic subject (August & Shanahan, 2006).

Addressing the issue of second language (L2) literacy development in US schools, many researchers made attempts to define this concept (Kim, 2005; “The United States,” 2011). In particular, L2 literacy may be defined as “one’s ability to use printed and written information to function in society, achieve one’s goals, and develop one’s
knowledge and potential” (“The United States,” 2011). Importantly, Kim (2005) extended the definition of literacy by viewing it as a “transaction” between a student, a text, and a social context (p. 4). Moreover, Yi (2010) approaches literacy from a social perspective that is, seeing it as a system of life-long activities bound by various context factors such as political, economic, historical, social, and cultural. For L2 learners, literacy is a more complex process than for the native speakers (NSs) of the language because of more factors that come into play when L2 learners engage in literacy activities (Kim, 2005). L1 and L2 proficiency, metacognitive knowledge, and learners’ experience and cultural knowledge have an influence on English language learners’ (ELLs) literacy development (Richards, 1997).

Literacy instruction at school is an essential element for both NSs of the English language and ELLs (Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001). Nevertheless, deliberate explicit literacy instruction that is, “deliberate and explicit teaching of skills and strategies,” which allow students to engage in literacy practices effectively, is rarely offered in the U.S. school system (Heller & Greenleaf, 2007; Rivera & Collum, 2006; Wang, Algozzine, Ma, & Porfeli, 2011, p. 444). Therefore, ELLs face challenges in learning complex course content and, simultaneously, dealing with the lack of cultural and/or historical knowledge, gaps in academic vocabulary, and other factors (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). As a result, according to the 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy (n.d.), 11 million adults in the USA were non-literate in English, 4 million of them reported about language barriers. Across the nation, ELLs lagged behind non-ELLs by 41 points or more on the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress 12th-
grade writing assessment (NCES, 2008). Thus, literacy development of ELLs is one of the areas, which need immediate attention of researchers, educators, and administrators.

Many researchers have investigated ELLs’ literacy development so far (Brown, 2011; Gutierrez, Bien, Selland, & Pierce, 2011; Kim, 2005). However, most of the studies have focused on ELLs’ development of reading (Fien et al., 2011; Leung, Silverman, Nandakumar, Qian, & Hines, 2011; Yesil-Dagli, 2011). Few studies, however, have looked into the development of K-12 ELLs’ writing (Enright & Gilliland, 2011; Fránquiz & Salinas, 2011; Kibler, 2010). Even fewer have focused on adolescent L2 writing (Yi, 2010). With the implementation of No Child Left Behind in 2002 aiming at setting the same standards of assessment for all students including ELLs, the focus of instruction shifted to reading and mathematics, leaving the development of literacy in K-12 neglected (Applebee & Langer, 2009; McCartney, 2008).

One of the activities, which combines reading, writing, and interaction of language learners, is peer review. Drawing on previous work by Tsui and Ng (2000) and Zhu (2001), Hu (2005) defined peer review as “a collaborative activity involving students reading, critiquing, and providing feedback on each other’s writing, both to secure immediate textual improvement and to develop, over time, stronger writing competence via mutual scaffolding” (pp. 321-322). Peer review is recommended as a strategy for ELLs’ literacy development in K-12 settings (Peregoy & Boyle, 2008). In addition, it is the activity that can be beneficial for ELLs not only for academic purposes, but also for the development of their own personal writing. However, there is a major gap in the research literature on L2 learners’ peer review practices because no studies, to my knowledge, described and explained peer review of adolescent ELLs in the USA.
Problem of Statement

It is important to admit that there are many studies on peer review in language classes (Grami, 2010; Liu & Lin, 2007; Min, 2006; Zhao, 2010). However, most of them focus on peer review of adult language learners in academic settings in the USA or abroad (Hu & Lam, 2010; Jin & Zhu, 2010; Lai, 2010). Only one study seems to involve adolescent L2 writers participating in peer review (Tsui & Ng, 2000). Nevertheless, Tsui and Ng’s (2000) study was carried out not in the United States context, but in China. Surprisingly, despite the lack of research on the use of peer review in K-12 settings for ELLs’ writing development, some textbooks suggest the use of peer review to pre- and in-service teachers in various educational contexts and with language learners of various levels of language proficiency (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Peregoy & Boyle, 2008). Thus, there is an urgent need for studies on the use of peer review with ELLs in the K-12 and online contexts.

Moreover, it is crucial to view writing and peer review practices holistically as situated in context and explore (a) L2 students’ perceptions of this activity, (b) affordances that is, opportunities in the environment, which ELLs choose to employ in order to participate in peer review and improve their writing in L2 (Gee, 2006; van Lier, 2004), and (c) revisions the adolescent ELLs choose to make in their writing due to peer review from the ecological perspective which brings a critical aspect to research. Finally, there is a need to describe and explain peer review practices of adolescent ELLs because of such characteristics of this age group as constant identity construction and need for social interaction (Ortmeier-Hooper, 2010). Furthermore, it is necessary to study adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices not only in face-to-face classroom based context,
but also online because of the vast expansion and use of technology nowadays. Such research foci will help understand the nature of peer review practices in the development of adolescent L2 writing, contribute to the researchers’ and educators’ knowledge about the role of peer review in adolescent L2 literacy development, and fill the gap in the research literature on the use of peer review in the development of adolescent L2 writing. Finally, research studies on ELLs participating in peer review, face-to-face and online, will shed light on the use of this activity across different contexts.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts.

**Exploratory Questions**

The following exploratory questions guided the study:

1. How do four adolescent ELLs perceive peer review in face-to-face and online contexts?

2. What affordances do four adolescent ELLs choose to employ during peer review in face-to-face and online contexts?

3. What revisions do four adolescent ELLs choose to make in their writing due to peer feedback in face-to-face and online contexts?

**Theoretical Framework**

This study employed the ecological perspective in investigating adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices in face-to-face and online contexts (van Lier, 2004). Ecological
perspective is “neither a theory nor a method. It is a way of thinking and a way of acting” (van Lier, 2004, p. 3). Though the term “ecology” may seem somewhat unusual for language learning and teaching, it started being widely used both in applied linguistics and in language education (Kramsch, 2002; van Lier, 2004). The use of ecological perspective on language learning implies looking at the context and investigating its components, which facilitate language education (van Lier, 2004). It acknowledges a learner as an active member in the environment, a larger organism, which is full of processes, meanings, and affordances for learning and interaction. In this organism, language is viewed as “a system of relations, rather than a collection of objects” (van Lier, 2004, p. 5). Finally, ecological perspective is critical in nature that is, it involves the researcher’s constant assessment of what is happening and analysis of what should be happening (Lafford, 2009; van Lier, 2004). Due to the complexity of ecological perspective, I further explain its concepts and essence by organizing the review in the following subcategories: ecology, emergence, affordances, and language learning from an ecological perspective standpoint.

**Ecology.** Ecology as a term was invented in the middle of the 19th century by the German biologist Ernst Haeckel for the scientific discipline that studied the relationships of an organism with other organisms with which it has some contacts (Arndt & Janney, as cited in van Lier, 2004). Two dominant views of ecology are called “deep ecology” and “shallow ecology” (van Lier, 2004, p. 3). The latter focuses on minimizing humans’ impact on the environment while the former studies a phenomenon within its environment, taking into account all the affordances, processes, interconnections,
influences, and factors (van Lier, 2004). Both views of ecology contributed to and informed ecological perspective on language education (van Lier, 2004).

From an ecological perspective, language is seen as an essential component of humans’ life. It is “relations (of thought, action, power), rather than as objects (words, sentences, rules)” (van Lier, 2000, p. 251). It helps people interact and dialogue with others and the environment (Bakhtin, Holquist, & Emerson, 1986). Language is a mediational tool, which surrounds humans and is a part of social and physical world as well as other meaning-making systems. During human conversations, gestures mediate language while language mediates activity (van Lier, 2004). Language enables humans’ interaction with others, other-regulation, and further self-regulation which all afford humans to be active agents in the environment (Lafford, 2009). Therefore, language links the cognitive and the social aspects of humans’ activity. Thus, studying language from ecological perspective involves considering both the social and the cognitive, though the social is seen as primary (van Lier, 2004).

The combination of the social and the cognitive is also a part of how ecological perspective views the concepts of self and identity (van Lier, 2004). Though the notions of self and identity were not a focus of this dissertation study, they require some attention due to the age period of the participants in my dissertation study. As I discuss more in Chapter 2, adolescence is the period of human life when teenagers constantly negotiate their identity (Erikson, 1986); therefore, though the concepts of identity and self were not the major foci of the study, I was aware of them when carrying out the study. According to van Lier (2004), self may be defined as “a real entity,” constructed both socially and dialogically by every person (p. 107). Self is constantly changing with person’s
establishment of their identity in the society through interaction. Thus, when using language, a person not only shares some information with his or her interlocutors, but also expresses who s/he is and his/her opinion and attitude towards the listeners or readers (van Lier, 2004).

Identity, in its turn, is related to the notion of self because it is “the project of this person (with this sense of self) to place him/herself in the world, and to act in this world in some identifiable manner” (van Lier, 2004, pp. 124-125). It is both a project and a projection of the self in interaction with political contexts and various social groups. Therefore, identity is created not only by the person, but also by social surrounding of this person (Gee, 2000-2001). Moreover, a person may have multiple identities, which can be created, changed, and destroyed by the individual and by people around him (van Lier, 2004). Therefore, identity and language constitute each other; they are intertwined and interrelated (van Lier, 2004). Thus, with the focus on language education, the concepts of language, identity and self play an important role and should be discussed and/or taken into account as factors which could have an influence on the language learners’ perceptions and actions. In studies on SLA, ELLs succeeded in creating multiple identities and expressing their self when using English as L2 (Black, 2006; Lam, 2000, 2004; Yi, 2007).

**Emergence.** Emergence is one of the two major concepts in ecological perspective. Emergence may be defined as a process of simple elements’ reorganization into more complex systems and their restructuring based on changing conditions (van Lier, 2004). Therefore, from ecological perspective, language learning is not a simple and constant accumulation of simple elements but the construction of complex systems from
these simple elements. It is important to point out that the ability to adapt to the changing conditions is inherent to the complex systems, but not to the simple elements (van Lier, 2004). For example, when a learner receives feedback on the missing ending “–ed” for the Past Simple tense, s/he may start adding the ending correctly to the verbs after the necessary practice and use of regular verbs in the Past Simple tense. Therefore, it would mean fixing not a specific error but the adaption of the whole complex system to this change and conditions. Moreover, language emerges based on the communicative needs of learners, time, place, and other factors of the environment (Lafford, 2009). In particular, it should reflect criteria of appropriate language use to the learners’ context. Thus, language-learning activities should reflect real world that is, be ecologically valid.

**Affordances.** The other major construct within ecological perspective is affordances. Van Lier (2000) refers to James Gibson as the author of the term *affordance*, which he used to explain the relationship of an organism and a particular feature in the environment. Importantly, affordances are not something that causes an action, but something that is available to the person to do an action (van Lier, 2004). Affordances may be defined as the relationship of an object that is available to an organism and the organism that can make use of this object in its own particular way. The environment has many meanings and objects that any organism can use. These particular chances or opportunities (relevant and meaningful to the person) to use objects from the environment constitute affordances (van Lier, 2002).

As an example for environment, organism, and affordances, I refer to an imaginary classroom in a High School. In such case, the classroom can serve as an environment where language learners are active organisms and are a part of the
environment. The classroom is full of objects, which some learners can find meaningful, while some—not. The simple phrase on the board could attract some language learners’ attention while some could not consider it at all. If a language learner perceives the phrase as meaningful, the phrase serves as a semiotic object and provides a learner with an opportunity to engage into action. The learner could look up the phrase in the dictionary and further practice and learn it, or a learner could ask the teacher for help with the phrase, etc. Thus, the phrase on the board provides language learners with affordances of either looking up a new phrase in the dictionary, practicing and learning new vocabulary, communicating with the teacher, etc.

The construct of affordances substituted the concepts of person’s abilities and traits, which are not stable (Kono, 2009). Affordances are different for each organism. The same object may afford some other opportunity for each organism (van Lier, 2000). Therefore, an affordance is “action potential and it emerges as we interact with the physical and social world” (van Lier, 2004, p. 92). Moreover, affordances are related to “meaning potential” (van Lier, 2004, p. 92). According to van Lier (2004), the cycle of meaning emergence is holistic, continuous, and mutually reinforcing. The first perception of the affordance is immediate and direct. However, it may be followed by many iterations before the emergence of linguistic and symbolic meanings which later merge into the cultural one (van Lier, 2004).

Though there are various classifications of affordances (Barab & Roth, 2006; Forrester, 1999; Reed, 1988), van Lier (2004) classifies all affordances into immediate or direct and mediated or indirect. Immediate affordances are often called first-level because they are available to a person immediately while mediated affordances require
construction of meaning on the speaker’s or writer’s part and interpretation of the meaning on the listener’s or reader’s part. Voice quality, prosodic features, and body language could serve as examples of immediate affordances if a person does not need any other assistance with understanding them. Encountering an unfamiliar word in the text that prevents a learner from understanding the meaning could be an example of a mediated affordance. Thus, the emergence of meaning may include many interpretation processes rooted in contextual affordances.

**Language learning and ecological perspective.** From an ecological perspective, language is a set of signs, which organize and enrich the affordances (Kono, 2009). Therefore, the construct of affordances is applicable to language education (van Lier, 2000). Moreover, affordances are a part of language learning and teaching. Affordances for language learning are all the properties of the environment that afford learners’ opportunity to interact. The richer the context is in terms of affordances, the more participation, engagement, and motivation a learner may reveal (Iddings & Jang, 2008). When a learner (an agent) is engaged in an activity within the environment full of signs, s/he perceives some information and either finds it relevant and the information becomes an affordance or perceives it as irrelevant. Thus, affordances are relationships that match something from environment with a learner. Finally, affordances reinforce perception and activity and allow for meaning to emerge (van Lier, 2004).

From ecological perspective, there are two major conditions for language learning: access and engagement (van Lier, 1996). Access implies having language in the environment while engagement means learners’ participation in meaningful activities. Therefore, language learners should be engaged in various activities with the target
language speaking so that they will have the chance to pick up relevant to them linguistic affordances. Sometimes learners might need assistance from teacher or other peers to interpret affordances and internalize the information. Importantly, van Lier (2004) extends the notion of Vygotsky’s ZPD from inclusion of not mere expert-novice scaffolding to the equal peer-peer, self access, and self-regulated. Finally, the key element that connects and combines perception with action is attention of an agent.

According to van Lier (2004), a language learner when attentive perceives affordances and progresses through various levels of awareness. Specifically, a language learner first notices and focuses on a particular aspect of the language. Further, a learner achieves the practical and discursive awareness that is, s/he obtains some control over the linguistic feature and can manipulate it and analyze its structure and functions. Level 4 is a critical awareness of a language learner, which allows the agent to be aware of the social and political aspects of the language.

**Why ecological perspective?** When deciding on the theoretical framework for my dissertation study, I thoroughly looked at the research questions and reflected upon my beliefs and views on language learning. I strongly believe that my previous educational and professional experiences as well as my background played an important role in choosing a problem to study, phrasing the exploratory questions, and subsequently determining what theoretical lens to employ to conduct my dissertation study.

For example, the first research question addresses L2 students’ perceptions of peer review activity, that is participants’ opinions, attitudes, and any ideas about the use of peer review for L2 literacy development. As I have discussed above (see pp. 10-12),
the concept of perception is important from an ecological perspective standpoint in terms of how a learner makes meaning out of the affordance with the perception as an initial step in the process. For the purposes of this study, I studied ELLs’ perceptions of the peer review as an activity. When applied holistically, it defined how adolescent ELLs chose to employ affordances and made revisions in their writing due to peer feedback (Research Question 3). In addition, seeing peer review as a complex social activity, where interaction and scaffolding are essential elements embedded in a certain context, directed me to another major construct in ecological perspective—affordances (Research Question 2).

Moreover, I evaluated the design of my dissertation study based on the list of criteria, which van Lier (2004) offered to explain the essence of ecological research. These criteria include the following:

1. Contextualization of the study with the focus on the relationships in the context.

2. Consideration of spatial and temporal dimensions.

3. Critical aspect of the study.

4. Ecological validity of the study.

Having talked about the relationships or affordances in the context as the focus of Research Question 2, I further discuss how I justify the employment of ecological perspective for my study with regards to Criteria 2-4. First, the design of my study as well as the nature of a peer review activity determined the necessity of a longitudinal
study, which was bound by time (8 months) and space (face-to-face meetings and online meetings). The purpose of the study (to describe and explain adolescent L2 students’ peer review practices) determined the critical aspect of the dissertation because I aimed to provide suggestions both for educators and administrators on how to enhance adolescent L2 students’ writing development. Finally, to meet the ecological validity criteria, my analytical constructs, notions, and procedures were rooted in emic perspectives rather than etic ones (van Lier, 2004).

Definition of Terms

The following terms were used in the study. In this section, I aim at explaining and informing the readers how I used specific terms.

Peer Review: In this study, peer review refers to the collaborative activity, which consists of students’ reading each other’s drafts, critiquing them, and providing feedback to each other about strengths and weaknesses of their writing in L2. In Chapters 4-6, the terms peer review and peer editing are used interchangeably because the participant teacher used the term peer editing for the activity of peer review.

Adolescents: Adolescents are persons 12-19 years old who usually attend grades 7-12 (Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011).

English Language Learner: In this study, English language learners (ELLs) are students who learn English at school and speak other language as native at home (Peregoy & Boyle, 2008). In addition, English language learners learn English as a Second language (ESL) as a part of ESL or English Language Development (ELD) program in their school. For the primary, first or native language of ELLs, I will use abbreviation L1.
Context: In this study, I use the definition of context from the ecological perspective. Specifically, ecological context is physical and social in its essence. It not only surrounds language, but also defines it. A learning context consists of various “physical, social and symbolic opportunities for meaning making, and the central notion that drives this meaning making is activity” (van Lier, 2004, p. 62).

Affordances: In this study, affordances refer to the opportunities in the context, which ELLs choose to employ during peer review practices (van Lier, 2004).

Background and Personal Perspective

I got interested in peer review activity as a part of L2 students’ literacy development after I had started teaching academic reading and writing in an intensive English program in the USA. Among various pedagogical strategies and activities for L2 development, my students found peer review rewarding and beneficial. Though peer review activity was rather time consuming for me in terms of preparation and for students in terms of time spent in the classroom on all the steps of peer review session, I was pleasantly surprised how motivated, active, and serious my students were about peer review. I found them engaging in peer review practices voluntarily, when writing other assignments when peer review was not a required step. Thus, my students’ feedback about benefits of peer review activity triggered my interest in this activity.

Finally, the doctoral course on second language writing enhanced my interest in peer review as a potential topic for research. During this course, I wrote the review of literature about peer review. Further, after identifying gaps in research literature, I conducted two case studies on peer review activity in a language classroom. The focus of
the first study was on a teacher’s perspectives on peer review in ESL classes while the purpose of the other case study was to describe and explain discourse in adult ESL peer review groups with the focus on the content of the students’ interaction. Finally, I found peer review as a suggested strategy for ELLs’ literacy development in a textbook for pre-service teachers in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) 2 course. To my surprise, no studies have been done on peer review practices of adolescent ELLs in the USA. Thus, my personal, educational, and professional experience and beliefs about language learning and teaching prompted me to focus on peer review practices of adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts.

**Importance of the Study**

Peer review activity plays an important role in ELLs’ development of literacy in L2. During peer review, students have an opportunity to look at their and other students’ writing from a different perspective that is, of a reader and of a reviewer. Peer review is a collaborative effort of two or more persons who aim at improving their and their partner(s)’ writing. Despite the potential benefits of peer review activity, there are no studies, to my knowledge, which focus on peer review practices of adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts. However, peer review is suggested in textbooks for pre-service teachers as an activity for L2 literacy development. Thus, it is crucial to describe and explain peer review practices of adolescent ELLs.

The study may benefit researchers and educators in terms of (a) showing how adolescent ELLs perceive peer review, (b) revealing what affordances ELLs choose to employ when peer reviewing each other’s writing, and (c) demonstrating what revisions
ELLs choose to make in their writings after and due to peer review activity. Therefore, the study will help teachers who have ELLs in their classes to better understand the process of peer review and to provide the basis for its further application in face-to-face and online contexts. Finally, the study may serve as the foundation for the further research on peer review done by adolescent ELLs either in face-to-face or online context.

Summary

In Chapter 1, I described the purpose of the proposed study: to describe and explain peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts. In addition, I explained the theoretical framework of this study, the ecological perspective, and its major concepts such as emergence and affordances. I also described how my personal, educational, and professional experience and background contributed to my interest in the topic. In Chapter 2, I review and synthesize literature relevant to peer review practices of adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts. In particular, the categories for review of literature for Chapter 2 are as follows:

- L2 literacy;
- L2 literacies in the 21st century;
- peer review.

In addition, I identify gaps in the literature. In Chapter 3, I describe methodology of the study. In Chapter 4, I provide a holistic description of the four cases. Chapter 5 provides a description of findings as relevant to research questions. In Chapter 6, I discuss the findings, implications of the study, and future research directions.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

The purpose of the study was to describe and explain peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts. The exploratory questions, which guided the study, were

1. How do four adolescent ELLs perceive peer review in face-to-face and online contexts?

2. What affordances do four adolescent ELLs choose to employ during peer review in face-to-face and online contexts?

3. What revisions do four adolescent ELLs choose to make in their writing due to peer feedback in face-to-face and online contexts?

In this chapter, I review literature relevant to the topic of my study. In particular, I focus on (a) L2 literacy, (b) L2 literacies in the 21st century, and (c) peer review. First, I synthesize and critique literature on L2 literacy and L2 literacies in the 21st century. Noteworthy, I include studies on reading and writing in L2 as they are traditionally considered as literacy skills. The first two categories in Chapter 2 provide the overview of literature on L2 literacy and foundation for the third category, peer review. Figure 1 shows the visual schema of the organization of the literature review.
Figure 1. Visual schema for the Literature Review. Figure 1 shows the major categories and subcategories of the literature review.

L2 Literacy

As I wrote in Chapter 1, there have been multiple attempts to define the concept of literacy. Traditionally, as stated by Pérez (1998), literacy was seen through the lens of literate-illiterate dichotomy, which defined it as the ability to read and write. Noteworthy, such definition often implied literacy in L1 while the need to define literacy in L2 remains unaddressed. L2 literacy is different from L1 literacy due to a number of factors, which come into play when an ELL is engaged in the traditional literacy practices of reading and writing in L2. Such factors include L1 literacy, proficiency in L2, differences in understanding and experience with reading and writing strategies, peer review, and providing citations (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Roessingh & Elgie, 2009). In the report “Developing literacy in second-language learners,” August and Shanahan (2006) define L2 literacy in terms of skills, which constitute literacy in L2. In particular, they listed...
• prereading skills (concepts of print and alphabetic knowledge);
• word-level skills (decoding, word reading, pseudo-word reading, and spelling);
• text-level skills (fluency, reading comprehension, and writing skills).

In the next sections of Chapter 2, I focus on the review of literature on early and adult L2 literacy development, impact of L1 and L2 proficiency on L2 literacy development, and pedagogical strategies for teaching L2 literacy. This, in its turn, builds the ground for the discussion of L2 literacies in the 21st century.

**L2 literacy development.** The question of how ELLs develop their literacy in L2 has been the focus of research for some time already (Roessingh & Elgie, 2009). For example, some researchers conclude that early L2 literacy development (K-grade 2) is similar to the development of literacy in L1, focusing mainly on reading and grounding their conclusions in the research on such micro-skills as phonics, phonemic and phonological awareness, and letter recognition (D’Angiulli, Siegel, & Maggi, 2004; Kelly, Gómez-Bellengé, Chen, & Schulz, 2008). Others state that it takes from 5 to 7 years to become L2 literate taking into account individual differences, type of L2 instruction, level of literacy in L1, and L2 status (Cummins, 1989; Tucker, 1986). Thus, though L2 literacy development may resemble L1 literacy development, it differs in terms of time length it takes for ELLs to become literate in L2.

In addition to the difference between L1 and L2 literacy development, young ELLs develop L2 literacy differently from adult ELLs. Addressing early literacy development in L2, Wong Fillmore (1991) and Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco (2001)
state that in the majority of young ELLs, English as L2 overtakes their L1 due to its wide use for communication at school and outside of home. Moreover, young ELLs often acquire sound-symbol relationships in L2 to the extent that they can outperform young NSs in reading and spelling in L2 (Lesaux & Siegel, 2003). However, with the course of time, such ELLs meet the challenge of vocabulary development in L2, which leads to their lagging behind NSs (August, Carlo, Dressier, & Snow, 2005). Though ELLs manage to acquire several hundred of basic words in L2, they are usually short of low-frequency vocabulary in L2 which is crucial for the further L2 reading development (Roessingh & Elgie, 2009). Thus, explicit vocabulary instruction is a crucial but, unfortunately, frequently overlooked element in ELLs’ literacy development in L2 (Blachowicz, Fisher, & Ogle, 2006).

As for adult L2 literacy development, college level L2 learners often have an advantage in L2 literacy development over ELLs in K-12 contexts due to their L1 support and L1 literacy. For example, when learning how to write or read in L2, an adult ELL can use L1 as a reference (Richard-Amato & Snow, 1992). However, adult ELLs often face the challenge to achieve native-like proficiency in L2 which is often explained by Critical Period hypothesis (Gass & Selinker, 2001; Krashen, 1987), lateralization of brain parts engaged in L2 acquisition (McNeil, 1966), and high levels of anxiety adults show when learning L2 (Marinova-Todd, Marshall, & Snow, 2000). This, in its turn, affects adult L2 learners’ literacy development (Bifuh-Ambe, 2009) and has an influence on adult L2 learners’ transition from intensive language programs to mainstream university classes (Vásquez, 2007). Thus, ELLs’ age also plays an important role in L2 literacy development.
Impact of L1 and L2 proficiency on L2 literacy development. Among various factors that may have an influence on L2 literacy development, L1 is crucial to consider. As mentioned above, many researchers found that L1 significantly helps students in learning L2 (Friend, Most, & McCrary, 2009). For example, bilingual students often refer to their knowledge of cognates (words that have the same pronunciation and similar meaning in different languages) to refer the meaning and, as a result, become successful readers (August, Carlo, Dressier, & Snow, 2005). Moreover, many researchers agree that ELLs’ literacy skills in L1 and their concept and content knowledge transfer to the target language (Pollard-Durodola & Simmons, 2009; Proctor, Carlo, August, & Snow, 2005). Thus, overall L1 serves as a support in ELLs’ literacy development.

On the contrary to L1 support, gaps in L2 proficiency often create challenges for ELLs’ literacy development (Lee & Schallert, 1997). For example, Clarke (1980) states that low-level L2 proficiency limits L2 readers in their interaction with a text in the target language. Similarly, Carrell (1988) considers the transfer of L1 reading skills and background knowledge possible only after ELLs achieve a threshold of language proficiency in L2. In a study on the threshold hypothesis in an EFL context, Lee and Schallert (1997) compared the contribution of L1 reading ability and L2 proficiency to L2 reading ability. Eight hundred and nine Korean middle school and high school learners with various levels of reading ability and levels of proficiency in L1 and L2 participated in the study. The findings of the study show that in predicting L2 reading ability, the contribution of L2 proficiency is larger than the one of L1 reading ability. In addition, learners with the low levels of proficiency in L2 reveal little relationship between L1 and L2 reading abilities, which is contrary to the learners with higher levels
of proficiency in L2. Thus, gaps in L2 proficiency have an impact on L2 literacy development.

**Pedagogical strategies for teaching L2 literacy.** Many studies on L2 literacy development have addressed strategies for literacy instruction (August & Shanahan, 2006). In particular, explicit teaching of reading and writing skills is important for successful literacy development (Cummins, 2000). Among various explicit reading strategies, ELLs need the focus on developing their text-level skills (Lesaux & Geva, 2006; Lesaux, Koda, Siegel, & Shanahan, 2006) and frequent and systematic exposure to L2 vocabulary (Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002; Townsend, 2009). In addition, such teaching strategies as employing ELLs’ knowledge about reading in L1, engaging students in discussions, and vocabulary development before and after reading a text help L2 students in their development of comprehension skills (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005; Proctor, Carlo, August, & Snow, 2005; Samway, 2006). Finally, the teachers’ use of literacy developing strategies is crucial for ELLs’ participation in mainstream classrooms and development of their literacy skills in L2 (Peercy, 2011).

**L2 Literacies in the 21st Century**

With the course of time, the concept of literacy has changed from embracing only individual dimension to situating literacy as a social and cultural phenomenon (Perez, 1998). In particular, "social literacies" (Gee, 1996; Street, 1995), the "New Literacy Studies" (New London Group, 1996), or "situated literacies" (Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanič, 2000) focused on cultural, political, and social contexts of literacy. Importantly, they all argue that literacy skills are not decontextualized and are not limited only to
reading and writing. On the contrary, literacy practices vary from context to context and are intertwined with “discourses (the way the communicative systems are organized within social practices)” (Perez, 1998, p. 23). Moreover, various literacy practices are defined as multiliteracies that is, person’s ability to interpret symbols of the context and engage in literacy tasks such as interpreting specific information even with the changes in the environment (Perez, 1998). In the further overview of literature, I discuss major approaches to L2 literacies in the 21st century, pedagogical strategies for teaching L2 literacies in the 21st century, and adolescent L2 writing.

**Major approaches to L2 literacies in the 21st century.** Among the prevailing approaches to L2 literacies in the 21st century, I further focus on (a) social literacies, (b) situated literacies, (c) New London Group, and (d) critical literacy. From the social literacies' standpoint, multiliteracies are practices that are a part of communicative system in a society, Discourses (Gee, 1992). Discourses may be defined as “a socio-culturally distinctive and integrated way of thinking, acting, interacting, talking, and valuing connected with a particular social identity or role, with its own unique history, and often with its own distinctive ‘props (buildings, objects, spaces, schedules, books, etc.)’” (Gee, 1992, p. 32). In order to be able to engage in multiliteracies within a certain Discourse, a person needs the knowledge of a specific social language associated with the relevant Discourse (Gee, 2001). The examples of social languages may be the language of law, medicine, literature, and so forth. (Gee, 2001). Each of social languages consists of vocabulary items, syntax, and discourse connectors, which are all related to a specific socially situated identity and specific social practices (Gee, 1999). Finally, from social
literacies’ perspective, the learners’ active participation is crucial because it shapes and changes the very meaning of literacy practices (Perez, 1998).

The focus on the context in discussion of literacy practices is also central for situated literacies (Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanič, 2000). From this perspective, the literacy practices differ by setting (Barton & Hamilton, 1998), by time (Graff, 1987), by language (Martin-Jones & Jones, 2000), and by cultural context (Bartlett, 2007). Therefore, Bloome (1989) argues about the importance of considering differences in culturally held expectations when providing literacy instruction at schools. Moreover, development of culturally relevant pedagogy is possible only when taking into account students’ funds of knowledge that is, the system of expertise embedded in the community practices (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). Thus, from the situated literacies’ standpoint, it is crucial to address cultural aspects in L2 literacy instruction because the knowledge of the target culture may be missing in ELLs’ funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992).

In addition, members of the New London Group argue about the necessity to acknowledge the changing nature of literacy practices within the changes in context, in particular due to the technological advancements (New London Group, 1996). The New London Group is a team of 10 researchers including James Gee and Allan Luke who aim at addressing changes in literacy due to technology, globalization, and social and cultural diversity (“New London Group,” n.d.). They claim that the most important knowledge and skill under the conditions of new capitalism is sociotechnical designing which is the design of products and services that would create new workers’ identities and values (Smith, 1995). No wonder that digital literacies, an ability to read, understand, and
interpret hypertextual and multimedia texts, have become a crucial component in designing new workplaces and workers (Bawden, 2001; Gee, 2000).

With the rapid development of technologies, there appeared the need to redefine the concept of text and extend it from written words and images to a part of discourse such as text messaging or TV advertisements (Evans, 2005; Kress, 2003). Furthermore, the technological aspect of literacy practices also embraced the multimodality of a text; that is, video, audio, hyperlinks, and other interactive features (Larson, 2009). Several studies have addressed the beneficial use of digital technologies for L2 literacy development (Black, 2006; Duff, 2002; Gee, 2000; Lam, 2005). For example, in Black’s (2006) study, an adolescent ELL from China in a Canadian context succeeded in creating online identities and developing her literacy in L2 through participation in an online fanfiction site, a website where fans create narratives about popular cultural icons, create new characters, finish the plot of popular stories, and so forth. Thus, contemporary literacy instruction should address the issue of multimodality and developing L2 literacy through technology (Pirbhai-Illich, Nat Turner, & Austin, 2009).

In addition to the literacy approaches outlined above, critical literacy deserves attention because it argues for learners’ literacy skills development and improvement of their critical engagement with texts (Luke, 2000). In particular, critical literacy classrooms focus on the power relations between the audience and the text, and how authors present the information to the readers (McLaughlin & DeVoogd, 2004). From critical literacy perspective, successful readers not only comprehend the meaning of a text but also understand its ideological aspects, critically analyze it, and see how power permeates the text (Stevens & Bean, 2007; Wallace, 2001). The studies on the
development of L2 students’ critical literacy skills include Fraser (1998), Huang (2011), Ko and Wang (2009), Kuo (2009), and Perkins (1998). The researchers suggest that L2 teachers should go beyond basic literacy skills instruction and facilitate ELLs’ critical literacy development (Huang, 2011).

**Pedagogical strategies for teaching L2 literacies in the 21st century.** Having adopted different approaches to the concept of literacies in the 21st century, many researchers have focused their attention on the application of various pedagogical strategies of teaching L2 literacy to ELLs from immigrant families. Thus, the meta-analysis study by Adesope, Lavin, Thompson, and Ungerleider (2011) included 26 experimental and quasi-experimental ESL studies with 3,150 participants in K-6 who went through instructional interventions in terms of L2 literacy. The researchers compared pedagogical strategies based on their effect on reading and writing in L2. The results of the study show that collaborative reading interventions such as peer reading, peers’ oral interaction and negotiation of meaning, and their shared interpretation of texts are more beneficial for L2 literacy development than multimedia-assisted reading interventions (such as the use of read-along multimedia materials) and systematic phonics instruction (that is, teaching ELLs to make correspondences between graphemes and phonemes). Finally, all pedagogical strategies had a significantly positive effect on the development of literacy in the target language (Adesope, Lavin, Thompson, & Ungerleider, 2011).

Thus, the studies on L2 literacy and L2 literacies in the 21st century highlight the importance of L2 literacy development with consideration of such crucial factors as ELLs’ L1 literacy (Pollard-Durodola & Simmons, 2009), their L2 proficiency (Bifuh-
Ambe, 2009), and L2 students’ age (Thomas & Collier, 2002). Moreover, they emphasize the importance of explicit teaching of literacy skills, which range from providing ELLs with systematic exposure to L2 vocabulary (Townsend, 2009) to peers’ discussions, co-construction, and co-interpretation of texts (Adesope, Lavin, Thompson, & Ungerleider, 2011). It is important to point out that the studies reviewed above investigated the L2 literacy skills development of ELLs of different age groups. Therefore, in the subsequent part of Chapter 2, I focus on the review of research studies, which looked into the adolescent L2 writing, in order to position my dissertation study and reveal the gap in the research literature.

**Adolescent L2 writing.** Adolescent L2 writing is an emerging interdisciplinary field of inquiry that draws its foundation from SLA, bilingual education, applied linguistics, and literacy and composition studies (Harklau, 2011). Though 44% of all ELLs in the US schools are adolescents often with low level of literacy skills, few studies have addressed adolescent second language writing as a central focus (Harklau, 2011; Harklau & Pinnow, 2009; Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). In addition, most of the scarce recent research studies on K-12 second language writing have mainly investigated the emergent literacy of elementary-age students (Blanton, 2002; Fu & Matoush, 2006; Samway, 2006) and the transition of L2 writers from high school to college (Harklau, 2000, 2001). Therefore, adolescent writing turns out to be an under-researched field taking into account that writing is an essential element in learning content of various subjects in the US schools (Fisher & Ivey, 2005). Thus, reviewing the scarce studies on adolescent L2 writing, I aim at revealing the gap in the research literature and building a foundation for my dissertation study.
Adolescents in the US schools fall under the category of students who face multiple high-stakes assessments that determine their graduation from high school and admission to college (Harklau, 2011). Therefore, the focus of instruction for adolescents often shifts to the content areas that students need to cover in order to pass standardized tests and other district requirements (Enright & Gilliland, 2011). With the implementation of No Child Left Behind, mathematics and reading became of primary concern; meanwhile, the development of L2 writing skills is neglected (McCarthey, 2008). Meanwhile, the diversity and multiculturalism of US high schools are a challenge to various standards and high-stakes assessments which claim the need to provide equal education to diverse classrooms but, simultaneously, constrain instruction to ELLs (Skerrett & Hargreaves, 2008).

Hence, adolescent L2 writing is highly influenced by various factors, which include sociopolitical, institutional, and cultural requirements and individual classroom contexts (Lee, 2008a, 2008b). For example, adolescent L2 academic writing is comprised of several genres, the focus on which can be explained by expectations for each content subject (Christie & Derewianka, 2008). In addition, students’ experiences and motivation, teachers’ instructional and pedagogical approaches, and teacher-student dynamics in the classroom play a role and shape adolescent L2 writing in US high schools (Blanton, 2002; Lee, 2008b). Meanwhile, according to Tardy (2006), L2 writers differ from L1 writers in many aspects. L2 writers need more explicit instruction about genres and their expectations. They may experience more difficulties while writing because of L1 and other contextual factors. In a high school setting, there is a need for more research studies
to understand the complexity of adolescent L2 students’ learning of written genres (Juzwik et al., 2006; Kibler, 2011; Tardy, 2009).

The concept of audience is another crucial issue in adolescent L2 writing, which has attracted researchers’ attention (Kibler, 2011). The understanding of audience is heavily influenced by culture; therefore, L2 writers face difficulties in writing for various audiences without explicit instruction on the matter (Ramanathan & Kaplan, 1996; Reynolds, 2005). Moreover, L2 students often find it challenging to meet the expectations of teachers as evaluating audience (Hyland, 2004). In order to meet teachers’ expectations, L2 students must not only show academic knowledge but also know how to write in school (Kibler, 2011).

Thus, in a recent study, Kibler (2011) focused on the school-based writing in humanities and biology subject areas. In an in-school context, four adolescents with Spanish as L1 and English as L2 produced various writing tasks such as persuasive letter and science lab report. The findings of the study show that ELLs’ understanding of genre and task requirements differed from the one of teachers’ because the explicit explanation of such was shared mainly through teachers’ feedback to students’ writing and not through the explicit instruction. The differences were mainly in terms of lexical choices, general elements of writing, grammar, and mechanics of writing (Kibler, 2011). One of the major implications in Kibler’s (2011) study is the highlighted necessity to provide explicit instruction on content writing to L2 adolescent students.

Acknowledging the importance of situating the further research on adolescent L2 writing within the constrains and influence of various factors, Ortmeier-Hooper and
Enright (2011) created a conceptual map, which provides the basis for understanding and investigating various research topics on ELLs’ writing at school through synthetic research approach that is, looking at each matter under study through the lens of the whole picture, but simultaneously take into account other separate factors present as elements of the big whole. In the model, some factors fall under the category of “identity negotiations and social interactions,” others—under “national and local educational policies, curricula and conditions,” which lead and are intertwined with “students’ in-school and post-secondary trajectories” (Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011, p. 170). It is important to point out that all the factors and aspects of adolescent literacy development are interconnected and reliant on each other (Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011).

In addition, Ortmeier-Hooper (2010) emphasizes the importance of acknowledging “identity negotiation and social interaction” of adolescents in any research on adolescent L2 writing (p. 171). The age of adolescence is a period of questioning and exploration of one’s identity (Erikson, 1956). It is the quest for one’s independence and maturity (Christenbury, Bomer, & Smagorinsky, 2009). Social interaction outside of the classroom has an impact and carries the influence of academic life (Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011). In particular, adolescent L2 students bring with them the world of their social experiences into the classroom, which affects their social engagement and interaction in a school context. Therefore, the issues of “identity negotiation and social interaction” should be inherent and taken into account when conducting research with adolescents. They can play an important role in students’ making choices, decisions, and interactions in out-of-school and in-school contexts (Oakes, 2005; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2010).
Black’s (2006) study deserves a special attention in this literature review. Though the primary focus of the study is on the L2 adolescent writer’s identity formation through literacy practices as a part of voluntary writing in Fanfiction.net website, the researcher touches upon the review practices of the audience. The brief part on the feedback from audience and its negotiation reveals how valuable the collaboration and social nature of writing was for the adolescent L2 participant’s identity formation and the development of her writing in L2. The findings of the study show how L2 adolescent writer could create a strong transcultural identity that is, identity “constructed through the different cultural perspectives and literacies,” through the literacy practices in the online community (Black, 2006, p. 171).

Peer Review

One of the activities which is recommended to pre-service and in-service teachers for enhancing their K-12 ELLs’ literacy development is peer review (Peregoy & Boyle, 2008). It is a complex activity with many steps such as peer review training, students reading a peer’s writing, and students providing feedback to each other. During peer review training, students learn about peer review and typically practice with a hands-on activity (e.g., reviewing a writing sample chosen by the teacher). In the “students reading a peer’s writing” step, students read a text that has been written by one of their peers. Finally, in the “providing feedback step” students provide feedback to a classmate in written and/or spoken form, often discussing and negotiating this feedback. After peer review sessions, the students revise their writing and decide what changes they choose to make and which suggestions of their peers they choose not to follow.
Peer review as an activity has captured attention of many researchers. Some label this activity: peer evaluation (Stanley, 1992), peer revision (McGroarty & Zhu, 1997), peer response (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Liu & Hansen, 2002), and peer critique (Marx, 1990). Among various terms used to name it, I consider “peer review” most suitable based on how I view this activity. I consider its collaborative aspect to be at the core of the value this activity can bring into any classroom. Peer review provides students with an opportunity to share their writing artifacts and become audience for each other (de Guerrero & Villamil, 1994), develop critical thinking skills and provide constructive feedback (Hyland, 2000; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996), learn how to negotiate and develop the argument (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; McGroarty & Zhu, 1997; Nguyen, 2008), and, finally, improve their writing skills in L2 (Min, 2006). Thus, by appropriating the term “peer review,” I do not aim at diminishing or criticizing the other terms that exist. On the contrary, I acknowledge the variety, which only shows the complex and multifaceted nature of this activity. Noteworthy, though using the term “peer editing,” the teacher asked the students to engage in the process of “peer reviewing” each other’s works. Thus, I use both terms interchangeably in this dissertation report.

Though there are many different steps that comprise peer review, most of the studies have investigated the training step; mainly, the effects of peer review training on ESL students’ writing and their ability to provide and negotiate feedback. For example, Stanley (1992) examined the impact of a relatively long (approximately 7 hours) and thorough peer review training in one university ESL composition class. The training of the experimental group included the discussion and evaluation of several sample writings, role-playing of providing and negotiating feedback, and discussion of individual
strategies, which could be employed during interaction in the peer review sessions. In contrast, the control group received a much shorter (approximately 1 hour) training during which students watched a model of peer review session and then had a brief discussion about it. Stanley’s findings showed that the L2 students in the experimental group were much more engaged and motivated than the participants in the control group. In addition, the students who received the longer training managed to offer clearer guidelines and suggestions on their peer’s writing. Finally, their feedback was of higher quality in terms of many aspects such as a higher frequency of specific responses to problematic areas in writing and the overall clarity of feedback.

In addition, several researchers have examined the effect of trained peer review on L2 students’ subsequent revisions and on the development of their writing overall. For instance, Berg (1999b) studied the impact trained peer review had on ESL students’ revision types and writing quality in a university intensive English program. Four groups of ESL students volunteered to participate in the study. The experimental group (one ESL writing class of intermediate proficiency level and one ESL writing class of intermediate-high proficiency level) received peer review training while the control group (2 ESL writing classes with the corresponding levels of proficiency to the experimental ones) had no training at all. The training for experimental group included 11 steps (each 5-45 minutes long). In summary, the participants received the training on what language to use in order to ask questions, on how to express and negotiate their opinion, and so forth. Moreover, the participants learned about and discussed specific foci of peer review, such as global aspects of writing (e. g. meaning and clarity). The findings of the study show that trained peer review sessions resulted in a significantly more revisions of the content
in the participants’ drafts in comparison to the ones produced by the students in the control group. In addition, peer review training had a significant positive influence on the quality of writing, as determined by the Test of Written English (TWE) scoring criteria.

Similarly, Min’s (2006) study examined the effects of peer review on the quality of writing and the number of revisions in one group of L2 learners; however, the study was conducted in an EFL context—at a Taiwanese university. In Min’s study, each student received the same peer review training, which consisted of two cycles of in-class modeling of peer review sessions (2 hours each) and two one-on-one teacher-student conferences (half an hour each). The researcher collected and compared participants’ first drafts, revisions, and the reviewers’ written feedback. The findings show that peer review sessions resulted in more revisions and in a higher writing quality with regards to the development and organization of ideas and overall clarity. Taken together, these studies suggest the nature of peer review training is a very important factor contributing to the effectiveness of peer review in ESL classes.

Another study that contributed to the understanding of peer review process with the focus on peer feedback was done by Kamimura (2006). The researcher investigated the impact of peer feedback on EFL students’ writing in two Japanese university-level courses. Based on the General Tests of English Language Proficiency (G-TELP), the participants were of high and low proficiency levels in EFL. Both classes received the same peer review training, which lasted 2 hours and was designed by Stanley (1992) and Berg (1999a). The findings of the study show that peer feedback resulted in significant improvement in both groups’ writing performance. The participants’ essays were scored holistically before and after the peer review (from 1 to 6, where 6 is the highest score).
Moreover, both groups made significantly better revisions in terms of content. Finally, the participants of high proficiency level in EFL produced longer rewrites when compared to their original drafts and focused on the global aspects of writing. The low proficient EFL participants’ revisions were of the same length, and the students’ focus was primarily on the local aspects of writing after the peer review session.

Finally, the only study with the focus on the process of peer review was conducted by Hu (2005). In his article, the researcher offers a first-person teacher-as-researcher perspective. In particular, Hu shares his approach to conducting peer review sessions with upper-intermediate Chinese EFL students in an EAP course in Singapore and analyzes his own experimentation with peer review procedures from 2001 to 2003. Every course (six month long) aimed at helping students develop their writing and prepare them for university-level writing assignments in English. The students’ major assignments were six 500-word writings and a 1,500-2,000 word research paper. The author categorizes his pedagogical approach in his writing course as “process-oriented, genre-centered, theme-structured, and task-based” (Hu, 2005, p. 328).

Hu (2005) provides a detailed explanation of all the steps in peer review sessions and how he was changing them over time. The major experiments with the process of peer review were in terms of peer review training. Specifically, it evolved from the whole-class discussion of peer review and teacher’s explanation of this activity procedures to 15 peer review training activities with the focus on raising awareness, practice, demonstration, instruction, and reflection. In particular, Hu (2005) describes his changing approach to the explanation of procedures and pre-response review. The author
conducted the reiterative analysis of peer review process, students’ writing, and students’ oral and written feedback.

The findings of Hu’s (2005) study show that the inadequate training and the lack of sufficient teacher follow-ups to student work are the major factors, which undermined the success of peer review in the 2001 class. In addition, through such analysis and continuing reflection, the teacher managed to improve peer review in terms of the quality and increased number of activities in the peer review training, revised order of response modes (the oral feedback preceding the written), assigning students into pairs (students’ selecting different partners for each peer review session), and implementing several teacher follow-up activities.

**Content of peer review interaction.** Among the studies with the focus on peer feedback, it is important to review those that investigated the types of feedback, which ESL students choose to offer during peer review. For example, Nelson and Murphy (1992) examined the task dimension of peer review. The researchers’ goal was to determine if four intermediate ESL students stayed on task during peer review. In their study, the peer review training consisted of the teacher’s explanation of the purpose of peer review, of the language that should be used when providing polite and specific feedback, and examples of “reader-based” replies (p. 175). In addition, the students had a chance to practice writing feedback on the drafts of the teacher’s former students. Finally, the teacher distributed the list of guiding questions for peer review, which focused primarily on writing organization. Hence, the students read the peer’s writing, wrote their comments, and then discussed them orally with their peers in groups. The findings of the
study show that the ESL students’ comments were mostly about study of language (73% of the total number of comments).

Another study that shed light on the content of students’ interaction during peer review was carried out by McGroarty and Zhu (1997). The researchers investigated the impact of peer-review training on the quality of 169 university freshmen’s comments in English composition courses. Both experimental and control groups received peer-review training which included watching a video about a peer-review session and a whole-group discussion about the content of the video. Further, the experimental group received thorough three-session training and practiced reviewing a peer’s writing, providing comments and suggestions. In addition, the instructors facilitated students’ feedback in terms of clarity and focusing on global aspects of writing (audience, development of ideas, and purpose of writing). The findings of the study indicate that peer review training resulted in a significantly higher number of students’ comments on the global features of writing in the experimental group.

Thus, the studies on the process of peer review highlight the importance of peer review training for the subsequent steps of peer review and for the successful implementation of this activity in the classroom. The findings of the studies reviewed above also show the intertwined and interrelated nature of all steps in peer review activity. Thus, it is crucial to have the holistic view of the activity and examine the process of peer review and L2 students’ revisions due to this activity taking into account all steps that comprise peer review and the affordances which may play an essential role during peer review and after it.
Benefits and drawbacks of peer review. Peer review is generally viewed as a beneficial stage in the writing process, which enhances L2 students’ literacy development (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). However, there are many factors that may have an influence on the effectiveness or failure of peer review in L2 students’ writing development. For example, some textbooks mention that teachers sometimes are hesitant if to conduct peer review sessions in their classes because it requires lengthy preparation for peer training and for peer review sessions in their ESL classes (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Kroll, 2003). This logistical concern is not the only one; however, there are many advantages, which are important to consider when conducting a study on peer review and when implementing it as an activity with L2 writers.

Peer review: Possible benefits. According to the overview above, the major evident advantage of using peer review is the development and improvement of students’ revising skills (Berg, 1999b; Min, 2006). In addition, peer review sessions may offer other linguistic, cognitive, affective, and social benefits. For example, Lundstrom and Baker (2009) focused on the comparison of the effect of providing the feedback versus receiving the feedback by ESL writers (both at beginning and intermediate levels of proficiency). The researchers conducted peer review training on how to provide feedback to the “feedback givers” and on how to receive feedback to the “feedback receivers.” The peer review training for feedback givers learned how to make suggestions to their peers while feedback receivers—how to revise an essay incorporating suggestions offered by feedback givers.

The participants’ pretest and posttest essays, written at the beginning and at the end of the semester, were scored in order to determine their improvement in writing. The
essays were evaluated on the six aspects of writing: development, organization, structure, cohesion, vocabulary, and mechanics. The findings show that the students with the beginning level of English proficiency who participated in the study as feedback givers had significant improvement in writing in terms of all six writing aspects. On the contrary, the intermediate L2 students (feedback givers and feedback receivers) made significant improvements in only three aspects of writing: development, organization, and grammar. Moreover, the feedback givers of the intermediate-level in L2, who had never participated in peer review before, achieved significant gains in organization and development when compared with the feedback receivers of the intermediate-level in L2. Thus, one of the benefits of peer review sessions is providing feedback because it can result in significant improvement of their writing in L2.

Other researchers have also noted the bidirectional advantages of peer review in terms of collaborative nature of the activity. For instance, de Guerrero and Villamil (1994), Villamil and de Guerrero (1996), and Carr (2008), have highlighted L2 students’ interpsychological efforts to reach intersubjectivity. Both feedback givers and feedback receivers adopt equal responsibility for the task during peer review because they exchange the roles of readers and writers when participating in peer review. In conclusion, peer review carries many benefits both for L2 students receiving feedback and for L2 students giving feedback.

Peer review: Potential issues. Despite many advantages that peer review may bring for L2 students’ writing development, some researchers reported about potential issues to consider before implementing this activity. Such issues include tension and misunderstandings, which may emerge due to cultural differences of the students who
participate in the peer review (Carson & Nelson, 1994, 1996). For instance, Carson and Nelson (1994) argue that students from collectivist cultures (such as Chinese and Japanese) consider group work as reaching collectivist success and achieving cohesion and harmony within the group. Students from individualist cultures, on the contrary, focus on the success of an individual when participating in a group activity. Thus, in Carson and Nelson’s (1996) study, Chinese students felt reluctant to comment negatively or disagree with their peers. Instead they concentrated on preserving a harmonious and positive atmosphere in the group. On the contrary, Spanish-speaking students did not hesitate to offer critique and disagree, because they saw the need to help the peer with writing as the primary priority, which was obviously above keeping harmony in the group. Thus, differences in L2 students’ culturally dependent attitudes towards group work may have an influence on the dynamics of students’ behavior during peer review.

Moreover, in the study on the task dimension and the social dimension in L2 writing groups, Nelson and Murphy (1992) observed one or more participants employing a dominant role in the group. The dominant participants tended to attack other members with negative comments, critical feedback, and disagreement to the feedback they had received. In addition, the participants in the dominant role produced the larger number of utterances. Therefore, participants’ attitude to the peer review task highly depended on their role within peer review group. The participants in the dominant role viewed peer review sessions as beneficial for their writing development. On the contrary, students with low-status roles such as the weakest writer felt discomfort because of the received critique and negative feedback. Thus, students’ roles in peer review groups may also
contribute to the L2 students’ negative perception of peer review and the failure of this activity.

The other factor that may have a negative influence on the success of peer review is the students’ preference to receive teacher feedback instead of peer feedback. Hence, in Zhang’s (1995) study on the affective advantage of peer review in ESL classes, a significantly higher number of students reported about their preference for the teacher’s feedback to the peers’ feedback. In addition, Connor and Asenavage (1994), Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, and Huang (1998), Miao, Badger, and Zhen (2006), Paulus (1999), Tsui and Ng (2000) and Zhang (1995) all found that though L2 students viewed peer review as important in their learning, they still preferred teacher feedback to peer feedback. In addition, students seemed to believe that teacher feedback resulted in more changes in their writing and led to the improvement of their writing in L2. Thus, such research findings may question the effectiveness of peer review for L2 students’ writing development.

**Peer review and Web 2.0.** With the wide spread of technologies and the vast use of Internet in teaching and learning, it became possible to conduct peer review sessions online, with the use of various Web 2.0 tools (Murugesan, 2007). In particular, the researchers focused their attention on the nature of electronic feedback (e-feedback) and its influence on L2 students’ revisions and development of writing skills. For example, Ware (2008) investigated how English and Spanish learners provided feedback through Multi-User Domain Object Oriented (MOO) applications in two conditions: feedback as a requirement and feedback as an optional task. The findings of the study show that in
both conditions L2 students preferred the feedback on form; however, students engaged in sharing feedback only when it was a requirement.

Similarly, Liu and Sadler (2003) explored the nature of e-feedback in comparison to the feedback offered in a face-to-face context. In particular, the focus of their study was on the differences in feedback in two different contexts (technology-enhanced and face-to-face). In addition, the authors investigated the influence of context on the type, focus of feedback, and students’ revisions after peer review. The researchers found that L2 students made more comments through MOOs; however, the comments, which students made in a face-to-face context, were of higher quality than the comments made online. The authors conclude that comments in a face-to-face context were enhanced by the elements of nonverbal communication, which was not available through the use of MOOs.

Furthermore, Tuzi (2004) investigated e-feedback in a written form and its impact on L2 learners’ revisions and writing. L2 participants were asked to submit their written e-feedback in a website, created by the teacher. The findings of the study show that though students expressed their preference for the oral feedback from their peers, e-feedback had more positive influence on students’ revisions when compared to the oral. Specifically, e-feedback helped students focus on the macro aspects of writing when revising the text. Guardado and Shi’s (2007) findings were in alignment with Tuzi’s (2004). The researchers found the online context to be conducive to the higher quality of peer review feedback. In their study, ESL students, when using Blackboard discussion board, revealed the awareness of the audience and provided positive and negative comments, balancing them in quantity. However, some students chose not to respond to
their peers’ request to clarify the meaning. This broke the communication and negotiation of meaning during the peer review process. Finally, many students claimed that they questioned their peer’s comments. This finding supports one of the potential issues that teachers need to be aware of and address it during peer review training.

Among the studies with the focus on the use of Web 2.0 applications for peer review purposes, two explored the use of blogs for providing peer review feedback (Dippold, 2009; Liou & Peng, 2009). The blogs turned out to be a good platform for sharing peer feedback (Dippold, 2009). In addition, the findings of the study show that the participants who had received peer review training offered more comments oriented on revisions. Moreover, they were more enthusiastic and motivated for revisions and making changes in their writing (Liou & Peng, 2009). Though, overall, L2 participants positively commented on the use of blogs for peer feedback in an L2 writing class, several participants reported about their fear to impose ideas on their peers, the need of thorough training, and a lack of confidence when providing feedback to the peers (Dippold, 2009; Liou & Peng, 2009).

Finally, several studies explored the impact the online context has on adults’ peer review interaction (Hewett, 2000; Jones, Garralda, Li, & Lock, 2006; Liang, 2010). Aiming at investigating differences in interactional dynamics, Jones, Garralda, Li, and Lock (2006) found that peer interactions online had a more student-centered and less hierarchical (in terms of power) nature. The participants were using a free Web 2.0 instant messaging application “I seek you” (ICQ), Version 7.7, in order to provide feedback in a distant environment. The findings of the study show that the students mostly focused on process and content in their comments. However, when the
participants provided feedback in a face-to-face context, their comments were primarily on grammar, style, and vocabulary.

Similarly to Jones, Garralda, Li, and Lock’s (2006) study, Hewett (2000) found that the technology shapes the adult L2 students’ interaction at peer feedback step during peer review. In her study, the researcher compared the nature of oral peer feedback in a face-to-face oral context and computer-mediated context, using Norton CONNECT application. The findings of the study show that the oral interaction in a face-to-face context focused mainly on the global areas of writing such as organization and content. On the contrary, the oral comments during peer review in CONNECT were mostly about group management and specific aspects of writing. The participants made revisions and incorporated their peers’ suggestions after peer review in both contexts. However, they followed more suggestions from their peers due to peer review in CONNECT talks. Similarly, in Liang’s (2010) study, the L2 learners made more comments about task management and content than on grammar during synchronous online peer review in a Taiwanese undergraduate EFL writing class.

Thus, drawing on the findings of studies reviewed above, peer review is a complex activity that may enhance L2 students’ writing development. In particular, if the students receive thorough training, they make more macro revisions in their writing (Berg, 1999b), provide feedback of higher quality (Kamimura, 2006), learn how to negotiate meaning (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; McGroarty & Zhu, 1997), and enjoy the activity in general (Tsui & Ng, 2000). Meanwhile, there are also potential issues that ESL/EFL teachers should consider when conducting peer review sessions in their classes. Such issues include students’ culturally related attitude toward the group work (Carson &
Nelson, 1994), L2 students’ preference for teacher feedback to student feedback (Miao, Badger, & Zhen, 2006), and students’ feeling lack of confidence in their expertise (Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, & Huang, 1998).

Gaps in the Literature

Though research studies on adult ELL peer review practices are, by all means, informative for ESL/EFL teachers, none of the studies, to my knowledge, have focused on the use of peer review with L2 adolescent writers in the U.S. context. This is the major gap in the research literature, which needs urgent attention due to the peculiarities of this age group, as I discussed at the beginning of this chapter. In addition, drawing on the findings of the studies that did look into the use of technology for L2 students’ peer review, it is important to have the holistic view of the activity with the focus on adolescent L2 students’ perception of this activity, affordances, and revisions that students choose to make due to their peer review practices, employing ecological perspective as a theoretical framework of the study.

Summary

With the course of time and the spread of technology, the traditional view of literacy as a person’s ability to read and write has been substituted by the concept “multiliteracies” or “literacies” to embrace such skills as interpreting contextual symbols, interpreting multimedia and hypertextual texts, and understanding ideological aspects of a text (Gee, 2001). Moreover, major approaches to literacies in the 21st century agree that literacy practices are contextualized that is, they should be discussed as a part of Discourses, and they differ by time, language, and cultural context (Gee, 1992). Thus,
though the traditional view of literacy did not embrace L2 literacy, the development of literacy in L2 differs from the development of literacy in L1. Such factors as ELL’s age, individual differences, L1 literacy, and level of ELLs’ L2 proficiency have an impact on ELLs’ L2 literacy development and make the difference between L1 and L2 literacy development even more obvious.

Among various pedagogical strategies for L2 literacy development, peer review is of a particular attention and interest due to (a) the combination of literacy practices during peer review such as reading and writing; (b) its collaborative nature; and (c) the potential benefits that peer review may bring for ELLs’ L2 literacy development. However, despite the abundance of studies on peer review practices by adult ELLs, no studies have described and explained peer review practices of ELLs in K-12 in the USA. Moreover, no studies have focused on peer review practices of adolescent ELLs though at this age, ELLs differ from adults and younger ELLs because they undergo the exploration of their identity and view collaboration and social interaction as ways for negotiating and establishing their identity. Thus, there is a need to describe and explain peer review practices of adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts.

In the next chapter, I describe the methodology of the dissertation study. In particular, I explain (a) sites, (b) participants, (c) data collection, (d) data analysis, (e) data quality, and (f) the role of the researcher.
Chapter Three: Methodology

The purpose of the study was to describe and explain peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts. The exploratory questions, which guided the study, were

1. How do four adolescent ELLs perceive peer review in face-to-face and online contexts?

2. What affordances do four adolescent ELLs choose to employ during peer review in face-to-face and online contexts?

3. What revisions do four adolescent ELLs choose to make in their writing due to peer feedback in face-to-face and online contexts?

In this chapter, I explain the methodology of the study. In particular, I describe (a) sites, (b) participants, (c) data collection, (d) data analysis, (e) data quality, and (f) the role of the researcher.

Methodology

Based on the guiding research questions outlined above, the methodology of this dissertation is a multiple case study (Creswell, 2007; Janesick, 2011). In a qualitative inquiry, researchers aim at understanding some phenomenon or human behavior from the emic perspective, considering the importance of context and meaning, emphasizing
necessity to conduct research in natural settings, and playing the role of a research instrument in their studies (Janesick, 2011). According to Creswell (2007), the purpose of case studies is to describe and explain a bounded case or bounded cases over time through observations, interviews, and artifacts. In addition, Stake (2006) points out the importance of “experiencing the activity of the case as it occurs in its contexts and in its particular situation” as a major requirement for qualitative case studies (p. 2). Thus, conducting a case study is describing and explaining a certain phenomenon, entity, or quintain within its context with the focus on its activity or functioning (Stake, 2006).

In this dissertation study, I focused at peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs as the central phenomenon. Considering the context and including the participants’ emic perspectives was important for me, as a researcher of the study, because of the essence of the qualitative study as discussed above and because of the theoretical framework—the ecological perspective. Moreover, I aimed at describing and explaining four cases bounded by time and place—the data collection took place during Fall 2012, and the participants were the students in one class of the high school. Finally, in order to meet the major criteria for qualitative studies as outlined by Stake (2006) that is, to experience the phenomenon under study in the specific context and situation, I collected data from multiple sources such as observations (recordings and field notes), researcher’s and participants’ e-journals, interviews, and artifacts.

**Sites.** For the purpose of this study, I collected data in the face-to-face context of Purple High School in Green County School District and online. When selecting the school for the study, I considered purposeful sampling (the number and diversity of ELLs) and convenience. The names of the high school and school district are
pseudonyms, selected by the researcher. The information about the sites came from the online resources such as reports and websites, observations, interviews, and artifacts. Noteworthy, in describing face-to-face and online contexts, I use the terms “site,” “context,” “setting,” and “environment” interchangeably.

**Face-to-face context.** I conducted the study in Purple High School in Green County School District in the southeastern part of the USA. The state, where I conducted the study, had experienced the gradual growth in the number of ELL student population (Education Information and Accountability Services, 2010). Currently, the state is the third in the USA in terms of the number of ELL students in K-12 settings—over 250,000 ELL students. In addition, it is among leading in terms of diversity of ELLs. The ELLs speak about 230 languages as their L1, with Spanish as a major L1 (“Bureau of Student Achievement,” n.d.).

**Green County School District.** The Green School District is defined as county-wide and includes 267 schools of grades K-12. In particular, 142 elementary, 44 middle, 27 high, four career centers, five technical education centers, and 43 Charters belong to the Green County School District. In addition, it manages 82 adult programs in the county (“Information,” 2013). The top priority of the district has always been student achievement (2011 Annual Report, n.d.). According to the 2011 District Annual Report, the vision of the school district is “to become the nation’s leader in developing successful students” (p. 12). The school district aims at providing such quality of education to each student that would allow him/her to become successful and responsible citizens of the USA (2011 Annual Report, n.d.).
The Green County School District aims at providing ELL programs to help ELLs understand instruction in English as an L2. Moreover, the major goals of the district in terms of education are to ensure equal educational opportunities and support to all students including ELLs. The schools in the district provide education to 25,000 ELL students with over 102 languages as their L1 (English Language Learners, n.d.). The majority of the ELLs are Spanish, Haitian Creole, Korean, and Vietnamese.

As in the whole state, the ELLs in the Green County School District take the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA), an English language proficiency test by Educational Testing Service (ETS; “Bureau of Student Achievement,” n.d.). According to the state’s CELLA fact sheet (2006), CELLA measures ELLs’ proficiency in terms of four skills: (a) listening, (b) speaking, (c) reading, and (d) writing. The ELLs take CELLA as a group but for the speaking section, they have a one-on-one interview with the teacher. The test results for each ELL students could be used for their placement into or exit from ESOL programs, finding students’ strengths and weaknesses in English, and measurement of their annual progress in ESL. The score for each of the four skills classifies ELLs’ proficiency as beginning, low-intermediate, upper-intermediate, and proficient (“CELLA Interpretive Guide,” 2012).

In terms of technology use, the Green County School District provides technology training for all divisions of Green County Public Schools. Eight trainers, a team leader, and a supervisor support the county schools in terms of software, hardware, and relevant training (“Technology Training & Professional Development,” 2013). In addition, the Green County School District has increased the use of technology in general and social media in particular for various school districts purposes (2011 Annual Report, n.d.). For
example, the school district started using ParentLink telephone message system for sending emergency messages such as weather alerts and school closings. The district also uses Twitter in order to spread the information to the public in a timely manner on the Internet (2011 Annual Report, n.d.).

*Purple High School.* According to Public School Review (2012), Purple High School provides education to students in grades 9-12. Purple High School aims at offering a safe academic environment conducive to students’ development and their success in terms of achieving academic and career goals. In addition, Purple High School’s central goal is to help students become creative, proud, and respectful citizens. According to Purple High School’s Public Accountability Report of 2010-2011, out of 2,065 students, 956 belonged to White racial/ethnic group, 465—Black or African American, 513—Hispanic or Latino, 68—Asian, 1—Native Hawaiian or other Pacific islander, 8—American Indian or Alaska Native, 54—two or more races (Florida Department of Education, n.d.).

One hundred and ninety-seven students at the school were classified as ELL (Florida Department of Education, n.d.). The curriculum for ELLs included English I-IV through ESOL and ESOL Reading -Writing Skills I and II. According to the school’s website, Purple High School provides students with a wide range of supplemental programs and clubs including Book Club, Creative Writing Club, Drama, International Club, Science Fiction Club, and Spanish Honor Society. The students can also get tutoring on such subjects as mathematics, science, social studies, Spanish, and technical/career.
Advancement via Individual Determination (AVID) class. The participants of the study were students of AVID class. Mostly they were first-generation college. The majority of students in her AVID classes were from single-parent household (either via divorce, death, or by choice) and lower socio-economic status. Predominant number of students was minorities: Hispanic and African-American. ESOL students were accepted to AVID on a case-by-case basis. The teacher of the class pointed out that among various factors she especially paid attention to an ESOL student’s willingness to get on the track of going to college and to the students’ work ethics. Such determination in many cases showed the students’ readiness to become a member of AVID family (see Appendix A for AVID Program Application). I further describe the class in Chapter 4.

Online context. In addition to collecting data in face-to-face classroom context, I aimed at describing and explaining peer review practices of the participants online. In order to provide adolescent ELLs with the platform for writing online, I chose wikispaces.com, a free Web 2.0 tool for students’ collaboration. Wikispaces.com afforded the participants with one single space or website where they could engage in their own writing, provide written feedback to each other, make revisions, and polish their writing. In addition, it was convenient for me as a researcher to keep track of all changes because wiki saved every change on every page in a chronological order. When creating a wiki on Wikispaces.com, I registered it as an educational tool, which allowed making it completely private and inaccessible to the public. Only invited guests could register and become members of the wiki. Finally, I chose the following address for the wiki: L2literacy.wikispaces.com (see Figure 2 for the Home page of the wiki on p. 55).
Figure 2. Screen shot of L2 literacy wikispace. Figure 2 illustrates the Home page of the wikispace where the participants read about the wikispaces.com, posted drafts of their writing, provided written feedback to each other, and made revisions in their writing.
Figure 2 illustrates the Home page of the wiki, which the participants opened when entering the site for the first time. On the Home page, I listed how they could use the wiki, what they should do to start using the wiki, and where they could find resources if they needed help with using the wiki. After finalizing the Home page, I created the individual page for every participant. I named the pages with the participants’ pseudonyms. I asked all the participants to choose their own pseudonyms. However, I had to do it for Anni as the girl could not provide me with the pseudonym for herself. Later, I asked the participants to use their individual pages for writing their essays online. As a creator of the educational wiki, I could create profiles for the participants and generate the list of their login and password information.

Though I initially planned to ask the participants to use the wiki for writing and peer reviewing purposes online, the teacher supported by the administration of the school asked me to use the computer laboratory on Purple High School campus for this part of the study. The teacher did all the arrangements regarding scheduling the computer lab for the study as the computer labs were mostly used for testing purposes. Despite many efforts and attempts to schedule the computer lab with access to Skype and headphones, it turned out impossible. Therefore, the participants could not provide the feedback to each other orally and negotiate it using Skype as a free Web 2.0 teleconferencing tool, as initially planned.

During the first session in the computer lab, I distributed the information with the ELLs’ login information to L2literacy.wikispaces.com. Further, I introduced them to the wiki, explained the Home page, and asked the students to open their individual pages. When introducing the wiki, I provided a brief training to students on how to use the wiki
for their writing online (see Appendix B for training materials for online context) and explained how they could use the wiki’s features to provide feedback to the peers. Specifically, I suggested the participants using the different color for their feedback so that the peers could easily see the feedback.

**Participants of the study.** In the recruitment of the participants for the present study, I aimed at describing and explaining four adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices based on Creswell’s (2007) suggestion of inviting four or five participants for a multiple case study because this number allows for collecting sufficient data for cross-case analysis. In the recruitment, I first used a snow ball strategy that is, I sampled ELLs and the teacher based on the assistant principal’s recommendation who knew who of the teachers had ELLs and conducted peer review in their classes (Creswell, 2007).

In terms of criteria for purposeful sampling of the four adolescent ELLs, I aimed at inviting ELLs who were 12-19 years old as defined by Ortmeier-Hooper and Enright (2011). In addition, I preferred recruiting the participants from different ethnical backgrounds who would not share the same L1. Their levels of language proficiency in L2 could range from low-intermediate to proficient, as determined by the CELLA (“Florida - CELLA,” 2005). Noteworthy, I did not select the participants based on their gender or socioeconomic status. In order to avoid the influence of attrition on the study, I initially recruited seven participants. During Fall 2012, the participants had to meet additional criteria. They had to

a) attend and participate in all peer review sessions face-to-face and online;

b) submit all artifacts which were used for peer review purposes in the face-to-face and online context.
After receiving Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval from the university and the permission to conduct the study from the Green County School District, I observed the classes of three teachers who had ELLs in their classes and who planned to conduct peer review during Fall 2012. After the first observation, I purposefully sampled the teacher of AVID because she heavily focused on the development of literacy in her classes and planned to conduct many peer review sessions. Furthermore, the teacher told me at the first meeting that she would be willing to participate in the study. In addition, her class impressed me with its clear organization, rapport between students and the teacher, and students’ active participation. Finally, she had many ELLs in her AVID 1 class whom I could recruit for the participation in the study.

From an ecological perspective standpoint, I needed to consider all relationships in the context/environment under the study (van Lier, 2004). Therefore, I asked the teacher to sign the IRB consent form to allow me to observe the classes and collect and utilize data from observations, students’ writing, audio recordings, and e-journals. I also interviewed the teacher in order to supplement data collected from the ELLs and during observations and to clarify my assertions during member checking (Stake, 2006).

After the teacher signed the IRB consent form, I explained my purpose of visit to the Purple High School to all students in AVID 1 class and invited them to participate in the study. I distributed the assent forms for the adolescent participants and consent forms for their parents. I explained the purpose and procedure of the study as well the participants’ role in the study. In addition to inviting ELL participants, I asked NSs of English for the consent to use their oral and written comments as the data for my study because ELL participants were assigned in groups/pairs with NS of English for peer
review. Nevertheless, the focal participants/agents of the study were four adolescent L2 students, and their peer review practices were of primary importance in my data collection and analysis. I started data collection when I received the assent forms signed by the students and the consent forms signed by their parents.

Initially, seven adolescent ELLs volunteered to be the participants of the study. However, over the course of the semester three of them could not attend and participate in all peer review session, missed one of the interviews, and/or failed to submit written artifacts used for peer review. Thus, in this report I focus on the four adolescent ELLs as focal participants. Table 1 (see p. 60) presents information about the four participants of the study. Specifically, all four participants were 14-years old. Two of them were boys, and two—girls. Two participants were from Haiti with L1—Creole, while other two from Salvador and Honduras with L1—Spanish. The participants’ proficiency in English (reading and writing) ranged from high-intermediate to proficient. I describe the participants in more detail in Chapter 4.

Importantly, for every peer review sessions, the participants worked with different peers. Five students who participated in peer review with the participants submitted the IRB assents and parental consents while four chose to not participate. As some of the students who worked in pairs/groups with the participants chose to not participate in the study and with the primary focus on the participants’ peer review practices, I further name all students who peer reviewed the participants work as “peers.” Noteworthy, for the purposes of the study I included the data for only those peers who signed the assent forms and submitted
them along with parental consent forms. Such peers were both females and males, ELLs and NSs of English.

Table 1

*ELL’s Information as of October 2012*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Participant’s or his/her family’s country of origin</th>
<th>Participant’s native language</th>
<th>Level of English proficiency (reading and writing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BravoWolf</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Salvador</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>High-intermediate in writing and proficient in reading (as of May 19, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anni</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Creole</td>
<td>Proficient in reading and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightning</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Creole</td>
<td>High-intermediate in writing and proficient in reading (as of April 27, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Proficient in reading and writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Table 1 provides information about the four adolescent ELLs who participated in the study. In particular, it shows the age, participant’s or his/her family country of origin, native language, and the level of proficiency in English. The level of proficiency in English was either from CELLA scores; otherwise, I relied on the teacher’s best judgment if CELLA scores were not available. Only for Lightning, CELLA scores were from the year of 2012.

**Data collection.** For this dissertation study, I collected data through (1) interviews, (2) observations, (3) researcher’s and participants’ e-journals, and (4) artifacts. The data collection started after I had defended my dissertation proposal and received IRB approvals from the university and the permission from the school district to conduct the study at Purple High school in Green County. Specifically, it officially
started on April 3, 2012 and was over at the end of December 2012. Therefore, the official data collection lasted nine months. Due to a number of data collection methods, I further describe each of them in more detail.

**Interviews.** According to Janesick (2011), interviews are a major part of any qualitative research work and its “most rewarding component” (p. 99). She defines interviewing as “a meeting of two persons to exchange information and ideas through questions and responses, resulting in communication and joint construction of meaning about a particular topic” (p. 100). Interviewing grants researchers with the possibility to unfold the participants’ perspective and experiences, which may not be available through mere observations (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). For the purposes of this study, I aimed at conducting semi-structured interviews that is, the interviews which are guided by a list of questions but the wording, number, or order of questions are flexible and may be changed during the interview based upon necessity (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

I conducted interviews with both the focal participants of my study—4 adolescent L2 writers and with their teacher. I interviewed ELL participants two times based on their availability. Appendices C and D (see Appendices) contains the protocols for Interview 1 and 2 with the four high school ELLs. The protocols consist of five guiding open-ended questions. The types of questions might be defined as descriptive and big-picture (Janesick, 2011). In addition, due to the semi-structured format of the interview, I asked other questions during interviews in order to clarify some information, elicit rich data, and respond to the new ideas on the matter of the inquiry (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). The protocol for Interview 2 was based on the data elicited during observations and Interview 1 (see Appendix D). In addition, I conducted two interviews
with the teacher of four ELLs in order to check information collected through observations and to supplement data collected from the ELLs (see Appendices E and F).

Each interview lasted approximately one hour and was scheduled based on mutual convenience in terms of time for both the participants and the researcher. I conducted the first round of interviews with the focal participants and the teacher after the second peer review session in the classroom and after the first peer review online because I aimed the ask the participants about their peer review practices in both environments. The second round of interviews took place at the beginning of December 2012 after the participants’ third peer review session in the face-to-face context and the second peer review online. Finally, though I planned to conduct all interview online, using Skype video-/audio-conferencing tool and audio-recording them with QuickTime or any other Web 2.0 tool, the teacher supported by the school administration requested all the interviews and online data collection to be conducted at school. Thus, all data collection, including interviews and online peer review sessions, happened on Purple High School’s campus during the classes.

**Observations.** In qualitative research, observations are one of the major data collection methods (Janesick, 2010). The purpose of observations as a data collection method in my study was to observe and describe the context, participants, and peer review practices in the face-to-face context (Janesick, 2011). In particular, the following questions served as guiding during my observations:

1. The physical setting.
   a) What does the setting look like?
b) How does the setting change over time and how does that influence the participants’ behavior (if relevant)?

2. The participants.
   a) Who are the participants of the study?
   b) Do they engage in the classroom activities and how?

3. Activities and interactions.
   a) What are the activities and interactions in the classroom that may play a role in participants’ peer review practices and their perceptions of this activity?
   b) What is the nature of students’ interaction with each other and with the different activities and tasks in the classroom setting?
   c) How are the activities and interactions structured?
   d) How does the peer review process look like?

4. Other factors.
   a) What does not happen that should be in place in students’ participation, engagement in different student activities, and so forth?
   b) What may participants’ nonverbal behavior add to the other data?
   c) What are other factors about the participants, context, or activities/tasks/interactions/conversations that may be important to consider when analyzing data and addressing the exploratory questions?

5. My own behavior.
   a) How do I, as a researcher and an observer, behave in the classroom within the role I chose for the observations?
b) What are my thoughts, attitudes, insights, and perceptions during observations?

For the purpose of this study, I started observing the participants in AVID 1 classroom face-to-face setting on the 21st of September. I observed the participants for two hours every week and conducted in total 28 observations each one hour long. During observations, I neither participated in any activities in the classroom nor engaged in students’ writing, peer review, or revision practices in order to not disrupt the natural flow of the class. However, I was present in the classroom, and the students knew the purpose of my being there.

It is important to point out that observations of peer review sessions in a school-based context were of my particular interest. Therefore, I audio-recorded each peer review interaction in pairs or groups in a school-based context. As for the online peer review sessions, I planned to ask the participants to audio-record their interaction in Skype with the help of QuickTime or any other software. Nevertheless, due to the contextual limitations, it appeared impossible to obtain access to computers with Skype or any other conferencing Web 2.0 tool. Thus, the participants provided peer feedback only in a written form, and I was present in the computer lab and observed their working at writing and peer reviewing online.

Field notes. During each observation, I recorded relevant information following the observation guiding questions listed above (see pp. 62-64). For this purpose, I used the field note format suggested by Janesick (2011; see Appendix G). I took detailed descriptive notes about setting, participants, and other aspects as well as direct quotations of participants’ speech in the Observations Column and recorded notes to myself in the
Notes Column. My comments in the Notes Column included notes about my feelings, ideas for subsequent interview questions, reactions, and interpretations. I further typed all notes, which I had handwritten during observations within 48 hours after each observation.

*e-Journals.* For the purposes of this dissertation study, I wrote a researcher’s journal while my focal participants made entries into their participants’ journals. Journal writing is “a powerful heuristic tool and research technique” (Janesick, 1999, p. 506). Janesick (2011) suggests journal writing as a member check of researcher’s own thinking (Janesick, 2013). It also affords enhanced reflexivity of a researcher, mediation, dialogue, and awareness of the researcher’s “unconscious self” (Janesick, 1999, p. 516). In addition, it allows the researcher to complement other techniques of data collection and helps the researcher realize him/herself as a research instrument in the process of qualitative inquiry (Janesick, 2011).

The aim of writing e-journals for the purposes of this dissertation was two-fold: to supplement data from other sources and to keep record of my reflections as a researcher in conducting this study. In writing e-journal entries, I focused on a range of issues that I encountered in the process of conducting a dissertation. Such issues included thoughts on the data collection, perceptions of the participants’ ideas, actions, or interactions through the lens of my background as an EFL in the past and an EFL/ESL teacher in the present, and notes on the extraordinary events, successes and problems in carrying out the study. Therefore, journal writing as a research technique served the purpose of leading a dialogue with myself and getting feedback from myself (Janesick, 2011).
Among many free Web 2.0 tools for researcher’s and participants’ journal writing, I chose penzu.com. penzu.com is a free Web 2.0 tool, which allows writers to set a journal as private or share it with anybody (see Figure 3 below and Figure H1 in Appendix H).

Figure 3. Screen shot of the researcher’s reflective e-journal in penzu.com. This Figure shows the cover of the researcher’s e-journal with such features as settings, legacy, and lock.
I wrote e-journal entries every week or even more frequently. Noteworthy, I provided the students with the training on how to use penzu.com (see Appendix B for training materials). For the researcher’s e-journal, I made it private so that my reflections and other ideas would not be accessible to the public and would stay confidential, while the participants had the choice of sharing their journals with their friends, families, teachers or anybody else or keeping them private and sharing their entries only with me as a researcher. All four participants made their e-journals private and shared their entries on peer review practices only with me, as a researcher.

**Artifacts.** The artifacts that I collected for the study included (1) guidelines for the writing assignments, (2) students’ writing, and (2) peer review handouts. In particular, I collected the focal participants’ first and subsequent drafts, which were used during and after peer review sessions. In addition, the teacher of the participants asked the students to provide peer feedback in a written form; therefore, their answers and written feedback also constituted a part of the data. As for the online context, I asked my ELL participants to write two pieces in any genre online so that they could participate in online peer review twice during the semester of my data collection. The ELLs were the students from one class and participated in the peer review sessions online all at the same time.

In total the written artifacts for the classroom face-to-face context included (a) three drafts of the first writing assignment (two peer review sessions), (b) two peer-editing checklists for the first written assignment, (c) two drafts for the second writing assignment (1 peer review session), and (d) one peer-editing checklist for the second written assignment. For the online context, the participants shared 2 drafts of their writing, thus participating in 2 peer review sessions during Fall 2012.
**Data analysis.** Data analysis is the process of making sense of the data (Janesick, 2011). In qualitative inquiry, data analysis stage is simultaneous and deeply intertwined with data collection (Creswell, 2007). Therefore, during data collection, I constantly drew insights into the matter under study, interpreted, and based the subsequent data collection steps on the collected data. In addition, I worked at data preparation and data analysis during data collection stage. Therefore, the data collection and analysis were not a linear process but rather spiral, inductive, and iterative (Creswell, 2007). Though it is hard to separate these two stages in conducting the study, in this part of the chapter, I aim at describing the steps I made in analyzing data.

**Data preparation.** I started data analysis with a thorough data preparation and organization. Throughout data collection I was transcribing audio recordings of my observations and interviews. In addition, I organized the rest of the data based on their type and chronological order. Though transcription may seem a monotonous process, it is an essential and initial stage in the data analysis (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). During transcription of the recording, I reflected and took notes on my ideas at that stage. I used those notes in the further analysis of data and finding emerging themes (Janesick, 2011). In the actual transcription, I focused on the content rather than turn-taking or nonverbal behaviors; therefore, while transcribing, I kept it as detailed as necessary for the content analysis and interpretation of data. Finally, I used Transcriptions, free software that allows for the more convenient and fast transcription process, and Dictation, software available for Mac users which allows for using the voice instead of typing the text.

**Construction of categories.** During data analysis, I looked for and color-coded meaningful units of data which were relevant to the exploratory questions of the study
(Janesick, 2011). Due to the nature of multiple case study, I started with within-case analysis and then proceeded with cross-case analysis of the data (Stake, 2006). With *within-case analysis*, I treated each case as separate. I started category construction with reading and rereading data and making notes on the units of data that seemed meaningful and relevant to the research questions. Such units may constitute a line of transcription or the whole page but should be the smallest units for interpretation on the particular aspect or phenomenon under study (Creswell, 2007). During and after taking notes and reading the data several times, I sorted and assigned the units into categories (Janesick, 2011). Finally, I named the categories based on what information I saw in the data.

Noteworthy, Creswell (2007) raises the issue of counting or disregarding the number of units of data under each category in a qualitative case study. For the purposes of this study, I did not aim at calculating the number of units under each category because I focused on the content of each unit and considered the categories equal in importance disregarding the number of units under each of them. Nevertheless, I did count the comments and revisions the participants made in their writing due to peer feedback in order to provide rich description and explanation of answers for Research Question 3. Thus, during within-case analysis, I took the following steps: (a) reading data several times, (b) making notes on the relevant units of data, (c) coding the units into categories, and (d) naming the categories.

Once I finished analyzing each separate case, I continued with *cross-case analysis* during I focused on similarities and differences between L2 participants’ peer review practices. For the cross-case analysis, I followed the steps suggested by Stake (2006). Specifically, I (a) read a draft for each participant’s case, (b) made notes while reading,
(c) wrote a summary for each case including context information, (c) reflected on the commonalities and differences of each participant’s case, (d) reflected and took notes on the importance of each finding in order to understand adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices, (e) took notes on and listed cross-case tentative assertions, (f) evaluated the quality of each assertion in terms of support from the data, and (g) revised tentative assertions and generated the list of final assertion statements. Finally, I aimed at enhancing my interpretation of the data and findings through member-check procedure (Janesick, 2011).

**Member checks.** Member checking is the process during which the researchers ask participants to read the transcripts of data or the written report and check if the researchers’ interpretation of the data provided by the participants is accurate (Janesick, 2011). When doing member checks, I aimed at enhancing credibility of the findings, triangulation, and promoting collaboration of the researcher and the participants (Creswell, 2007). For the purposes of this study, I asked my participants for their feedback on my interpretation of their emic perspectives during the interviews. The participants read the units of data and commented on what had happened in that particular situation or what they had meant in the corresponding situation. Subsequently, I incorporated their feedback into my interpretation of data and findings.

**Data quality.** In terms of data quality, I focused on the concepts of credibility and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I use these terms in evaluating the trustworthiness of the study from Lincoln and Guba (1985) because they established their usage for qualitative inquiry in a naturalistic setting (Creswell, 2007). In order to enhance credibility and confirmability of the findings, I collected data from multiple sources such
as observations, researcher’s and participants’ e-journals, interviews, and artifacts. Likewise, I used member checks to triangulate data analysis. I acknowledged my role as the researcher in the study, my interest in the matter under study, and my assumptions about the phenomenon.

In addition, I invited a peer reviewer—a person who had no connection to the study. The role of the peer reviewer was to assess the accuracy of the findings that is, to check if the findings and their discussion were supported by the data (Janesick, 2011). In addition, my critical friend contributed to the confirmability of the findings. A critical friend is a capable researcher and practitioner who provides support and challenges the researcher in the process of conducting the study (Baskerville & Goldblatt, 2009). For example, when collecting data, I discussed my observations of oral peer feedback sessions with my critical friend. I shared my concerns that the noise in the classroom due to all students talking simultaneously, students’ awareness of being the participants in the study, and the structure of peer review activity in Ms. Smith’s class could have influenced the ELLs’ participation in oral peer feedback sessions. My conversation with the critical friend allowed me to reflect about my observations deeper, look at the situation from a different perspective, and come up with new ideas for the further research on the matter under study. Thus, through critical friendship, I obtained fresh insights, negotiated my assumptions and assertions, and attempted to achieve confirmability of the findings.

The role of the researcher. My role in conducting the dissertation was of an instrument in a qualitative inquiry (Janesick, 2011). Therefore, I depended on myself to sharpen my data collection skills of observing and interviewing, data analysis skills of
finding meaningful units of data, sorting and assigning them into categories, and writing a report. To that end, I took two qualitative research courses. In Qualitative Research 2 course, I conducted two mini pilot studies and practiced my observation and interviewing skills. Moreover, I took detailed field notes using the form suggested by Janesick (2011) and transcribed the audio-recorded data using Transcriptions and Dictation. Finally, I analyzed the data for emerging categories during both mini projects.

As a research instrument in my dissertation study, I kept researcher’s e-journal to record my reflections, experiences, and ideas related to the exploratory questions. I also did observations at Purple High School, took detailed field notes, interviewed the participants, and collected artifacts. During data collection, I constantly worked at data preparation, organization, and analysis. In particular, I transcribed the data, organized it, and analyzed it for emerging meaningful units, codes, and categories within cases and across cases. Finally, as suggested by Janesick (2011), I attempted to be open and flexible about any changes and unknown outcomes in the process of conducting a study. Thus, I consider this dissertation process a journey that has been full of reflection, awareness of my role in this study, and exploration of new sites and new ideas.

Summary

In Chapter 3, I provided the detailed description of the methodology of my dissertation study. In particular, I described (a) sites, (b) participants, (c) data collection, (d) data analysis, (e) data quality, and (f) the role of the researcher. In the next chapter, I present the holistic description of four cases.
Chapter Four: Holistic Description of Four Cases

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts. The exploratory questions, which guided the study, were

1. How do four adolescent ELLs perceive peer review in face-to-face and online contexts?

2. What affordances do four adolescent ELLs choose to employ during peer review in face-to-face and online contexts?

3. What revisions do four adolescent ELLs choose to make in their writing due to peer feedback in face-to-face and online contexts?

I present the findings of the study in Chapters 4 and 5. In Chapter 4, I provide a rich holistic description of four cases. In particular, I present (a) procedure for compiling the profiles, (b) classroom and online as social contexts, (c) the teacher, (d) four ELLs, (e) cases, and (f) factors influencing adolescent L2 participants. In Chapter 5, I present the findings of the study regarding peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts.
Procedure for Compiling the Profiles

I begin each case with the description of the ELL, including demographic information, family background, and life and studying in the U.S. Then I describe participants’ experiences in (a) learning ESL, (b) developing literacy in ESL, and (c) using Internet resources for educational purposes. I also explore various factors that might have had an influence on the ELLs’ peer review practices in face-to-face and online contexts.

Classroom and Online as Social Contexts

The two social contexts in this dissertation study were Ms. Rose Smith’s classroom and online setting. Both contexts served as a platform for students’ communication and interaction for the purposes of this study; however, it was the face-to-face classroom context where I first had a chance to meet my ELL participants.

Classroom. Ms’ Smith’s classroom was the first one I entered at Purple High School when sampling the participants’ of the study. All the classes I observed were impressive, but it was Ms. Smith’s classroom that attracted me most, not because the teacher planned to do a number of peer review sessions, and there were a few ELLs as potential participants for my study; it was the atmosphere of the classroom and complete trust between students and the energetic, positive teacher, which impressed me most. The classroom setting reflected the goals of the class AVID and contributed to the student’s engagement.

The classroom as a social context had a number of details worth mentioning to render how then context could contribute to the students’ learning. The walls were
decorated with a number of slogans encouraging students to put their best into learning, posters with strategies for students’ success, and reminders about students’ proper behavior. In addition, there was a “parade” of sweaters hanging around the room. Every sweater was different and had a name of various universities and colleges in the USA. All space on the walls around teacher’s 2 desks was taken by students’ personalized messages of gratitude and love to the teacher as well as pictures of Ms. Smith’s family. Such mixture of personal and educational was contributing to the rapport between the teacher and the students.

In addition, there were other aspects in the classroom organization, which the teacher and students used all the time. In particular, the teacher divided the board into several sections with the Goals and Objectives for each grade in the left part and the rest of space in the middle and on the right for note-taking and announcements. Moreover, the teacher often used the two large mobile whiteboards; when students worked in groups; they were taking notes and explaining matter under study using these whiteboards to facilitate their argument, explanation, and presentation.

The room was also filled with books and school supplies. The books on different subjects including dictionaries and writing guides took all the shelves and were also piled next to the teachers’ desk with the computer. The desks were neatly arranged forming rows in the classroom; however, Ms. Smith changed the arrangement of the desks quite often based on whether students worked in groups, in pairs, or individually for the purposes of a particular class. Finally, though it was Ms. Smith’s classroom, I would hesitate calling it her room—the students were the ones who frequently changed the
slogans on the walls, put the messages for the teacher on the mobile whiteboards, and arranged the school supplies, making the room their own.

**Online.** In addition to face-to-face classroom, for the purposes of this study the participants were interacting in an online context. The participants worked at their writing in the computer lab at school though it was not considered a part of their classroom assignment. In particular, the participants used the following websites for writing, peer reviewing each other’s work, and reflection: (a) wikispaces.com and (b) penzu.com. Wikispaces.com served as a platform for participants’ writing their drafts, reading their peers’ writing, providing written feedback for their peer, and revising their own writing. Penzu.com turned out an excellent free Web 2.0 tool for participants’ reflection. Each of the participants created a private online journal, recorded their reflection about peer review practices in the journal, and shared the relevant pages with their reflection with me. Noteworthy, the participants were allowed to use other websites for peer review purposes in the computer laboratory; however, I was asked to make sure the participants did not try to access any other content online which would not be relevant to their peer review practices.

**The Teacher**

The teacher who volunteered to participate in the study chose the pseudonym of Ms. Rose Smith. Ms. Smith is a white American with English as her L1. In Fall 2012, she was 36 years old. During Interview 2, she shared that she had a bachelor degree in Justice and Political Science. Therefore, her first career was the job of a paralegal. Without any degree in education, Ms. Smith switched to her second career—teaching. First, she taught
history for four years. Afterwards, she took AVID training and decided to start teaching the class. In addition, during 2008-2011, she took several trainings on how to teach classrooms with ESOL students: “Dealing with differences,” “Title I: Working with Hispanic students & families,” “Empowering ESOL teachers Volumes I & II,” and “Diversity.” When talking about her teaching, she said,

I took an AVID training and got bit by the bug and decided I want to do this.

When I first got hired by the county seven years ago, I was told by the supervisor of history, “I don't need a history teacher. I need a reading teacher who can teach history and can teach how to write.” So I’ve taken all these quiz training and Kagan training so that has forced a lot of the writing in my classes. Also, AVID's curriculum is very writing heavy, but they give us a lot of leeway on how we want to approach it so we can really tailor it to our kids. (Interview 1 with Ms. Smith)

Thus, by Fall 2012, Ms. Smith’s total teaching experience was seven years.

When I first visited Ms. Smith’s classes, I immediately felt the atmosphere of trust, understanding, and attentiveness in the classroom. During my first observation, students worked at controversial quotes that could be interpreted as racist. Ms. Smith asked students to initially express their reaction towards quotes in writing and then opened the whole class discussion about the information on the board. During those 50 minutes, students focused on how important it was to use quotes from other sources and format them in the correct way. Ms. Smith was all the time there for the students, encouraging them to honestly express their opinions and leading the discussion, making suggestions to students and providing feedback, addressing students’ questions and
paying attention to every student in the class. The energetic, friendly, and attentive teacher had an excellent rapport with the students. It was obvious and impressive.

Students in Ms. Smith’s classes differed tremendously in terms of their backgrounds and behavior, starting from family up to the cultural and linguistic. Nevertheless, what I observed in Ms. Smith’s classes was the gratitude and respect the students had for that amazing teacher. During one of the observations, I wrote down the poem, which her students had written for Ms. Smith as the letter of gratitude. In the poem, the students wrote,

Even though it doesn’t show,
We want you to always know,
We appreciate you and how you’ve helped us grow.

Some may bicker, some may whine,
But our saving grace has always been thine.
You’ve helped us overcome
Those who look at us as dumb.
Some of us are old, some of us are new,
Yet all we wanted to say is Thank you.

No matter what we do,
You are never blue
For us you go the extra mile
With a smile,

On your face all the while (AVID 4 students).

The poem only confirmed what I observed during each visit to Ms. Smith’s class. Her communication with students, notes with “Thank you” and “Love this teacher” messages on the walls of the room, and mutual attention were the signs of changes Ms. Smith was bringing to those students’ lives.

**How was she doing it?** Ms. Smith used a variety of teaching strategies and techniques in order to enhance students’ learning. Ms. Smith’s classes always started with a clear plan and objectives for the day on the board. She always began her classes on time with detailed guidelines and explanation of the material and activities. In addition, she always provided a few examples in order to help students understand new material better or to support previous statements. The teacher did not hesitate to repeat any information upon students’ requests and answered all students’ questions regarding the topic under discussion, paying attention to every student’s raised hand and comments. Thus, the classes gave the impression of teacher-students’ working as one harmonious entity—students’ staying on task engaged in various activities and teacher’s facilitating and enhancing students’ learning.

When explaining new material to students, Ms. Smith managed to effectively introduce the new information to students building it on the students’ funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). Moreover, it was done through a whole-group discussion, interactively so that the students would not lose interest and stay motivated. For example, when talking about peer review, the teacher engaged the students in the discussion with the questions about their experience with peer review, the nature of peer
review in their previous classes, and their attitudes towards that activity. Further, she followed up on their answers and built her further explanation of the purpose, structure, do’s and don’ts, handouts, and other aspects of students’ work during peer review activity referring back to students’ answers about peer review. Thus, Ms. Smith exemplified activation of students’ funds of knowledge in her instruction.

In addition, Ms. Smith used a lot of group work and put an emphasis on students’ collaboration in her classes. The teacher explained to students the importance of working together, sharing their insights, and helping each other. Every time she planned to use group work she reorganized the classroom, moving desks to make small “discussion circles” to enhance students’ collaboration and carefully choosing nametags when assigning students into each group. Occasionally, she provided students with whiteboards so that they could write down the most difficult issues and try and find the solutions to them together. Furthermore, the teacher would also interchange the use of group work with individual or in pairs, where necessary. Finally, the students always received clear instructions on what to do and how. Thus, during multiple observations during Fall 2012 semester, I did not see students being bored or frustrated, instead they actively participated in all activities in Ms. Smith’s class.

For peer review purposes, Ms. Smith assigned students in pairs/groups differently for each peer review session throughout the semester. When assigning students, she considered such factors as students’ progress in terms of development of writing, relationship between students, and cultural differences. In particular, the teacher aimed at assigning strong students in terms of writing with students who needed more assistance with their essays. In addition, in order to facilitate students’ collaborative work during
peer review, she would assign students into pairs if they were friends. Finally, Ms. Smith stated that she would also take into account cultural differences when preparing for the peer review sessions (Interview 1 with the teacher).

Another aspect deserving special attention was the teacher’s intentional adjustment of the language she used for the explanation, examples, and encouragement of students. Ms. Smith used to insert a few academic words such as “myriad” or “exemplify” in order to expose students to the vocabulary, which they would later encounter in tests. Occasionally, she would write down those words on the board and follow up on them in the subsequent classes. However, when providing an example in order to make the material easier for students, she used to incorporate many colloquial expressions, idioms, and words the students would have no difficulty of understanding. According to my observation field notes, it helped attract students’ attention and keep them focused on the task.

In terms of making adjustments in order to accommodate ELLs in her class, Ms. Smith always did it unnoticeably that is, she never wanted to make a difference between students and use any labels. Repeatedly, she emphasized that her ELL students do not differ from her NSs of English. Surprisingly, what I learned during my observations and interviews was that students felt ashamed of being ELLs, tried not to mention they attended ESOL classes, and were bullied because of being ELLs. Therefore, Ms. Smith avoided differentiating the students. It was possible to do so because all ELLs in Ms. Smith’s class were of upper-intermediate or proficient level in terms of reading and writing in English. The teacher also pointed out that she used holistic grading of their projects and activities and assessed students’ individual progress in her class. She said,
“And I would never accommodate [ELLs] blatantly I try to do it very… I… because I can grade holistically, I am going to grade depending on the level of my ELL student. I'm not going to grade easier because I want them to improve” (Interview 1 with Ms. Smith). For the assessment purposes in AVID, she used portfolios, and all students were required to keep all their writing and all activities in their individual folders. Finally, Ms. Smith made sure she was available for assistance to all students, including ELLs.

**Major literacy assignments in Ms. Smith’s AVID 1 class.** In order to contextualize peer review as a part of ELLs’ development of literacy in L2, I describe the major literacy assignments at which the ELLs worked during Fall 2012 in Ms. Smith’s AVID 1 class. In particular, the assignments were Mandala assignment and Life Goals assignment. Both assignments included not only writing but also reading and other skills; therefore, I define the assignments as the literacy ones.

During the first part of Fall 2012, the ELLs as other students in the class were working at Mandala assignment. The major goal of the assignment was to describe the five symbols, which represented some precious things or people to the students. Over the first part of the semester, the students had to brainstorm about the assignment and draw the symbols in a Mandala circle (see pp. 101-104 for the participants’ Mandala Visual). Further, they wrote two paragraphs to describe two of their symbols. After finishing their two paragraphs, the students participated in the first peer review session in Ms. Smith’s class. The teacher conducted the second peer review session after the students completed the whole essay and described all the symbols on their visual. Thus, peer review sessions were part of students’ working at their literacy.
During the second part of Fall 2012, Ms. Smith provided the students with the guidelines for the second literacy assignment—Life Goals. For this assignment, the participants had to write an essay and describe their life goals. As with the previous assignment, the ELLs were working at their paper step-by-step. They brainstormed, developed an outline, and worked at writing about each goal separately. Nevertheless, they had only one peer review session for this assignment because of the time constraints. The teacher conducted the peer review sessions when the students completed the first draft of their Life Goals essay.

During all stages of the participants’ work at the Mandala and Life Goals assignments, the teacher provided students with clear instructions, answered all students’ questions, and provided feedback to them if they needed reassurance about their progress. From the beginning of the semester, Ms. Smith explained to the students that all of their work (drawn and written) should be kept in each student’s individual folder so that later the teacher could grade the student’s participation at all stages of working at the assignments. The students’ feedback on peer-editing checklists and notes on the peer’s papers were part of their portfolio and submission. Finally, the teacher emphasized that when grading, she considered each student’s individual progress throughout the semester.

**Four Adolescent English Language Learners**

When I first met my participants, they were all 9th-grade students enrolled in AVID class with Ms. Rose Smith. The participants shared some similarities but also were different in many ways. For all of them, English was a second language, and they learned English in the USA. Two of the participants (BravoWolf and Maria) shared Spanish as an
L1 while the other two (Lightning and Anni) spoke Creole at home. Nevertheless, they all came from different ethnic backgrounds. Their levels of language proficiency in English ranged from upper intermediate to advanced.

In order to gain a profound understanding of the participants’ background, I collected data through the interviews with the participants and their teacher. In addition, the individual reports about each participant supplemented and triangulated the self-reported data. All participants were from low-income families. Despite financial struggles, all families were supportive of their children’s education and showed willingness to allow their children to participate in the study. All participants had assistance with their literacy development and practices from either their parents or siblings at home.

The Cases

**BravoWolf, a writer.** BravoWolf, a 14-year-old boy, characterized himself as nice, hard-working, easy-going, and social. He was born in Tallahassee, and his family moved to the present city when he was four. BravoWolf’s family included his mother, father, and ten-year-old brother. In the Fall of 2012, participant’s mother worked in the construction sphere while his father – in the roofing. The BravoWolf’s parents were from Salvador and came to the USA about sixteen years ago. Therefore, the main language at the participant’s home was Spanish. The only exception was BravoWolf’s talking with his younger brother who could speak mainly English and understand Spanish a little. It turned out that it was BravoWolf who taught his parents some English because they did not take any ESL classes in the USA.
BravoWolf's educational experiences. BravoWolf started learning English in the kindergarten when he was about two years old. When recalling his learning of English as a second language, the participant stated that it was not hard for him because in comparison to Spanish, the English language did not contain any conjugations and endings. In addition, he pointed out that his teacher in ESOL classes was of tremendous help because she could speak Spanish and English so the lack of communication gap with the teacher facilitated his learning of English. Finally, BravoWolf stated that he took ESOL courses for about two years and then did not need any further assistance with his English proficiency.

When sharing his experience of studying in the USA, BravoWolf stated that there were many distractions and difficulties he had to overcome every day in order to stay on track and be a good student. In particular, he said,

Studying here is not actually good because there is a lot of stuff going on because where I live, there is a lot of crime. It's pretty hard to be focused because you have to worry about your surroundings also. But in school, it's kind of easy because it is peaceful and calm, and you can get away from this stuff. It's not like it all around you. Because when I try to do my homework, there are sirens. And I'm trying to do my homework, like geometry, and it's really distracting. All the stuff that happens where I live... I live in ghetto. (Interview 2 with BravoWolf)

According to my field notes and reflective journal, the participant felt rather uncomfortable when talking about the jobs of his parents and frustrated when mentioning
the crimes in the neighborhood where he lived; nevertheless, he was still willing to share factors that influenced his studying.

Among positive factors, which had an influence on his studying, BravoWolf pointed out that music helped him multitask and allowed him to concentrate better. Interestingly, the boy pointed out that he needed a quiet place to study but considered music not bothersome. In addition, the participant said that his brother was of great help because BravoWolf could try and explain his brother some confusing material and that would make it clear. In addition, his younger sibling would often quiz the participant per his request. The participant also shared that he frequently used online resources for studying purposes, mainly his search for specific information started from Google and Wikipedia. Thus, BravoWolf considered listening to music, interaction with his brother, and online resources helpful for his studying.

In addition to writing short stories, BravoWolf enjoyed being a member of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) and American Sign Language clubs at Purple High School. The boy explained his decision to join ROTC club by willingness to become more disciplined. In his opinion, more discipline and organization contributes to a person’s success. In addition, he wanted to learn more about Navy and military, find new friends in ROTC, and become a good citizen in the future. As for American Sign Language club, the participant said that though being Spanish-English bilingual, he was always eager to communicate with people who knew only American Sign Language. Finally, based on his interests, BravoWolf shared that his first choice for the future career would be becoming a lawyer while joining the military or becoming a writer were his second and third options, respectively.
**BravoWolf’s literacy practices.** BravoWolf loved writing. He considered writing short stories his main hobby. During Interview 1, the participant shared that he wrote essays not only as school assignments, but also at home voluntarily. He said, “I like making my own stories, because it is really fun. I can develop good climaxes and plots so it will be really interesting.” (Interview 2 with BravoWolf). Interestingly, the boy repetitively mentioned listening to music when writing essays and short stories. He also asked me if he could listen to music while writing and peer reviewing in the computer lab.

BravoWolf’s journey as a writer started in the third grade when an author, who was famous for books for third graders, inspired him to start writing short stories. He also added that his ESOL teacher helped him in becoming comfortable when writing. The boy strongly believed that it was practice that would help him become better writer and would allow him to write essays for school assignments and tests and short stories without any difficulties. This belief was rooted in the example of the above-mentioned author whose books impressed him very much when he was in the third grade.

In addition, BravoWolf shared that he would often be inspired to write when reading subtitles for movies. Specifically, he often only read subtitles instead of watching the movie. The combination of visual elements of the movie, subtitles for reading, and listening to the characters talking contributed to the boy’s progress in English as L2 and development of reading skills. Moreover, BravoWolf stated that when reading subtitles, he would choose a quote that impressed him or made him think, and he would further write about it. Among his favorite movies, the participant singled out “Full Metal Jacket” which made him interested in joining ROTC and inspired him to write.
When talking about his writing process, BravoWolf elaborated about the importance of the content of the writing prompt and his familiarity or background with that topic. The participant explained that he needed to experience the matter for writing to some extent in order to write about it. He said,

BravoWolf: What helps with my writing is like give me the prompt about nature. And I can look at trees, and they will inspire me to write about trees, and see how good they are in nature. But if you give me the prompt of how you're going to get into the university, how is that going to help me? Like, I went to the USF three times, but I never experienced USF. I just went inside. So if I've been there, I can write about it. I just went there to visit, not like stay there and study.

Researcher: So when you say you need to look at trees, do you mean trees outside or trees on the Internet?

BravoWolf: I look outside because looking outside is real than in Internet (laughing).

Researcher: So that visual aspect helps you to write. Right?

BravoWolf: Uhu. Like the colors of trees, how the trees help us...

Researcher: That's very good. How do you make the connections?

BravoWolf: The connections… well I'm trying to put trees in human life because all humans know pretty much human life. So when you compare trees, you can practical make anything possible. If you
compare anything to humans, you can make anything possible. You can write about it. You can write a book about it and still make sense. (Interview 2 with BravoWolf)

Thus, comparing the prompts about applying to USF and a simple topic about trees, the participant illustrated how essential it was for him to have background information in order to employ his funds of knowledge and write about it.

**Anni, an artist.** Anni, a 14-year-old girl, was a hard-working, diligent, and brilliant student. Her family included the father, the mother, and Anni’s two siblings: an older brother (18 years old) and a younger sister (11 years old). In the Fall of 2012, her mother worked as a chef in the kitchen at an elementary school while her father—as a shuttle driver for one of the hospitals in the town. She was born in Haiti. They moved to the United States in 2003. They first came to Miami, Florida and after 3 months relocated to the present city in the southeastern United States. Anni’s aunts, uncles and cousins still lived in Haiti. Anni’s first language was Creole, and the family spoke Creole at home. According to Anni, her parents’ knowledge of English was rather basic, and they could not speak it fluently.

**Anni’s educational experiences.** The participant’s first memories about school in the USA were associated with being surrounded by people whom she could not understand and with whom she could not communicate. During the second interview, Anni shared her experiences when going to school for the first time. She said,
It was difficult because I didn't know how to ask. Like I didn't know how to ask the teachers how to go to the restroom or anything. So I just sat really quiet. It was really hard because I could not talk to anybody. (Interview 2 with Anni)

With the course of time, Anni started enjoying her school life in the USA. Though quiet and always concentrated on task in class, she associated her school life not only with testing, assignments, and homework, but also with having many friends and teachers’ constant support.

In her free time, Anni loved drawing, listening to music, and spending time with her friends. In addition, she was a member of Drama club. It was her first year in the Drama club, and she joined it because she loved watching movies and acting in plays. Anni also expressed her willingness to join Key club the following year in order to do more volunteering. In future, Anni saw herself as an engineer and a graphic designer because she liked math. Though Anni’s parent encouraged her to become an artist, Anni stated that she saw her future career in engineering as a more pragmatic choice while keeping drawing as a hobby.

**Anni’s literacy practices.** Though mentioning that ESOL classes helped her in learning English as a second language, Anni pointed out that it was reading for school assignments and for leisure, which benefited her progress in learning English, especially in enriching her vocabulary. In addition, Anni pointed out that writing in English never seemed to be hard for her. She stated that it was fairly easy to learn how to write because English uses the same characters as Creole. Moreover, the lack of accent marks in English was another factor which made learning how to write in English easier for Anni.
Though it was fairly easy to start learning how to write in English, Anni stated that it was still a lot for her to learn. She stated that she needed to improve her expression and organization of ideas and thoughts in writing as well as learning how to persuade in essays. Surprisingly, Anni did not remember her teachers providing instruction on these areas, she stated that she used Google search online in order to find any resources that would help her improve her organization of ideas in writing. In addition, she used dictionary in a hard copy and dictionary.com in order to find information about vocabulary (e.g. classification of a word as a part of speech). Finally, Anni stated that she had difficulty with grammar, spelling, and punctuation when writing. Having a preference for reading over writing, Anni also engaged in another form of literacy practices—drawing. She confessed that though she did not enjoy writing much, she did keep a diary with her drawings in the form of anime.

**Lightning, a football player.** Lightning, a 14-year-old boy, was an easy-going, sociable, and energetic student. His family included two brothers and a sister. He was born in Port-au-Prince, Haiti and arrived in the USA in December 2007. His father left for the USA when the boy was a baby so he met his father for the first time in 2007. When in Haiti, his father used to work in the medical lab but after moving to the USA, he had a hard time finding the job so he went to work in the industry. The only fact Lightning knew about his father’s job was that he worked with acids. As of Fall 2012, the participant’s mother stayed at home taking care of Lightning’s 3-year-old brother. Lightning identified himself as bilingual in French and Creole but due to the lack of practice he felt his French got worse over time. At home, Lightning communicated in Creole with his mother and with younger sister while he spoke English to his brother.
**Lightning’s educational experiences.** The participant started schooling as a 4th grader in the USA in January 2008. When comparing his schooling in Haiti and the USA, Lightning defined them as extremely different. He remembered the new school, teachers, and classmates but he could not understand anything and anybody because he knew only several phrases in English after 1.5 years of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes. Over time, he started feeling more comfortable at school in the USA. He pointed out that his ESOL classes and other teachers helped him in learning English through various assignments targeting vocabulary, grammar, reading, and spelling. Frequently, his teachers and new friends at school gave him feedback on the word choice and corrected his pronunciation. That, in Lightning’s opinion, helped him in making progress in English as an L2.

The participant characterized himself a proficient user of technology. The boy had a computer at home and had been enrolled in virtual school classes for two semesters already. In addition, in ESOL classes, Lightning used Rosetta Stone software (Rosetta Stone, 2012). Interestingly, the participant characterized his experience of using the software as annoying due to his difficulties with pronouncing words in the correct way. In addition, the boy used Academy of Reading in order to practice and improve his reading skills in English (School Specialty, 2012). However, most of the time Lightning used the computer for entertainment and socializing. He frequently used yahoo (www.yahoo.com), Oovoo (Oovoo, 2012), and Facebook (www.facebook.com) for socializing with his friends. In addition, he watched movies, listened to music in youtube.com, and find workout information to get prepared and practice for football games.
In his free time, Lightning also loved listening to music, watch TV, and play computer games. In addition, one of Lightning’s dreams was to join National Football League (NFL) one day because he was passionate about football. The boy would stay after school to practice and do various exercises in order to become a member of the school’s football team. Another interest of his was drawing big buildings, which explained his second choice for career path—becoming an architect.

**Lightning’s literacy practices.** The participant’s literacy practices in English started in the fourth grade from the very first steps in learning English alphabet and reading the first words in English. Interestingly, the boy stated that he had started writing in English only in the 5th grade. Though Lightning complained about the use of Rosetta Stone in his classes, he confessed that he had improved his spelling when using it. During Interview 2, he stated that he had already mastered writing because he was out of ESOL classes; however, he was still learning a lot in Ms. Smith’s class. According to him, learning the genre of essays and developing his writing were two separate areas. The boy acknowledged that he worked hard both at learning how to write essays better and at his mechanics of writing because he needed to write well for SAT and FCAT exams and to get accepted to college.

Lightning confessed that though at that point he felt confident about his writing skills, he had had difficulty with organizing his ideas in writing. Specifically, he did not know how to express his ideas and explain his thoughts when building paragraphs. It was the ESOL teacher who helped him with the structure of the essay and with organization of his writing. In addition, Lightning frequently received help with his writing essays from his sister while his brother assisted him with his science classes.
Maria, a soccer player. Maria, a 14-year-old girl, was a shy, smart, and respectful student. She was born in the United States, but her whole family was from Honduras. Maria’s sibling included three elder brothers and two elder sisters. While brothers were in the USA, her sisters lived in Honduras, and she went to visit them every summer. In the Fall of 2012, Maria’s father worked in the construction sphere, building scaffolding in particular. The participant’s mom stayed at home. In order to provide for his family, Maria’s father had to commute to his work and came to see his family only for weekends. Like their father, the participant’s brothers also worked in the construction sphere. The family communicated in Spanish at home, and it was only brother who would sometimes talk to Maria in English. The father’s knowledge of English was elementary while Maria’s mother did not know English at all.

Maria’s educational experiences. Maria started learning English in the kindergarten. She shared that it was easy because of her bother’s support and help. She could come home and practice English when interacting with him. When describing her school life in the USA, she characterized elementary and middle school as a supportive environment where teachers used to go through her work together with her and were always there to provide guidance and feedback while in high school, the participant was seen mainly as an independent and autonomous learner. Though working hard in order to get ready for college, the participant felt on her own and stated that she still needed extra help with time management and reminders about deadlines. Finally, Maria often used Google search in order to find additional resources for her biology class and other courses.

At her free time, Maria enjoyed playing soccer, shopping, and watching TV. Though she was not a part of the soccer team at Purple high school, she played soccer
with her elder brothers. In addition, she loved watching various cartoons such as Sponge
Bob, MTV channel, and various Spanish TV shows. The student also used Facebook
(www.facebook.com) and Oovoo (Oovoo, 2012) in order to communicate with her
friends online. Maria hoped to become a doctor or work for the Federal Bureau of
Investigation (FBI) in future. The profession of a doctor seemed appealing to her because
many of her relatives worked as doctors. Meanwhile, Maria chose working for the FBI as
the second career option after she had been impressed by the guest speaker (FBI principal
investigator) in one of her classes in the middle school.

*Maria’s literacy practices.* Maria shared that she loved writing because she could
express her thoughts, ideas, and feeling in writing. Being literate in Spanish, the
participant learned how to write in English when she went to the kindergarten. She
pointed out that it was her teacher who had helped her develop writing with specific
classroom and homework assignments. According to participant, such assignments
targeted organization of ideas and structure of paragraphs and essays. In addition, her
brother was always of help with her writing at home. Specifically, he was helping her
with the mechanics of writing such as capitalization of words and spelling.

In terms of reading, Maria expressed her concern about her understanding and
remembering the information she read. She said,

*I can read out loud like silent, but then when my teacher like ask us questions
about it, I cannot answer them because I just … I read it well, but I didn't… I
wasn't paying attention to it, like I get distracted. (Interview 2 with Maria)*
At the elementary school, the participant was enrolled in intensive reading classes and had additional help with her reading. Having difficulty concentrating while reading, Maria acknowledged that it had an influence on her writing too. Quite frequently she felt short of ideas when she needed to provide details and explain her ideas in writing.

Factors Influencing Adolescent L2 Participants

While the primary focus of the study was the four adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices in the face-to-face and online contexts from the ecological perspective, it was also important to take into account the influence of various factors on the participants’ peer review practices and progress in class (Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011; van Lier, 2004). Among the various factors, which could be discussed on the matter, I first elaborate on the perceptions of ELLs in the high school context and further focus on the adolescent ELLs’ rich self.

Perceptions of ELLs in Purple High School. One of the factors that struck me when I observed AVID classes and conducted interviews with the teacher and participants was Ms. Smith’s persistence in not differentiating ELLs and students whose L1 was English. From Day 1, the teacher kept insisting that the ELLs in her AVID classes did not differ from other students. Moreover, she added that the ELLs would write frequently better than NS of English. My multiple observations of the classes and interviews with the participants shed light on this intriguing issue. The story started unfolding on October 5th, 2012.

On October 5th, Ms. Smith was absent, and the students had a substitute teacher for that class. The students’ assignment was to complete their Mandala by writing the
introduction and conclusion; therefore, the students were to work individually at their papers. About 30 minutes after the beginning of the class, the class phone rang. One of the students answered it and announced that Lightning was asked to go to Room 215 to ESOL. What happened next opened my eyes on how students perceived ELLs and explained the teacher’s statement that ELLs were not different in AVID classes in terms of their performance. After all the students in class heard the announcement, one of the students (NS of English) smirked and ironically said aloud that Lightning had to go to ESOL because he could no speak English well. The reaction of another ELL student whose L1 was Spanish was instantaneous. She turned around, as she sat in the front row, and replied to the student stating that he could not speak Spanish and implying that Lightning had nothing to be ashamed of by being an ESOL student.

The mainstream student’s attempt to laugh at Lightning as an ESOL student and the passionate response of the other ESOL student afforded my first glimpse into the serious issue—negative perception of ELLs in high school. My further interviews with Ms. Smith supported my interpretation of what happened in AVID class on October 5th. During Interview 1, the teacher said,

My gut feeling is a lot of them are **bullied by teachers**. And that is the gut feeling is that… because technically they are allowed to have accommodations to testing, and I will tell you I didn't know this. In the county, we are required to take the ESOL training, and I didn't take it the first year. And I was in Blue school [pseudonym] which was predominantly Hispanic. I didn't know that having 20 vocabulary words in the box and 20 filling the blank was bad for an ELL student, that you needed to do five and five, and five. I didn't know that. I bet there is a
number of teachers who look at them and are like "You're in America, learn English." I would not be surprised, at all. I think some of their bullying is peer from peer. I think that they probably hear in classes comments like "Speak English" when they're speaking to each other in Spanish or whatever language, but I would be even curious to hear. But I can almost guarantee that some of the bullying, it's almost subtle, probably being done by teachers. I would not be surprised. (Interview 1 with Ms. Smith)

Thus, the teacher defined the negative perceptions and attitude towards ELLs in high schools as bullying. She further explained that the bullying of ELLs in schools because of their L1s different from English could be done by teachers and by other students. According to Ms. Smith, the teachers’ attitude towards ELLs could be rooted in the lack of the ESOL training and thus, lack of knowledge. She further added that it could be students’ bullying ELLs as well.

The gap in understanding and lack of appreciation and/or tolerance on the part of students with English as L1 towards ELLs also merged from the data recorded during the first peer review session. Besides working at the peer’s papers, one female student with English as her L1, Cassidy, decided to share her experience about ESOL class first with the teacher and then with another male student (NS of English).

Cassidy: You know [directed to the teacher] on Friday when you had us dispersed? I went to the ESOL room (laughing). Never again!

Ms. Smith: Don’t say that (leaving).

Cassidy: Oh my God! It was this Korean kid that speaks… I don't know where
he is... I don't know. And he was like, “You're very pretty.” I said, “Thank you.” And then he was like, “Can I have your number?” I said, “No, sorry.” And he was like, “I don't care. I need you.” And there was kid there that did not know any English, but Spanish. And there was kid that knew only Arabic, and some of them knew some Korean language, Creole or whatever. I was laughing because they were crazy. They actually think they are calm but they are crazy. (Peer review 1, October 1, 2012)

According to Cassidy, she had a chance to attend an ESOL class when the students were dispersed because of Ms. Smith’s absence. The student obviously wanted to share her experience both with the teacher and other students. When the teacher decided to finish the conversation on the matter and left to help another student, Cassidy continued talking and mentioned students with various L1s and from different cultural backgrounds. Her final words in the excerpt above “I was laughing because they were crazy. They actually think they are calm but they are crazy” show the girl’s lack of understanding and respect to students from different linguistic backgrounds.

In addition, there appeared to be negativity between ELLs as well. As Ms. Smith stated, she observed surprising negative perceptions of ELLs towards other ELLs from various cultural, ethnic, and/or racial backgrounds. She shared,

I think someone like Sandra [pseudonym] can probably assimilate better. She doesn’t have an accent. I think that our darker skinned immigrants, especially our Haitians, we have a lot of issues, and it sounded comical the first time I heard it
because I did not get it. Like you would hear a lot of Dominican students say, “I can't date somebody who is black.” And I'm looking at them, and I'm like, “You're black.” Like in my opinion, you look black but I'm not dark. (Interview 1 with Ms. Smith)

Thus, according to the teacher, some ELLs would treat other ELLs badly because of the different tone of the skin. In her opinion, those L2 students who had slight accents had more chances to “assimilate” easily (Interview 1 with Ms. Smith). Therefore, based on the excerpt above, Ms. Smith did see assimilation as an important aspect of language learners’ success in the USA while the richness of ELLs’ heritage, the benefits of ELLs’ knowing another language, and uniqueness of ELLs’ experiences did not emerge during the interviews with the teacher. Thus, this supports the existence of the major issue of bullying, disrespect, and lack of understanding, which adolescent ELLs may face in K-12 contexts.

**The rich world of ELLs’ self.** Meanwhile, Mandala assignment allowed ELLs to express what they as adolescent ELLs in the USA valued most and what goals they set for their future, thus unfolding their rich world of self. In particular, in the Mandala assignment the participants drew five most important things in their life. Figures 4-6 illustrate Anni’s, Lightning’s, and BravoWolf’s Mandala Visual. Unfortunately, though Maria stated that she had submitted her Mandala visual, it turned out to be missing.

Figure 4 is Anni’s submission (see p. 101). In her essay, Anni wrote that Mandala symbols showed her values and who she was. In particular, the five symbols in Anni’s Mandala Visual were (a) Haitian flag (a symbol of Anni’s culture and homeland),
(b) guitar (a symbol of love for music), (c) dove with an olive branch and the peace sign (symbols of peace), (d) princess Tiana from *The Princess and the Frog* by Clements and Musker (2009; a symbol of child who is and will always be in Anni), and (e) one of the drawings which Anni had made before (realization of her talent in drawing).

*Figure 4.* Anni’s Mandala Visual. The figure shows the five symbols, which were precious to the participant. In particular, the participant drew Haitian flag, guitar, dove with an olive branch and the sign of peace, princess Tiana from *The Princess and the Frog* by Clements and Musker (2009), and one of Anni’s previous drawings.

In her Mandala essay, Anni pointed out that among other symbols, the Haitian flag represented her culture and the feeling of being homesick. The girl finished the description of the symbol of Haiti by the words: “I am proud of being Haitian and I’m not ashamed of anything” (Anni’s Mandala Essay). Thus, in her Mandala assignment, Anni
wanted to share her values and symbols, which would project her self—her identity. The final words in the essay further provided evidence that the girl might have faced difficulties being an ELL in the USA.

Figure 5 shows Lightning’s submission of Mandala Visual. In his assignment, the boy drew the symbols of music, football, parents, friendship, and his country.

*Figure 5.* Lightning’s Mandala Visual. The figure shows the five symbols, which were precious to the participant. In particular, the participant drew symbols of his country, parents, friendship, football, and music.

In his essay, Lightning elaborated that he considered music as a symbol of peace and amusement. Football was the boy’s favorite kind of sport. Friendship and parents were the two symbols, which represented people who would support and help him, when
needed. Lightning also added that he chose to draw parents as one of the symbols to refer to peace and kindness. The symbol of TV represented entertainment and fun in his life. Finally, the symbol of Haitian flag was, like in Anni’s case, the reference to Lightning’s home country and culture. Thus, like Anni, Lightning included the symbol of his country when drawing Mandala Visual and saw his culture and background as one of the most important aspects of his self and identity.

Figure 6 shows BravoWolf’s Mandala Visual (see p. 104). The participant drew (a) sunshine (a symbol of happiness and enjoyment), (b) school (a symbol of friendship), (c) iPod (a symbol of entertainment and communication), (d) phone (a symbol of keeping in touch with the friends and family), and (e) family. When describing Purple High School in his essay, BravoWolf wrote, “[Purple High school] is my safe haven, my only escape from life. It makes feel comfortable and safe. I can express my creativity without the criticism of other people” (BravoWolf’s Mandala essay). In case of BravoWolf, there emerged no negativity towards him as an ELL student. Noteworthy, the boy was born in the USA though identified himself as being from Salvador.

Interestingly, three participants approached drawing symbols in their Mandala Visual in a different way. Though the teacher explained to the students that they needed to make a circle and organize their symbols in its segments, Anni chose to draw the symbols as elements of one painting that is, they are all connected and seem to “flow” into each other. Lightning and BravoWolf followed the teacher’s guidelines and drew their symbols in segments of the circle. Finally, Lightning felt the need to add titles for the four symbols in his Mandala though the teacher asked the students to not write anything on their Visuals.
Figure 6. BravoWolf’s Mandala Visual. The figure shows the five symbols of things and people that the participant valued most. In particular, BravoWolf drew sunshine, school, iPod, phone, and family.

As for Maria, in her Mandala essay she wrote about three symbols: family, school, and best friend. The girl wrote about her family because they provided her with support, care, and love. When writing about school, she stated that education was the second most important thing in her life. The girl viewed education as the door into the future. Finally, when writing about her best friend, Maria shared how much she valued her best friend. Her friendship meant mutual care, support, sharing feelings, and source of advice.

Overall, the participants’ Mandala Visuals illustrated their rich world of self with appreciation for their countries, families, friends, education, peace, creativity, entertainment, happiness, and inner child (self). Having presented the findings on the
negative perception of the ELLs and adolescent ELLs’ rich world of self, I purposefully showcased and highlighted the gap in understanding between students from different cultural, linguistic, ethnic, and/or racial backgrounds. In Chapter 5, I further unfold the value of friendship in the students’ perceptions of peer review practices. In Chapter 6, I discuss the issues of adolescent ELLs’ construction and negotiation of identity based on the findings of the study.

**Summary**

In Chapter 4, I provided the rich holistic description of four cases. In particular, I described (a) procedure for compiling the profiles, (b) classroom and online as social contexts, (c) the teacher (d) four ELLs, (e) cases, and (f) factors influencing adolescent L2 participants. In the next chapter, I present the findings of the study regarding peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts.
Chapter Five: Findings

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts. The exploratory questions, which guided the study, were

1. How do four adolescent ELLs perceive peer review in face-to-face and online contexts?

2. What affordances do four adolescent ELLs choose to employ during peer review in face-to-face and online contexts?

3. What revisions do four adolescent ELLs choose to make in their writing due to peer feedback in face-to-face and online contexts?

I present the findings of the study in Chapters 4 and 5. In Chapter 4, I focused on the holistic description of four cases. In Chapter 5, I provide rich detailed description of findings, based on the research questions. In particular, regarding Research Question 1, I present the following categories (a) benefits of peer review, (b) difficulties, (c) face-to-face versus online peer review, and (d) peer feedback versus teacher feedback. With regard to Research Question 2, I describe and explain affordances, which the adolescent ELLs chose to employ in face-to-face and online contexts. As for Research Question 3, I describe the revisions the participants made in their writing first focusing on each case separately while further provide the findings in the cross-case analysis section.
Research Question 1. How do Four Adolescent ELLs Perceive Peer Review in Face-to-Face and Online Contexts?

One of the main foci of this research study was to describe and explain four adolescent ELLs’ perceptions of peer review activity in face-to-face and online contexts. When answering this research question, I relied upon data collected through interviews with the participants and their teacher, participants’ e-journals, researcher’s e-journal, and observations. Four major categories emerged during data analysis. In particular, the participants shared their perceptions in terms of (a) benefits of peer review, (b) difficulties, (c) face-to-face versus online peer review, and (d) peer feedback versus teacher feedback. When presenting participants’ emic voices for each category, I include subcategories, if applicable. When presenting data from the interviews or participants’ e-journals, I did not correct any errors the participants had made in order to enhance the transferability of the findings. Finally, Figure 7 provides the visual representation of all the categories and subcategories that emerged for Research Question 1 (see p. 108).

Benefits of peer review. Throughout data collection in Fall 2012, the adolescent ELLs were sharing with me the different ways of how peer review benefited their learning of L2. When thinking about peer review initially during Interview 1, Anni defined it as “reading over someone's paper and looking for mistakes and giving them ideas of what would be better in their writing.” She further brainstormed, “I think it's good, and I don't see how it would be bad because you're giving them… You're helping them with their essay, with their writing.” According to my field notes, all of them were eagerly helping each other both during face-to-face and online peer review sessions.
Moreover, according to the interview data and participants’ e-journals, all four ELLs considered peer review beneficial in a number of ways. Thus, the next part of this section focuses on benefits of peer review, which the participants identified due to their experience with the activity in face-to-face and online contexts.

**Improvement of writing in ESL.** Overall, the participants perceived peer review as beneficial mainly in terms of improvement of their writing in L2. For example in her e-journal, Maria stated in her reflection about peer review experiences, “I have improved my writing with peer editing. It has helped me a lot.” When talking about the benefits of peer review, all ELLs focused on various ways peer review helped them learn how to write better in L2. One of them was sharing and receiving an additional perspective on
the writing. For example, Maria stated that she relied on the friend that is, peer because she believed the peer would help her make her writing better. She said,

If you write and you don't know whether you did it right or wrong, and if you have your peer like your friend edit your writing like, they'll give you more facts about it. That's the way she could help make it better. (Interview 1 with Maria)

The choice of words in the excerpts above such as “friend” and “help” as well as the whole tone of the conversation with Maria, a shy ELL adolescent, highlighted the positive view of the adolescent towards peer review (Interview 1 with Maria; researcher’s e-journal). It allowed her to feel the support in the process of the development of literacy in L2. Finally, Maria highlighted the importance of “helping” through peer review in her first entry in the participant’s e-journal, “you could help other peers in their writing. [It] can help peers improve their writing also.”

Another participant who emphasized the importance of obtaining additional perspective on the writing was BravoWolf. He said,

Another benefit would be… it will be like second… it will be like second you. You have two people looking, seeing if there is a word spelled right or good punctuation in the right location, or a paragraph is short or long enough. That's like how a student can be a second you. So you know what they're talking about, you know where everything should be, in the right location. (Interview 1 with BravoWolf)
The metaphor of “second you” by BravoWolf highlights the intimacy of the relationship with the text the peer achieves when reviewing the text and the level of responsibility and trust peers feel during this activity.

In addition, the participants focused on the importance and content of peer’s feedback that allows them to improve their essays and develop their literacy in L2. Thus, when thinking about peer review and her experiences with this activity, Maria stated, “it was good. I liked it because it showed me what I need to work on and the ways I can improve my writing” (Interview 1 with Maria). She expressed the same opinion in her second reflective entry of the participant’s e-journal. Similarly, Lightning wrote about his perception of peer review in his e-journal, “My experience with peer editing is been amazing i can see a little improve i make last week,and how i write a higher level essay” (Lightning’s reflective entry 2 in the participant’s e-journal). Thus, both participants associate the activity of peer review with the progress in the development of their literacy in L2.

Anni expressed the similar view on peer review activity. She said,

Peer editing is very good because it really helps me to write essays better. Your essay after peer editing should be error free, and it should be even better than when you wrote it. Peer editing is a good thing because your essay is going to be really better. For people like me who really don't like to write or really don't know how to write or don't write good, peer editing can really help. (Interview 2 with Anni)
In addition, in her participant’s e-journal, she wrote,

I think that peer editing makes you a better writer, because when you receive feedback you learn from your mistakes and you make it better the next time. So everytime someone peer edits my paper I feel like I’m becoming a better writer.

(Anni’s reflective entry 2 in the participant’s e-journal)

Thus, Anni highlighted the importance of peer feedback. Moreover, her words showed the high expectations she had for the quality of her essay due to the revision after peer review. She did not mention the necessity for the teacher to look at her essay. Instead, she believed that her essay should be of much better quality and error free due to peer review.

In terms of the content of the peer feedback, the participants stated that peer feedback helped them address errors in terms of global and local aspects of writing (McGroarty & Zhu, 1997). According to McGroarty and Zhu, global aspects of writing include development of ideas, audience, purpose, and organization of writing. According to interview data, only BravoWolf saw the importance of peer feedback in terms of identifying areas for improvement on the organization of writing and development of ideas. In particular, he said,

BravoWolf: Peer editing… I think it’s a really good way for other students to find out what they think about the story. Let’s say the story… the beginning was right, but then the ending is in the middle, they try to improve it, to make it better, so it will be like the whole circle or not, circle with a piece like taken off.

Researcher: Could you please explain “the circle” part in more details?
BravoWolf: Like the circle is the story and each... and there is each... Pieces of the story will be like paragraphs in the plot. And let's say the ending was bad, so it will be like the piece is taken off. It will not be the whole circle.

Researcher: So in what respect does peer editing help improve that piece of the cycle?

BravoWolf: So let's say it had good details. It just had no explaining. So the student can help the other student improve the grammar, understanding, better word choices. (Interview 1 with BravoWolf)

With the help of the metaphor of the circle, the participant tried to explain how peers could help the author with the organization of the story (“the ending is in the middle”) as well as development of ideas (“no explaining,” “improve...understanding;” Interview 1 with BravoWolf).

Furthermore, BravoWolf shared that while peer reviewing, he considered if the essay met the genre requirements (Hyland, 2007; Yasuda, 2011). Specifically, he questioned the length of the peer’s writing after the second peer review online. In his participant e-journal, he wrote,

What I always say when someone asks me about the experience of peer editing… The essay I just read was about the world in 100 years, and I read the paper, and the topic was very straightforward, but the issue was that the essay was too short to be considered an essay. I like the idea that technology is advancing in a alarming rate that the old-fashioned stuff are outdated. (BravoWolf’s reflective entry 2 in the participant’s e-journal)
Thus, the participant paid attention to the length of the peer’s writing though the guidelines for the writing online did not specify that the participants should have produced an essay.

In addition to the global aspects of writing, the participants shared their concerns about the local aspects of writing in their work and in the work of their peers (McGroarty & Zhu, 1997). The authors defined local aspects of writing in terms of wording, grammar, and punctuation. As shown in the excerpt from Interview 1 with BravoWolf (see p. 112), the participant mentions “grammar” and “better word choices” as areas that a peer reviewer can help the author to improve due to peer review.

Lightning’s perception of the areas where peer feedback was beneficial was in alignment with BravoWolf’s. He wrote,

The thing i think about peer editing is that it help me write a better essay or write something better by not mispelling words, or put no grammar and bunch of other words. Its also improve my writing. (Lightning’s reflective entry 1 in the participant’s e-journal)

Similarly, Anni wrote in her participant’s e-journal,

I think that peer editing is a good way to make sure that your writing is good. When someone edits your paper they check for grammar, punctuations and spelling to help make your writing better. (Anni’s Reflective entry 1 in the participant’s e-journal)

Thus, Anni added punctuation to the list of the local aspects of writing that she considered during peer review and on which she needed feedback. Overall, the participants considered peer’s feedback on vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, and
spelling as beneficial for the improvement of their writing in L2.

**Development of communication skills.** Another benefit of peer review according to the ELLs was the development of communication skills in ESL. Specifically, they talked about peer review as an activity that helped them start conversing in English and learn how to discuss their feedback with each other. For example, BravoWolf said,

BravoWolf: It is also good way for the students *communicate*; see how well the story was planned out.

Researcher: What do you mean by planning the story?

BravoWolf: How ideas are expressed. Let's say… This is an example in school…

Let's say my freshman year was okay, then my junior year was okay also. But you mean okay, you are just saying okay. Can you please explain how it was like, was it interesting? (Interview 1 with BravoWolf)

In this excerpt, Brawolf explained that peer review provided students with the affordance to communicate that is, to provide feedback orally, discuss how the ideas were developed in writing, and initiate more feedback from the peer if it had been not clear.

Interestingly, Ms. Smith also viewed peer review as an affordance for the development of students’ communication skills. In particular when talking about the influence of peer review on students’ learning ESL, she said,

A lot of my ELL students are not comfortable speaking in front of the group, but when they're speaking with two people and then four people because a lot of them are concerned… they kind of have to do it off-the-cuff. Like they have to be able to converse. So it's helping them be able to develop those conversational
**language skills.** (Interview 1 with the teacher)

Further, Ms. Smith elaborated how participation in peer review allowed the ELLs to overcome the language barrier and feel comfortable in speaking English out loud in front of others. She said,

> Obviously if you have students who speak languages that you don't have, you run to… It's the **comfort in talking**. It's really getting them comfortable. I've never been a fan of just pulling students randomly like to read out loud. (Interview 1 with the teacher)

Thus, both the participants and the teacher perceived peer review as beneficial in terms of development of ELLs’ communication skills. BravoWolf viewed it as an opportunity to initiate more detailed feedback from his peers and discuss various aspects of writing while the teacher elaborated on the students’ getting more comfortable when speaking in peer groups.

**Difficulties.** While all four participants claimed that they could not see any disadvantages regarding peer review, all of them shared about difficulties they encountered associated with this activity. Having chosen to employ an ecological perspective for this dissertation study allows me to consider peer review as a part of the writing process (van Lier, 2004). Therefore, this category includes difficulties, which the ELLs faced not only during the actual peer review process, but also difficulties from the very start of the work at their writing assignment until submission of the final drafts. Furthermore, the participants did not differentiate peer review as a separate activity, but perceived it as an inseparable step of their writing process. Thus, the subcategories in this section are as follows: (a) difficulties with prompts, (b) concern about peer’s feelings and
critique, and (c) difficulties with revision. Noteworthy, I organized the subcategories in the chronological order that is, the order the students would encounter them while working at a writing assignment.

**Difficulties with prompts.** Two of the participants shared their thoughts regarding prompts that they had been given for writing assignments. Both of them faced a difficulty of producing an essay because of the content of the prompts. For example BravoWolf said,

"I have one comment about the **prompts** they gave us on L2 literacy [website wikispaces]. Some prompts were like I can't understand them, like “What would you like to invent?” **It's really hard for me to think** because there are many things that have already been invented. There is nothing new that we need. So it was really hard for me to write about because some people make topics for other people to write about and some people understand it. That's what I'm trying to say like FCAT [unclear] gives you a prompt like "If the whole world is cloudy for a year, what would you do?" Why would somebody put that? Nobody likes cloudy whole year, and nobody likes to do anything about it. So what I'm trying to say is that people should be **more clear about the prompts** they're trying to say instead of putting a random prompt that the computer gave them and tell them to write about it. (Interview 2 with BravoWolf)

Similarly, Lightning expressed the concern about prompts used for various assignments and difficulty of relating to their content. He said, “Sometimes it is kind of **hard to think**
what to write, whatever pops in your head, just write it down” (Interview 2 with Lightning).

Thus, BravoWolf and Lightning shared their perceptions and concerns about prompts assigned to them during standardized testing and other assignments which reflects the pressure of higher-stakes assessments on adolescent ELLs (Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011). The participants stated that they had difficulty with finding ideas for the assignments. Thus, they could not apply their funds of knowledge and build their ideas on some experiences or knowledge from the past.

**Concern about peer’s feelings and critique.** Another difficulty that the participants had strong feelings about was the concern to hurt their peer’s feeling when providing feedback about areas for improvement in their writing. Every participant, except for Maria, expressed the dilemma between providing detailed explicit feedback with the possibility of hurting a peer versus not commenting on the areas for improvement. For example, Anni said, “I don't want to make them feel bad. I have to be honest with them, and I don't want them to feel bad about their errors” (Interview 1 with Anni). The girl further stated that she chose to be honest with her peers and comment on all errors she found in the writing.

When peer reviewing each other’s writing, both peers had the responsibility of sharing their feedback. Therefore, it was easy for the participants to understand and elaborate on how the peer could feel when receiving feedback with criticism. For example, BravoWolf stated,
Peer editing was one tough thing because you have to read it, first you have to skim over it, then you have to read it through, take notes. Then you have to take the summary about it. And it's tough because **maybe the prompt was not clear enough**, and they are **writing off topic**, and that's all they were doing. And some people can't understand. Let's say you were writing a book you're going to sell, and you're going to be… you will sell a lot. And your editor comes and tells you, "This is garbage. Go home and start from scratch." You have like deadline to do it. That's pretty hard on you. What I'm trying to say is that peer editing is pretty hard because you're trying to explain what you're trying to say but you can't explain in words. (Interview 2 with BravoWolf)

Interestingly, the participant did not primarily focus on the way the feedback of the editor was phrased. Rather, he chose first to comment on how difficult it could be for the writers to express their opinion clearly and render the message to the readers without any confusion. Meanwhile, in such cases, the peer’s feedback could be offensive and rather abrupt for the author of the writing.

According to Lightning, phrasing, delivering and perceiving peer feedback often depended on the nature of the *relationship between peers*. The student said,

And sometimes there is a time when people make it harder by correcting the people. Sometimes, they do not know the person whom they are correcting so you do not really know, but they say like the bad way. But if you know the people, we are cool. (Interview 2 with Lightning)
Thus, Lightning considered that the feedback from a peer who was not a friend might be perceived in a negative way. On the contrary, the peers who were friends would achieve understanding regarding the feedback. This finding reflects the participants’ appreciation of friendship, which they included as one of the most important things into their Mandala assignment (see pp. 101-104). The participants considered friends as the part of their support system; therefore, in Lightning’s opinion, friendship among peers would allow providing and receiving peer feedback in a non-threatening way and would not lead to any conflicts or disagreements between peers.

Another cause for disagreement or conflict between peers could be the nature of peer feedback, which BravoWolf defined as **subjective, opinionated, or simply different** (Interview 1 with BravoWolf). That could cause peers to perceive the writing in one way or another as a critique. The boy said,

> Criticism, like they can say, “Oh, this is bad. This is horrible.” They can tell, "It is really bad.” Or other people can say, "It's good.” That's how people can think of it. It's their perspective. Like when they read it, and they say, “It's bad.” It's their opinion. Some people can be really personal about other people's opinion… It may hurt the author or the writer because they took so much time writing it.

(Interview 1 with BravoWolf)

Thus, BravoWolf considered criticism as one of the difficulties of peer review activity. Mainly, due to differences in perspectives and opinions, students might hurt each other feelings when sharing their feedback in a blunt way.
Both Anni and Maria found it challenging to point out the errors in peer’s writing and to make suggestions on how to address areas for improvement. For instance, Anni wrote, “Mabey on disadvantage of peer editing is that the editer might add his or her opinion and sometimes you might not agree to it” (Anni’s Reflective entry 1 in the participant’s e-journal). Similarly, Maria said,

Probably the person would not agree with me and will start an argument. They'll probably think that they are correct. Or probably, I am trying to say that it needs to be changed, but they're probably correct the way it is. (Interview 1 with Maria)

Thus, the participants expressed the concern about the development of an argument between peers due to disagreement on its content.

BravoWolf elaborated on how his peers could feel when receiving critique of their written work. He said,

The difficulties would be not being critical that is, not to criticize your writing. And the second would be not to be clear. Because when you are not clear, you can be offended because they may think it's good. And you may think it's bad. So if you're trying to be clear and say, "Oh, that's bad you must change this paragraph," some people can be aggressive with that… Let's say you're writing about the prompt on racism, and you'd say a bunch of racist things. Some person can get offended and tell you, “Oh, change that. That's too stereotypical. Why are you writing about that?” And they're trying like proof fact, proof fact. But there is no fact; you're just criticizing the prompt. So you're just making fun of the prompt,
you're just writing what you think, not what the prompt wants. (Interview 2 with BravoWolf)

In this excerpt from Interview 2, BravoWolf explains how hard it could be sometimes for students to not criticize but be clear about their feedback to their peers. Having many factors contributing to the situation such due to different backgrounds and opinions or misunderstanding the author’s message, the peers might misinterpret and develop aggressive feelings to the feedback provider.

Interestingly, Ms. Smith also commented on students’ concern about hurting each other feelings and their fear of criticizing. Ms. Smith saw peer review as an affordance to teach students how to provide feedback in a polite way and get comfortable with providing feedback on the areas for improvement. She said,

They need to be comfortable critiquing someone else's work. I think it makes them better at critiquing themselves. It's also really important for them to learn that you can critique somebody and not be construed as negative. If you tell somebody, ‘That's just not making sense. It's not flowing,’ it's not an insult. It's to help them. (Interview 1 with the teacher)

Ms. Smith further explained,

I'm doing because I want them… I feel like they can be more honest because that's not anyone in their classes. They have the ability to say, “This is working.” or “This is not working.” And I think this is going to work out better because I think you're going to hear a lot more honest feedback than in those groups because they are not hurting anyone's feelings. (Interview 1 with the teacher)
Thus, Ms. Smith saw this difficulty of students as necessary to overcome, and peer review was an activity that afforded such an opportunity for students.

**Difficulties with revision.** In addition to reporting concern about hurting peer’s feelings when providing feedback, the participants found it difficult at times to incorporate feedback after peer review and make relevant changes in their writing in order to improve it. For example, Lightning said, “And sometimes you know that it is spelled wrong, but you do not know how to spell it correctly, and that's what can get messed up also” (Interview 1 with Lightning). In the subsequent interview, the boy further explained,

You know when you get the thing to write about, it's easy to write it down, but not about what mistake you make. When you rereading it, it's kind of hard to change it and to spell it right. And the friend is writing you, but they sometimes do not know how to fix it also. (Interview 2 with Lightning)

According to the participant, the peer review process was beneficial because Lightning learned about the areas for improvement; however, the participant faced the difficulty of finding the ways on how to correct his spelling errors. In addition, the peer could not help in that case either. Thus, it was difficult for the peers to co-construct knowledge if both of them had gaps in their language proficiency in the same area.

Similarly, Anni reported the difficulty on making changes in her writing when the peer suggested deleting or substituting sentences or findings synonyms for the words in her work. The participant said,
Hard is when they tell me to **take out the sentence or edit the sentence**, that I really liked, maybe **changing the whole introduction** or **saying something else using the different words**. That's the hard part because I don't really like changing my sentences or... if I like them I just want to change them, or I just want to change the word. (Interview 1 with Anni)

Anni also added, “You could change it, or you could make it better or improve it, but **if you disagree, then it just stays there, nothing changes**.” In Anni’s case, the participant raised the concern about the difficulties with making revision and accepting peer’s feedback when the author of the writing disagrees with the feedback and prefers not to make any changes in the writing because of personal preferences for certain ways of expressing ideas and developing ideas in the writing. Finally, Anni added that in case of disagreement, the author of the writing might choose to not incorporate the peer’s feedback and would not make any changes because of the lack of the consensus if that would lead to any improvement of their writing in L2.

**Face-to-face versus online peer review.** All four participants experienced online peer review for the first time. Therefore, when I asked them to share their perceptions of engaging into this activity online, they mainly talked about the comparison between the two formats. Noteworthy, the participants’ peer review online was not associated with any school assignment. Therefore, the students were not under pressure of being assessed by the teacher, by deadlines of submitting an assignment, etc. They did it because they agreed to participate in the study and because they were willing to improve their writing in L2.
Overall, BravoWolf, Anni, Lightning, and Maria perceived peer review online as better than face-to-face, providing reasons and examples. Maria expressed preference to online peer review over face-to-face because of her frequent use of the computer at home. The participant said, “I think it was good. I like it better than [face-to-face]. It's like on the computer. I don't know, I use the computer more at home because of my homeworks so it's easier” (Interview 1 with Maria). When I asked Maria about her experiences with the use of the wikispaces.com for writing and penzu.com for online journal, the girl replied, “It was not difficult because you had an instructions, and you could do it by yourself. So it's easier” (Interview 1 with Maria). Therefore, the participant liked peer reviewing in online format more because she used the computer on a regular basis to study. In addition, she found both websites user-friendly. That, along with the clear instructions on how to use the websites, allowed her to do peer review at her own pace.

Anni’s perception of online peer review was in alignment with Maria’s. She also commented on the convenience and flexibility of peer reviewing online because of her ability to work at own pace and independently from the peer’s progress in the activity. The girl said,

I thought it was easier in the sense that the person is not there looking over you and seeing what you wrote until they actually read it. It was really easy because it was easy to find the mistakes and help them improve their essay. (Interview 1 with Anni)

Anni also added that she had no difficulties using the websites for writing and peer review purposes and said, “It's easier than writing it on the paper and then scrubbing
things out and putting stuff everywhere. It's much easier to do it online” (Interview 1 with Anni). Thus, like Maria, Anni appreciated the opportunity to progress through the assignment at her own pace and provide a peer with the feedback in writing. She also pointed out the benefit of using computer in writing as it allowed her to make changes in the writing easily.

Though the participants perceived peer review online as easier and better than peer review in the face-to-face format, they approached peer review online with the knowledge and experience with this activity from face-to-face school setting. During peer review session in the computer lab, I provided students with the brief training on how to use the wikispaces.com and penzu.com, an aspect, which was completely new to them. I also supported my oral training with the handout (see Appendix B), which contained the same information on the websites and the procedural steps such as the peer review should be done before writing in online journals. However, the students did not receive any handouts and training from me that would have guided them through the steps of peer review process or make them focused on certain aspects of writing over the other when reading the peer’s writing. Nevertheless, students had no difficulty peer reviewing each other’s work.

When reading each other’s work online, the participants focused on both strong areas in their peer’s writing as well as areas for improvement, just as they used to do it in class. Therefore, the participants could transfer knowledge and skills learned at school to their writing process, not for the school assignment. For example, during Interview 1 Maria answered my question regarding this aspect
Researcher: Did it matter that I didn't give you any form? Remember Ms. Smith gave you the form, and you had to fill it out? I didn't give you anything. How did you know what to comment about?

Maria: Because like in middle school, my teacher every time she would review every day or every week when we have a test or writing. So she would go over the day before, and she would read through the same thing, and we practiced too.

Researcher: How many times approximately did you have that [peer review] in the middle school? You said “a lot,” I remember.

Maria: I don't remember how many times, but whenever the writing test would come, we would do that. (Interview 1 with Maria)

Thus, Maria had no difficulty peer reviewing the other student’s writing online, having no guidelines or form which would have guided her through the process, because she had had an extensive experience in peer reviewing in the middle school. The participant also added that she had also asked her friends to peer review her writing in the past though it was not a part of the assignment. This showed the participant’s realization of the value and benefits of peer review for the development of their writing in L2 and the transfer of skills from face-to-face to online contexts (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Min, 2006).

The participants’ level of comfort with peer reviewing each other’s work online was rooted not only in the practice, as stated by all four ELLs “easy and good because I already knew how to do it because I've been doing it” (Interview 2 with Maria). According to my observation field notes and recordings, it also stemmed from the training that the teacher provided to the students before peer review. Specifically, Ms.
Smith had whole class discussion in order to learn about students’ beliefs and experiences with peer review and to point out how important this activity was and would be for their life. During Interview 1, the teacher shared how she showed to the kids the application of peer review to her professional life,

I've tried to explain to them that even with peers when my colleagues come in the classroom I've been told by a colleague, "I don't think that will work," “I don't think that's a good idea." And I've showed the kids we are going through peer evaluation process in Green County. You know I have somebody critiquing me, and I had a choice when they started that process. I could take it as negative and be like, “Oh, people are there to get me” or “Use it as an opportunity to grow.” And my peer evaluations… they haven't been bad, but there is always one area that they say, "You are progressing." which means you're not on level, which is fine because truthfully, you are normally right on. I have a problem with assessment. I don't do enough of assessment in class. I get over it. (Interview 1 with Ms. Smith)

Therefore, during peer review training, Ms. Smith also attempted making the benefits of peer review explicit. In particular, she talked with students how peer review sessions would further transfer to the out-of-school context and would carry the higher level of comfort with peer review process into the professional and other contexts. Thus, participants’ perceptions of peer review in both face-to-face and online contexts were rooted in the preparation/training for this activity and practice.

Peer feedback versus teacher feedback. In addition to talking about benefits and difficulties with peer review, face-to-face and online formats, the participants compared peer feedback to teacher feedback. When comparing, they discussed both providing and
receiving feedback. For example, Maria commented on how providing feedback and discussing it with her friends-peers was easier than asking and discussing it with the teacher. She said,

Maria: It was good. Because it's **harder to explain to the teacher than to a friend**, so it was easy for me. I would explain, and they would understand me.

Researcher: Why is it harder to talk to a teacher?

Maria: Because I didn't know… They use stronger **vocabulary**; they've got different vocabulary. (Interview 1 with Maria)

Thus, Maria shared that she preferred peer feedback to teacher feedback because it was more difficult for her to explain her point to the teacher because of the differences in teachers’ and ELLs’ vocabulary knowledge and use.

Moreover, Maria commented on why she liked receiving and negotiating feedback with her peers.

Researcher: What do you mean by “examples that are more interesting” when they [peers] explain?

Maria: **Something that you have been through together**… any kind of experience, like school, like in your house or anything like that. Because like when the teacher is older age, and you're like they know more about it. But then with my friend, I'm on the same level with them, and they understand me better. (Interview 1 with Maria)

In addition to the differences in vocabulary knowledge and use between the teacher and the students, Maria identified the existence of common experiences as one of the factors
that defined her preference for peer feedback.

On the other hand, Anni preferred teacher feedback to peer feedback when focusing on its quality and explained her reasoning. She said,

Anni: I think the teacher's feedback would be better than the peers' because most of the time the teachers are just more honest with you, and they are sometimes just smarter than the students. So I would take their feedback over the peers'. And sometimes they just say things just to say things, and I don't think the teacher would do that.

Researcher: Why would they do it just to say things?

Anni: Maybe they didn't feel like reading it, or they just did whatever. Maybe they just didn't want to be honest with you so they put whatever there. (Interview 1 with Anni)

Therefore, Anni viewed teacher’s feedback as more honest. She further explained that she considered teacher’s responsibility to help their students achieve the best grade while her peers did not have such responsibility. That revealed the participant’s trust in teacher’s feedback over the peer’s feedback. Nevertheless, both Anni and Maria stated that most of the time the content of their peers’ and teachers’ feedback was the same.

**Research Question 2. What Affordances do Four Adolescent ELLs Choose to Employ During Peer Review in Face-to-Face and Online Contexts?**

Another major focus of this research study was to describe and explain affordances, which four adolescent ELLs chose to employ during peer review in face-to-face and online contexts. When answering this research question, I relied on data collected through observations, interviews with the participants and their teacher, and
researcher’s e-journal. During my analysis of data with this research question in mind, I focused on the affordances as “possibilities for action that yield opportunities for engagement and participation” (van Lier, 2004, p. 81). Therefore, in this section of the Findings chapter, I bring together the agent of the action (the adolescent ELL participants) and the physical, symbolic, and social world (face-to-face and online contexts) of the peer review activity. Both face-to-face and online contexts provided the ELLs with a wide range of resources to engage with them (such as students, teacher, peer-editing checklist s, etc.) and topics for discussion (peer’s essay, peer’s feedback, etc.). These, in their turn, constituted semiotic resources of the environment (van Lier, 2004).

Figure 8 provides the visual representation of all affordances, which the participants chose to employ in face-to-face and online contexts for Research Question 2.

---

**Affordances in a face-to-face context**
- sitting in groups/pairs;
- listening to the teacher’s explanation about peer review;
- reading peer’s essay;
- asking questions while reading the peers’ writing;
- writing notes on peer’s essay;
- writing notes on the peer editing checklist;
- providing and receiving oral feedback.

**Affordances in an online context**
- using computers in the computer lab;
- participating in the training on Web 2.0 websites;
- writing online;
- reading the peer’s writing;
- providing feedback in a written form.

Figure 8. Affordances the four adolescent ELLs chose to employ during peer review in face-to-face and online contexts. The figure shows the affordance in the order students employed them during peer review sessions.
First, I present affordances that the participants chose to employ in a face-to-face context. Further, I continue with the findings on affordances employed by the participants in an online context. When I present findings for Research Question 2, I do not categorize affordances as immediate or mediated because it was not an initial aim of the study, and in many cases it was impossible to separate one from another. In addition, I present affordances in the chronological order that is, the order the participants employed them during peer review so that it would be easier for readers to see the activity of peer review holistically and associate each affordance with the progress of the activity. While describing affordances, I also explain how the participants employ them from the ecological perspective. Noteworthy, I describe and explain the findings on how the participants chose to employ the affordances in writing in the next part of this chapter—findings for Research Question 3.

**Peer review of school-assigned writing in a face-to-face context.** When peer reviewing each other’s writing in Ms. Smith’s class, all four participants chose to employ seven affordances: (a) sitting in groups/pairs, (b) listening to the teacher’s explanation about peer review, (c) reading peer’s essay, (d) asking questions while reading the peers’ writing, (e) writing notes on peer’s essay, (f) writing notes on the peer-editing checklist, and (g) providing and receiving oral feedback.

**Sitting in groups/pairs.** The affordance of sitting in pairs and groups for the peer review activity was the first one that the participants employed during peer review sessions. According to my observation field notes, the teacher took preparation for the peer review activity rather seriously. Every time before peer review, she arranged the desks in the groups of four. In addition, Ms. Smith put the signs with every student’s
name on each desk in order to assign students in peer pairs. Furthermore, the teacher thought through the second round of the peer review that is, once the students finished peer reviewing each other’s work, they could have additional peer review session with the student sitting in front of them.

When I asked the teacher about reasons behind assigning specific students into pairs/groups, she said,

I'm trying to pair up **stronger with not so strong** writers. And I don't even classify my ELL with my non-ELL because a number of my ELL students are incredibly strong writers, and I would be pairing them up with somebody who is not that strong. Now I would be aware if I had **cultural differences** or... I don't really have that issue so I don't have to be as in one of my classes... I have some issues when the kids just **don't get along** so I can't put them together. (Interview 1 with the teacher)

Therefore, when assigning students in peer review pairs/groups, the teacher considered the students’ progress in terms of writing, cultural differences, and relationships between students to enhance the potential benefits of the activity.

The participants also commented on the importance to have the “right” peer for the peer review activity. For example, during Interview 1, Anni said that students might not consider the peer review seriously, and provided feedback, which was either useless or dishonest. Lightning also commented on this issue and said,

And sometimes there is a time when people make it harder by like correcting the people. Sometimes **they do not know the person** whom they are correcting so
you do not really know, but they say like **the bad way**. But if you **know the people**, we are **cool**. (Interview 2 with Lightning)

Thus, the participants also realized how important it was to participate in the peer review with the person whom they knew and could rely on the quality of their feedback.

Though the participants were aware of this aspect of peer review, the teacher was the one who assigned them with their peers. Three semiotic resources were available for the students to employ the affordance: the desk, the sign with the name, and the teacher’s explanation of what to do. Therefore, when the participants entered the classroom, they looked for the desk with their name, and sat down, further participating in peer review in the assigned pair/group. Thus, the teacher reinforced students’ understanding with the instruction on what they should do and mediated that affordance for those students who were confused.

*Listening to the teacher’s explanation about peer review.* When in the face-to-face classroom context, the participants also employed the affordance of listening to the teacher’s explanation about peer review. Mainly, before asking the students to peer review each other’s writing, the teacher provided the students with the detailed explanation regarding the essence of peer review, its potential benefits and disadvantages, and procedure or steps the students would go through while peer reviewing. Though some students in the classroom were not that attentive, all four participants listened attentively to the teacher. Further, the participants were able to participate and engage in peer review using the peer-editing checklist, which the teacher provided them with for recording feedback on the peer’s writing.
Though, the ELLs had the prior experience with peer reviewing, they chose to actively listen to the teacher during the training. Hence, when during training the teacher said,

So, this is what you're going to do. You're going to trade with your shoulder partner whatever you have written. Everybody grab this sheet out. Guys, everybody grab this sheet of paper out [showing the handout]. You need to put under author's name your name. Under author's name, write your name. You are the author. Under peer's name, write the person's-sitting-next-to-you name.

(Classroom observation, October 10, 2012)

the participants were engaged in a meaningful activity that is, they (a) were active, and (b) picked up the information needed for the peer review activity. As with the previous affordance, it is difficult to classify it into immediate or mediated because of the differences in perception and interpretation of every participant and in the complexity of the teacher’s training (body language, prosodic features, voice quality, visual aids, movement around the room, etc.)

Interestingly, during peer review training, the participants did not employ the affordances of answering teacher’s questions regarding their experiences and attitudes towards peer review. Though all participants acknowledged during Interview 1 that they had had prior experiences with peer reviewing in middle school, nobody of the participants volunteered to share their perceptions of and attitudes towards peer review in class. This affordance as “action potential” was not realized. Though in most cases the participants worked hard at the tasks, they rarely raised their hands to speak up in front of
the whole class. Such observation of mine was also in alignment with the teacher’s opinion:

A lot of my ELL students are **not comfortable speaking in front of the group.** But when they're speaking with 2 people and then four people because a lot of them are concerned… they kind of have to do it off-the-cuff. Like they have to be able to converse. So it's helping them be able to **develop those conversational language skills.** And a lot of times especially if I have a Hispanic student who is ELL, and I have another Hispanic students who is not ELL, but it is still fluent, if I make sure that they are in appropriate groups, if an ELL student can't pick up the English translation, and you know that many things don't [translate], you've got somebody there who is almost instinctually is able to kind of fill it in for you. (Interview 1 with the teacher)

Thus, the teacher was aware of the students’ discomfort of participating in the whole group discussion. Nevertheless, it resulted in Ms. Smith’s belief that the students had no prior peer review training and in her assurance that she needed to provide thorough step-by-step instructions for the students in order to prepare them for the activity.

**Reading peer’s essays.** After the peer review training, the participants employed the affordance of reading peer’s writing. After the teacher’s explicit and detailed explanation of what they should do, the ELLs exchanged their paragraphs/essays and read their peer’s writing. Therefore, the simple act of asking students to exchange their papers by the teacher created the “meaning potential” in the environment (van Lier, 2004, p. 96). All participants perceived this affordance, picked it up, and engaged in the activity.
According to van Lier (2004), employing the affordance leads to the “semiosis (meaning making)” (p. 96). Thus, the activity of reading in itself could carry the amalgamation of benefits such as practicing L2 reading, vocabulary, grammar, development of critical thinking skills, and assessing peer’s writing based on the knowledge of requirements to writing in L2.

As for classifying this affordance as immediate or mediated, I consider the affordance of reading peer’s essay as multi-level. Specifically, it does include the affordance of seeing the peer’s writing as an immediate affordance. Further, it contains such a complexity of aspects as engaging funds of knowledge about letters in English, rules of grammar, etc. Moreover, the teacher mediated their understanding of the peer’s writing when she had provided students with the detailed guidelines for Mandala assignment, peer review training, and other information and materials which allowed for the participants’ understanding of the writing and for their ability to interpret and assess it.

*Asking each other questions while reading the peer’s writing.* While reading peer’s writing, two participants (Lightning and BravoWolf) employed the affordance of being in a close proximity to each other and kept asking each other questions immediately when they saw an area for improvement. This was not a part of the teacher’s instructions for the peer review. Specifically, Ms. Smith asked the students,

Take your essay, peer editing white sheet, and hand them to your neighbor. I have your neighbor hand theirs to you. Trade. Okay, now, trade your entire packet. You're going to spend the next 10 to 15 minutes *silently editing* your colleague's paper. If you have a question, that's fine. I know the difference… you are to edit.
Remember your peer editing instructions and your editing symbols. Okay? You may go ahead and begin. (Classroom observation, October 10, 2012)

According to the excerpt, Ms. Smith was clear about how students should have approached reading of a peer’s paper. Nevertheless, Lightning and BravoWolf did not follow the teacher’s guidelines.

Lightning’s participation in peer review session 3 showcases the participant’s need for immediate mediation on the part of his peer. Specifically, Lightning took longer time to read peers’ essays than other participants. Moreover, while reading he would not proceed further if he had a difficulty understanding the content. Therefore, when reading a peer’s essay during peer review session 3, he would often stop to ask his peer for clarification, “Ok. That's kinda hard to understand. “For me the goal that I need to support…” That kind of does not make sense” (Peer review session 3, November 11, 2012). By reading the target line over and over, Lightning was trying to figure out how to address the area of improvement while the peer explained the intended meaning. Finally, Lightning suggested the following: “So you should put something like that then: "For me the goal…” It makes sense” (Peer review session 3, November 11, 2012). Thus, in order to proceed in reading the peer’s paper, Lightning chose to ask his peer about the aspect in the writing, which would prevent him from understanding the content of the essay.

The fact that the students did not follow the teacher’s guidelines was rooted in the immediate need for the mediation. Based on van Lier’s model of levels of awareness, the participants were aware of the language and the target aspects of their writing from the beginning due to the affordance of reading. While reading, the participants noticed a
linguistic feature and focused their attention on it, which meant “entering into new acts of making meaning (semiosis)” (van Lier, 2004, p. 100). Noticing signals the possibility for the learning opportunity (van Lier, 2004). Therefore, the participants in this study chose to employ such opportunity and progressed to the next level of awareness – active control that is, they started analyzing the identified area in the peer’s paper and needed mediation due to the lack of details in the peer’s writing. Therefore, immediacy played an important role in the adolescent ELLs’ progress through levels of awareness (van Lier, 2004).

Finally, while asking questions, the participants were concerned about their peer’s feelings, which showed their progression to the critical awareness level (van Lier, 2004).

**Writing notes on peer’s essay.** Another affordance that all the participants chose to employ was writing notes on the peer’s essay. Interestingly, the participants did not follow the teacher’s guidelines in terms of the notes. Specifically, during the training the teacher asked the students,

First thing you're going to do is read the essay once silently. Do not mark anything on there. Second, you're going to reread the essay, **noting any errors.** On the back, everybody flip this [the teacher showed the handout to the students]. These are some **common proofreading marks.** I need you to become comfortable with these because a lot of your English teachers I know use them. And then when you are in college pay somebody to edit your papers, what I used to do, they're going to use these. So you need these and become familiar with them. If somebody has spelled something wrong, it is not your job to correct their spelling. It is your job to go where it says spelling “Sp” write a little sp. above it
and go on. If you're not sure that it is spelled correctly, write an “Sp” with a question mark. (Classroom observation, October 1, 2012)

Thus, the teacher asked the students to follow the guidelines on the peer-editing handouts (see Appendix I) and use the proofreading marks instead of putting down sentences or phrases.

None of the participants followed the teacher’s guidelines and used proofreading marks. The ELLs did stay on task and wrote notes, but their comments were expressed in words and phrases. For example, Lightning was peer reviewing BravoWolf’s essay on October 10, and he wrote a lot of feedback for the peer on the actual BravoWolf’s paper. All of his feedback was in sentences such as “I like your idea and paragraph,” “Like I want more detail of what kind of activities you did with your family. I love the you put for happiness.” BravoWolf also wrote detailed notes in sentences on Lightning’s essay. The notes included such sentences as “Good writing. Keep it up!” and “Space them.” During interviews, all participants commented that they wanted to help their peers with their feedback; therefore, took it rather seriously and focused on giving detailed feedback.

**Writing notes on the peer-editing checklist.** All four participants employed the affordance of filling out the peer-editing checklist (see Appendix I). Noteworthy, the teacher used the term “peer editing” instead of “peer review”; therefore, I use these two terms further in the report interchangeably. As a part of the peer review training, the teacher explained what students should do with the checklist and attracted students’ attention to the content of the checklist. While explaining all the aspects of the peer-editing checklist that the students had to comment, Ms. Smith asked the students to be
honest in their feedback and as detailed as possible in their comments. According to my observation notes, all four participants were working diligently at filling out the peer-editing checklist.

Having provided students with such a semiotic object as a peer-editing checklist, the teacher created an opportunity for students to engage into the synthesis of their knowledge about Mandala assignment, knowledge of grammar vocabulary in ESL, reading skill in L2, knowledge of requirements to writing in L2, and critical thinking skills. Such list is by no means exclusive because every participant perceived the peer’s writing through the prism of their own background and interpreted it in their own way.

As with the previous affordances, it is challenging to classify this affordance as immediate or mediated. The mere look of the form/paper would have provided the students with the affordance of writing on it. However, the participants received the prior training on how to use the peer-editing checklist, they read the peer’s essays, they wrote some notes of feedback for their peers, and they have asked clarifying questions while reading. In addition, all of the participants had the prior knowledge of the peer review. All of these elements mediated the participants’ activity of writing feedback on the checklist.

*Providing and receiving oral feedback.* Another affordance that some participants chose to employ during peer review sessions was providing and receiving oral feedback. After asking the students to fill out peer-editing checklist, the teacher announced the final stage of peer review sessions—discussing peer feedback in pairs. While all four participants took the task of writing down the feedback for the authors of
the papers seriously, only three participants (Anni, BravoWolf, and Lightning) chose to talk about their feedback. Nevertheless, even their discussions were more of a summary and the repetition of what they already wrote in the peer-editing checklist and on the margins of their peer’s essays. Moreover, the participants chose to agree with their peers and did not discuss any of the aspects of the feedback for a long time. Maria, being shy by nature, missing the first peer review session, and having incomplete drafts during peer review, preferred providing and receiving feedback in the written form.

The following excerpt shows how Anni chooses to participate in the peer feedback discussion session with the peer, a female NS of English:

Peer: The last sentence, I like that sentence. And I think for the ones that are underlined, I think you should use something else because you're kind of saying the same thing.

Anni: yeah. I did not know what to write.

Peer: Yeah. That's basically the only thing. The rest was good. And I don't know if you have a dot there, but I didn't see it so I put it. But I liked it, that detailed. (Peer review session 1, October 1, 2012)

According to the excerpt, the peer chose first to comment on the content of one of Anni’s sentences in the essay. Further, she explained the reason of underlining several sentences as she had seen them redundant and repetitive in meaning. In her turn, Anni agreed with the peer and confirmed it as the area for improvement. During Interview 1, she shared that she had been aware of that area for improvement in the first draft of her Mandala paper before the peer review session. In addition, as Anni explained to the peer during
their conversation, she did not know what else to add in her first draft. The peer also pointed out the missing period (punctuation) and stated that she put the “dot” just in case. The peer finished providing feedback by complementing Anni for details in the paper. Thus, during oral discussion, Anni did not initiate providing feedback to the peer, but chose to only receive the feedback and agree with the peer’s comments.

The peer feedback discussion between BravoWolf and his peer also had the format of summary of the feedback written in the artifacts. However, in this case BravoWolf was the one who started the conversation. In particular, he commented about his feedback to the peer, “This is good. I like your work. The only problem that you have is spelling. That’s it. Everything looks good. Just spelling. That’s it.” When further the peer provided detailed suggestions in the form of the questions on how to provide more details on the specific aspects in BravoWolf’s first draft, the participant said, “Oh, I see” and revised his subsequent draft following the peer’s suggestions. Therefore, the oral discussion of peer feedback during peer review session 1 between BravoWolf and his peer also had the format of the summary of written feedback during which the participant briefly commented on his peer’s essay and agreed with the suggestions with the peer on how to improve his paper.

During the rest of discussions, BravoWolf also eagerly received the feedback from the peers and agreed with all their comments. During peer review session 3, for example, when the peer was not sure if the words “doctor” and “lawyer” should be capitalized but shared the concern, BravoWolf said, “I think they have to be lower case. Yeah, just write it.” Therefore, the boy noticed the possible area for the improvement due to the peer feedback, which in that case was both written and oral, and chose to ask the
peer for the correction of that aspect in his paper. Furthermore, he showed the gratitude to the peers for the feedback and chose to complement them at the end of the discussion, “You know what you must be really really good at this.” Thus, BravoWolf actively and positively employed the affordance of providing and receiving feedback from his peers.

Unlike the previous cases, Lightning took longer time reading the peers’ essays than other participants. Therefore, when Anni and BravoWolf discussed the peer feedback in the form of the summary of the written feedback, Lightning was either still reading the peer’s essay and writing his notes for the peer or working with the peer-editing checklist. For example, during peer feedback session 1, Lightning said to the peer,

Lightning: I have a question for you.
Peer: What?
Lightning: What does that mean [konˈsiːz] [concise]? What does that mean?
Peer: Huh?
Lightning: That one says [konˈsiːz] [showing the word "concise" on the peer-editing checklist to the peer].
Peer: That means like my sentence is good. (Peer review session 1, October 1, 2012)

Therefore, Lightning chose to employ the affordance to participate in peer feedback session in a different way. According to the excerpt above, he chose to ask the peer, a male NS of English, about the meaning of the unfamiliar word, which he found in the peer-editing checklist. Though the peer could not define the meaning of the word “concise” in the best possible way, Lightning “noticed” the unfamiliar vocabulary unit and proceeded with the “action” of finding out what the word meant by asking the peer
(van Lier, 2004, p. 100). In his other oral feedback discussion sessions, he actively asked the peers about their essays while reading their work and accepted all comments about his writing.

Thus, Anni, BravoWolf, and Lightning chose to employ the affordance of providing and receiving oral feedback. Both Anni and BravoWolf listened to the peers’ feedback and agreed with all the comments. The format of their oral peer feedback session was the summary of the written feedback from the comments and marks on the essays and peer-editing checklists. While Lightning also agreed with his peers’ comments about his writing, he also chose to employ the affordance of oral discussion in terms of talking about unfamiliar vocabulary he encountered in the peer-editing checklist.

**Peer review of writing in an online context.** The affordances for peer reviewing in an online context were different from the ones in the face-to-face context because of the differences in the format (online versus face-to-face) and the nature of the activity itself (students were writing voluntarily online, not for any school assignment). Though the names of some affordances in this category overlapped with the affordances from the face-to-face context, the participants were going through different actions, and there was a difference in semiotic objects in the environment. During peer reviewing online, the participants chose to employ the following affordances: (a) using computers in the computer lab, (b) participating in the training on Web 2.0 websites, (c) writing online, (d) reading the peer’s writing, and (e) providing feedback in a written form.

**Using computers in the computer lab.** The initial difference of peer review online was the use of computers for the activity. Though initially I planned to ask participants to use computers at home for writing online for the purposes of this study, it turned out
problematic due to issues with the availability of computers at students’ homes. Noteworthy, the affordance of using computers in the computer lab at school turned out to be possible for the participants only after the teacher had arranged it with the school administration and the computer administrator. Thus, having computers in the computer lab at school allowed the participants to experience writing and peer review online.

When the participants chose to employ the opportunity of using computers for peer review purposes in the computer lab, they perceived it favorably and were open to participating in the activity. All four participants were comfortable using the computers. Moreover, I did explain to them initially when inviting to participate in the study that I would provide training on the websites they would use for peer reviewing online. Thus, the participants did not need any mediation in order to perceive and interpret this affordance.

*Participating in the training on Web 2.0 websites.* All four participants eagerly chose to employ the affordance of training on Web 2.0. Though they had an experience of using the computer for search of information and social networking websites, they did not know about the websites, which could be used for peer review purposes. Therefore, they attentively listened to the training that I offered to them and asked a lot of questions. The participants had two online peer review sessions. However, they went to the computer lab four times in order (1) to write their works, (2) peer review them, incorporate peers’ feedback, and write a reflection entry in their e-journals.

During the initial training, I explained to the participants how they should log in into their computers and how to use [http://l2literacy.wikispaces.com](http://l2literacy.wikispaces.com). I also provided the
ELLs with handouts with detailed explanation of steps they should make to use wikispaces.com and with their login and password information (see Appendix B). When being in the lab for the second time, the participants received a training on the ways to provide peer feedback using http://l2literacy.wikispaces.com and on Penzu.com website for e-journals (see Appendix B). Even after my explanation and reading all the guidelines, every participant had a question regarding various aspects of the use of the websites and what they should do next. Some participants also ran into some difficulties logging into the websites due to the misspelling of their login information and names of the websites.

Thus, having my training, computer, access to the Internet, and handouts as semiotic resources in the environment, the participants still needed the mediation and scaffolding to effectively employ the affordance of the training and progress to the action that is, peer reviewing each other’s work online. Nevertheless, arguing for the classification of this affordance as mediated would be a challenging task as the affordance itself could be further divided into a range of affordances such as listening to the training, asking questions during training, using the handouts, etc. Overall, BravoWolf, Anni, Lightning, and Maria perceived the affordance, successfully interpreted the semiotic resources from the environment with the help of mediation and scaffolding, and progressed into action that is, writing and peer reviewing online.

**Writing online.** All four participants chose to employ the affordance of writing online. In order to afford the participants the opportunities for writing online, I created a separate page for every participant and asked them to write on their individual pages. Every time the participants were to write online, I chose a number of prompts from various websites in case if they had difficulty coming up with the idea for writing. In
addition, I gave them an option to write on the topic of their own choice. I was also present in the room when the participants were writing, and some of them, Lightning and Maria chose to ask me questions regarding spelling and the length of the writing. Thus, the participants perceived the possibility of writing online employing such semiotic resources as my presence and knowledge, the availability of Web 2.0 website for their writing, the guiding list of prompts, the computer, and access to the Internet.

Thus, from the ecological perspective, the four participants perceived the access to all the semiotic resources listed above, interpreted their relevance to their goal (writing online), and chose to progress to the action itself—writing online. According to my observation field notes and e-journal, the participants stayed on task all the time while writing in the computer lab. Surprisingly, they did not attempt to use any other websites while writing. The possible explanation could be that many websites were blocked on the school’s territory, and the students would use computers at school mostly for testing purposes; therefore, the students chose to stay on http://l2literacy.wikispaces.com all the time while writing.

*Reading the peer’s writing.* After each participant had finished writing, they went to the computer lab in order to peer review each other’s work, incorporate peer’s feedback, and write a reflection entry in their journals. Following the teacher’s advice, I was the one who paired students up for peer review sessions. Therefore, I told the students the names of their peers and asked them to review their peer’s work. The participants eagerly employed this affordance. For example, BravoWolf wrote in his e-journal,
The paper I reviewed over was wonderful and very touching. It's sad to hear a loss of a good relative. But the paper I reviewed was very rich in emotions and compasion. It wasn't a long time I found a good paper that had all these attributes.

(BravoWolf’s reflective entry 1)

Thus, according to the excerpt above and to the participants’ perceptions of peer review process online, the participants eagerly engaged in reading peer’s work online.

From an ecological perspective, the participants “noticed” the affordance in the environment when I divided them into pairs (van Lier, 2004, p. 100). Moreover, they were already familiar with the procedure of peer review from the face-to-face context, and as it turned out, they could transfer this knowledge into the online context. While reading, the participants were not asking any questions. According to the field notes, while reading the peer’s writing for the second or third time, they were simultaneously typing feedback for their peers.

Providing feedback in a written form. The four ELL participants chose to employ the affordance of providing feedback in a written form online. Noteworthy, I did not provide the students with any training on what aspects they should focus in their feedback; however, I did suggest the ways to record their feedback in writing on the website. Specifically, I suggested using a different font color, italic, or bold font for typing their feedback in order to make the feedback distinct for the author of the writing. All participants chose to employ such features of the website as underlining, various font colors, and bold or italic fonts, as well as typing, inserting, deleting, and revising feedback. Specifically, Anni said, “It's easier than writing it on the paper and then
scrubbing things out and putting stuff everywhere. It's much easier to do it online.” As a result, all four participants recorded their feedback, as advised. Interestingly, as in the face-to-face context, the participants chose to insert their feedback in the text and write a summary at the bottom of the page.

Unfortunately, due to the limitations in the context, the participants did not have an affordance of engaging into peer feedback sessions over Skype. Though Maria, Anni, and BravoWolf perceived written feedback as sufficient for successful peer review, Lightning expressed the need for clarification on the peer’s feedback. Therefore, he wrote the message for the peer at the bottom of his page, asking a follow up question. He wrote, “Were do u think the punctuations needed.” It was fortunate the students were in the same computer lab, working at the same activity at the same time. Therefore, Lightning received the response form the peer right away. Otherwise, the affordance of oral peer feedback session or asynchronous chat between peers about feedback would have been beneficial for Lightning and the other student.

Finally, due to the fact that the participants were using computers in school computer laboratory, they were not allowed to use any other websites except for wikispaces.com and penzu.com. The teacher initially asked me about the websites which the participants would use for peer review practices online. She further checked if the students would have an access to them because not all the websites were allowed for students’ use on school campus. Finally, Ms. Smith asked me to make sure that the participants did not open any other websites except for the wiki and Penzu once in the computer laboratory. Therefore, the four ELLs could not choose to search for any other information and use it for peer review purposes if they wanted or needed it.
Research Question 3. What Revisions do Four Adolescent ELLs Choose to Make in Their Writing due to Peer Feedback in Face-to-Face and Online Contexts?

The last focus of this dissertation study was to describe and explain how the adolescent ELLs chose to employ affordances in writing due to peer review in face-to-face and online contexts. When answering this research question, I relied upon data collected through written artifacts (guidelines for the assignments, participants’ writing, and peer editing guidelines and checklists), interviews with the participants, researcher’s e-journal, and observation filed notes. The written artifacts from the face-to-face context were three drafts for Mandala assignment (two peer review sessions) and two drafts for Life Goals assignment (one peer review session), while in the online context, the participants produced two drafts of writing, thus participating in two peer review sessions during Fall 2012. When analyzing data, I examined the oral and written comments, which the participants received on their papers and on the peer-editing checklists, as well as revisions, which participants made in their writing due to peer feedback. Hence, in this section of Chapter 5, I specifically focused on how the participants employed the affordance of receiving peer feedback. In this part of Chapter 5, I present the cases in the same order as I described them in Chapter 4.

**BravoWolf, a writer.** Viewing writing as a hobby and even as a possible career path, BravoWolf took his writing rather seriously and considered peer feedback as beneficial for the revision process (Interview 1 and 2 with BravoWolf). During the first peer review session in the face-to-face classroom setting, BravoWolf received two comments on the strong aspects of his writing. In particular, the peer reviewer stated that he liked the message and BravoWolf’s paragraphs. In addition, the peer reviewer praised
BravoWolf for writing about happiness. The peer reviewer also identified several areas for improvement in BravoWolf’s essay and commented on such areas as

- development of ideas (3 comments);
- organization of ideas (1 comment);
- vocabulary (1 comment).

All comments were written as statements about an area for improvement (2) or as questions for the author (3). While working at the revision of Draft 1, BravoWolf addressed all the suggestions of the peer except for the comment on the organization of ideas. Specifically, the student considered the first sentence to be an appropriate topic sentence of the paragraph while the peer reviewer saw the gap in the organization of thoughts. Thus, among all peer reviewer’s comments, BravoWolf did not revise only one comment of the peer reviewer—organization of ideas in his Draft 1 of the Mandala assignment.

During the second peer review session in the face-to-face classroom setting, the students worked at the complete Draft 2 of Mandala assignment. The participants had already revised the draft once after the first peer review session; therefore, the peer feedback was not extensive, and the students did not spend a lot of time on the peer review session. Both in peer review sessions 2 and 3, the peer reviewers did not comment on BravoWolf’s strong aspects in writing. The only 2 comments that the peer reviewer made addressed the lack of punctuation marks. Both comments were in the form of suggestions on the peer-editing checklist. While working at the final draft of Mandala assignment, BravoWolf accepted all the peer reviewer’s suggestions into consideration and made the relevant revisions in the essay.
During the third peer review session in the face-to-face classroom setting, the students peer reviewed the first draft of the Life Goals assignment. The peer reviewer’s feedback for this assignment addressed the following areas for improvement:

- development of ideas (3 comments);
- cohesion (3 comments);
- grammar (4 comments);
- vocabulary (2 comments);
- capitalization (1 comment);
- punctuation (1 comment).

Though Ms. Smith asked the students to not correct their peer’s errors, the peer feedback was all in the form of corrections. When I analyzed the subsequent draft of BravoWolf’s essay, it turned out that the ELL accepted all peer reviewer’s corrections except for the two corrections of grammar errors. As the participant shared during Interview 2, the peer’s feedback was in the form of corrections; therefore, the boy considered feedback on those aspects in his essay insufficient and unclear in order make revisions. Thus, out of 14 peer reviewer’s corrections, BravoWolf accepted 12 and chose to ignore two.

During the first peer review session online, BravoWolf received only positive feedback from the peer reviewer. The feedback was in the form of the summary, written at the end of BravoWolf’s writing on his page in http://l2literacy.wikispaces.com. In the feedback the peer reviewer commented on how well the author had coped with the assignment and how well he developed the story. Thus, the student did not make any revisions of the first writing online.
During the second peer review session online, BravoWolf received two comments from the peer reviewer in the form of statements of what needs to be changed. Specifically, the peer reviewer wrote, “More details needed, not very specific in your wording” (Online peer review 2, December 3, 2012). During Interview 1, BravoWolf expressed his concern about subjectivity of peer’s feedback regarding vocabulary and ambiguity of the comment, written at the end of his writing, the student chose to not incorporate this feedback into his writing. Nevertheless, he did address the comment regarding the development of the ideas in the writing that is, lack of details, and revised his Writing 2 accordingly. Thus, the student revised his writing based on only one peer reviewer’s comment and did not proceed with the second one.

Thus, BravoWolf perceived the affordance of receiving peer’s feedback positively. During all peer review sessions, the student received 23 comments regarding areas for improvement in his writing. Figure 9 shows the types of comments based on their content and the number of peer reviewers’ comments for each category (see p. 154).

According to Figure 9, BravoWolf needed to work mostly at development of ideas, grammar, and vocabulary during his revisions. For the development of ideas, the peers asked BravoWolf to add more details in all seven cases. As for the peer’s feedback on grammar, it covered various aspects such as the ending “-s” in the Present Simple tense, the choice of infinitive versus participle in subject predicative, and the use of possessive pronouns “my” and “your” (Biber, Conrad, & Leech, 2002).
Figure 9. Peer feedback comments for BravoWolf: Content types and number. The figure shows various types of comments the peers made in order to address the areas for improvement in his writing. In addition, it includes the number of comments for each category.

The peers also suggested substituting several words and phrases with synonyms, which would better render the meaning and be less informal. The other areas for improvement, pointed out by peers addressed cohesion in his writing, punctuation, capitalization, and organization of ideas.

Due to peer feedback in face-to-face setting and online, BravoWolf made a number of revisions and addressed most of the peer’s comments. Figure 10 shows the types of revisions based on their content and the number of revisions for each type (see p. 155).
Figure 10. Content types and number of revisions in BravoWolf’s writing. The figure shows various types of revisions BravoWolf made in his writing due to peer review. In addition, it includes the number of revisions for each type.

Table 2 provides examples for each content type of revisions BravoWolf made in his drafts due to peer review (see p. 156). In Tables 2-5, I highlight the target areas for improvement and revision in bold. For every participant, I randomly selected the examples from the drafts, which they revised based on peer feedback in the face-to-face and online contexts.

Thus, BravoWolf made most revisions on such areas for improvement as development of ideas, cohesion, and punctuation. The rest of his revisions addressed grammar, vocabulary, and capitalization. The student chose to not address one comment on organization of ideas, two comments on grammar errors and the only comment on the cohesion of ideas in his writing, thus incorporating 20 of peer’s comments into his writing.
### Table 2

*Examples of BravaWolf’s Revisions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content type of feedback</th>
<th>Original draft</th>
<th>Revised draft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of ideas</td>
<td>“I got to be with my family did a lot of activities, and importantly fun.”</td>
<td>“I got to be with my family. We get the opportunity to do a lot of fun activities, and importantly to have a great time. <strong>We have a really good time, once I was going to Walmart to get something for the Jet Ski and instead got a cookout.</strong>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of ideas</td>
<td>“Sunshine is a symbol of happiness and enjoyment. One reason is that most of my summers were great.”</td>
<td>No revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>“And all of that will guarantee you to graduate.”</td>
<td>“All of that will guarantee you to correct me.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>“Sometimes people wants…”</td>
<td>“Sometimes people <strong>want</strong>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>“One being”</td>
<td>“For example”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization</td>
<td>“… a Doctor or a Lawyer”</td>
<td>“…a doctor or a lawyer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>“But remember this is only step one.”</td>
<td>“But remember, this is only step one.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Table 2 provides examples of BravaWolf’s revisions. In particular, the first column indicates the content type of area for improvement and revision. In the second column, I showed the target areas which BravaWolf’s peers identified and commented on as the ones for improvement. The third column shows how the participant chose to revise his subsequent draft based on the peer’s feedback.

**Anni, an artist.** Being in love with drawing, Anni did not consider writing as her hobby. Moreover, during Interview 1 she stated that she needed to work at her writing in order to improve her writing in ESL. Though having some doubts about peer feedback,
she still viewed it as beneficial and considered it rather seriously (Interviews 1 and 2 with Anni). According to researcher’s e-journal, Anni spent longer time than others on providing feedback to her peers and revising her papers in the classroom and online.

During the first peer review session in the face-to-face classroom setting, the peer wrote a positive comment about Anni’s writing. She wrote, “Great details. “It’s like having a movie inside my head” (Anni’s peer-editing checklist from October 1, 2012). In addition to writing this comment on the peer-editing checklist, the peer marked the sentence with the similar comment on Anni’s essay. The peer also provided feedback on the areas for improvement in Anni’s writing. In particular, the peer reviewer addressed

- organization of ideas (1 statement);
- vocabulary (1 correction);
- punctuation (2 corrections).

During the revision of her Draft 1 of Mandala assignment, Anni chose to accept one correction of punctuation mark in her draft. In addition, she revised her writing in terms of the organization of ideas. She considered the peer’s statement “Kind of went off topic. (I think)” and did not include the sentence in her subsequent draft (Anni’s Drafts 1 and 2). Nevertheless, the participant chose to not incorporate the suggested corrections of punctuation and vocabulary.

During the second peer review session in the face-to-face classroom setting, the peer reviewer identified 12 areas for improvement in Anni’s essay. As during the first peer review, the peer provided feedback in the form of corrections, and only one
comment was in the form of statement “Last sentence left me hanging” (Anni’s peer-editing checklist, October 10, 2012). In general, the peer feedback addressed

- development of ideas (4 corrections and 1 statement);
- grammar (5 corrections);
- capitalization (1 correction);
- spelling (1 correction).

The peer chose to not comment on the strong areas in Anni’s writing though the teacher emphasized the importance of identifying both strength and weaknesses in essays during peer review sessions. When revising her writing, Anni chose to incorporate all peer’s feedback in her writing and accepted all corrections as well as worked at making the relevant revision based on the peer’s comment.

During the third peer review session in the face-to-face classroom setting, Anni received peer feedback about 10 areas in her writing that would need improvement. In particular, the peer addressed

- organization of ideas (3 statements);
- development of ideas (1 statement with a guiding question);
- vocabulary (2 statements);
- spelling (underlining the word “determination,” circling the word “discipline” and “disipline” and providing the correct spelling, and correcting the spelling of the word “highschool;” Peer review of Anni’s draft, November 13, 2012).
After the peer review session, Anni worked at revising her paper and incorporated all changes into her final draft. Thus, she considered all of her peer’s suggestions and made the relevant revisions.

During the first peer review session online, the peer commented on two areas of strength in Anni’s writing. In particular, the peer wrote, “I think you did a good job in giving your reasons why you admire "Alicia Keys". Your introduction paragraph was very good. You explained well everything, you were specific” (Online peer review 1, October 30, 2012). Therefore, the peer provided comments on the development and organization of ideas in Anni’s writing. In addition, the peer provided feedback on the areas that required Anni’s revision. The peer’s comments addressed errors in (a) grammar (3 corrections) and (b) spelling (1 correction). When working at the revision, Anni chose to accept 3 corrections by the peer. Due to the possibility to track all changes in the text in wikispaces.com, I could see that first Anni accepted all 4 corrections, as suggested by the peer. However, she noticed an error in the correction of grammar and reverted her decision to the previous correct version of the phrase. Thus, Anni incorporated 3 corrections in the next draft and ignored one peer’s correction, which contained a grammar error.

During the second peer review session online, the peer made two comments regarding Anni’s second writing. First, the peer identified the strong area and wrote, “I think you did a very good job explaining your writing. You gave very good specific details about why Christmas is your favorite holiday” (Online peer review 2, December 3, 2012). Therefore, the peer addressed the development of ideas in Anni’s writing as a strong area. Meanwhile, the peer also suggested, “I think it would have been better if you
included a anecdote in your writing.” Both comments were written as a summary at the end of Anni’s writing. Though Anni read and considered peer’s feedback during the revision, she chose to not incorporate her peer’s suggestion on the development of ideas.

Thus, Anni considered peer feedback as another way to improve her writing in L2. The participant carefully examined each peer’s comment/suggestion/correction/statement and made relevant revisions in her writing. Overall, during all peer review sessions, Anni received 31 comments regarding areas for improvement in her writing. Figure 11 shows the types of comments based on their content and the number of peer reviewers’ comments for each category.
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Figure 11. Peer feedback for Anni: Content types and number. The figure shows various types of comments the peers made about Anni’s writing. In addition, it includes the number of comments for each type.

Thus, Figure 11 shows that most of peer feedback addressed areas for improvement in terms of grammar, development of ideas, and spelling. Comments on grammar included
the use of ending “-s” and the form of verbs in Present Simple, difference in use of relativizers “who” and “that”, indefinite article “a” and definite article “the”, and plural and singular form of nouns, and the use of the relative adverb “why” (Biber, Conrad, & Leech, 2002). In terms of development of ideas, all peers’ comments addressed the need for more details. The rest of the comments were on organization of ideas, vocabulary, punctuation, and capitalization of words in Anni’s writing.

Though during interviews Anni expressed doubts about the quality of peer feedback, the participant incorporated most of the peers’ comments when revising her drafts. Figure 12 shows the types of revisions based on their content and the number of revisions for each type Anni made in her drafts due to peer feedback in face-to-face setting and online.
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**Figure 12.** Content types and number of revisions in Anni’s writing. The figure shows various types of revisions Anni made in her writing due to peer review. In addition, it provides the number of revisions for each type.
According to Figure 12, Anni made most revisions in term of grammar, development of ideas, and spelling which is consistent with peer feedback as most of it was on these types of errors as well. Further, she revised organization of ideas, vocabulary, capitalization, and punctuation. The participant chose to not accept peers’ feedback on such errors as one punctuation, one vocabulary, and one development of ideas. Moreover, as discussed above, she did not incorporate one correction of the grammar because the correction itself was erroneous. Thus, in general Anni chose to employ the affordance of receiving peers’ feedback and revised her writing accepting 27 peers’ comments and ingnoring only 4 of them.

Table 3 shows excerpts from Anni’s original and revised drafts and provides examples of how the participant addressed areas for improvement in her essays, as suggested by her peers.

Table 3

*Examples of Anni’s Revisions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content type of feedback</th>
<th>Original draft</th>
<th>Revised draft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of ideas</td>
<td>“About 10 years ago, my family and I moved from Haiti to the United States. That was one of the biggest milestones in my life; starting a new life in a different country.”</td>
<td>“About ten years ago, my family and I moved from Haiti to the United States. That was one of the biggest mile stones for me and my family; starting life in a new environment with different languages, food and customs.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization of ideas</th>
<th>Initially, Anni wrote the sentence “Lou Holz said “If you’re bored with life, if you don't get up every morning with a burning desire to do things, you don’t have enough goals.” at the end of Introduction in her essay.</th>
<th>Per suggestion of the peer, Anni moved the sentence “Lou Holz said “If you're bored with life, if you don't get up every morning with a burning desire to do things, you don’t have enough goals.” to the Conclusion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>“In my Mandala there are 5 symbols that represents who I am and what is important to me.”</td>
<td>“In my Mandala there are 5 symbols that represent who I am and what is important to me: a Haitian flag, a guitar, a dove holding a olive branch, Princess Tiana and one of my drawings.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>“to yell”</td>
<td>“to talk back”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization</td>
<td>“In my mandala, …”</td>
<td>“In my Mandala, …”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>“It will take a lot of commitment and dedication.”</td>
<td>“It will take a lot of commitment and dedication but if I work hard now, big rewards will come later.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>“Sleeping is dreaming. Dreaming takes me to another world, it's like having a movie inside my head, and I watch it every time I sleep.”</td>
<td>“Sleeping is dreaming. Dreaming takes me to another world, it's like having a movie inside my head, and I watch it every time I sleep.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Table 3 provides examples of Anni’s revisions of her essays due to peer feedback. The first column names the content type of area for improvement and revision. The second column includes excerpts from the original draft, which the peer identified as an area for improvement. The third column shows the relevant excerpt from the revised draft.

**Lightning, a football player.** Being positive about peer review and seeing it as a beneficial activity for the development of his literacy in L2, Lightning was concerned
about his revision skills. During interviews, he kept insisting that it was hard for him to incorporate peer feedback into his writing (Interviews 1 and 2 with Lightning) as in most cases he did not know how to improve his writing based on the peer feedback due to the gaps in his L2 proficiency. In particular, he was especially concerned about his spelling. Therefore, it was rather interesting to analyze the data for the participant and look into how Lightning chose to employ the affordance of receiving peer feedback from his friends.

During the first peer review session in the face-to-face classroom setting, Lightning received peer feedback on 19 areas of his writing. One of the comments was on the strong aspect of Lightning’s writing—providing specific details and explanations in the essay. The rest of the peer feedback addressed

- grammar (8 corrections);
- capitalization (6 corrections);
- spelling (2 corrections);
- punctuation (2 corrections).

Interestingly, Lightning accepted only 7 corrections provided by his peer for his next draft, leaving 11 of them unattended. As the participant explained during Interview 2, he had not had extensive experience in peer review; therefore, it took time for him to get familiar with the procedure of the activity and treat the peer’s feedback accordingly. Specifically, the participant did not incorporated feedback in terms of comments on grammar (6), capitalization (4), and punctuation (1). The participant chose to accept the proposed changes on grammar (2), spelling (2), punctuation (1), and capitalization (2).
During the second peer review session in the face-to-face classroom setting, the peer provided Lightning with feedback on 1 strong aspect of his writing and 17 areas for improvement. The peer positively commented about the beginning of the essay with the comment “Good writing. Keep it up 😊.” In the rest of the feedback, the peer corrected

- grammar (10 areas for improvement);
- capitalization (1 area);
- spelling (3 areas),
- formatting (3 areas).

Surprisingly, after the second peer review session, Lightning accepted almost all the peer’s corrections. In particular, the student attended 15 areas for improvement that the peer pointed out in the feedback and did not correct only 2 errors—in grammar and capitalization.

During the third peer review session in the face-to-face classroom setting, the peer did not provide any feedback on the strong aspects of Lightning’s Life Goals essay. Instead, in the feedback, the peer wanted to help Lightning with grammar (9 corrections) and vocabulary (3 corrections). After the peer review, the participant incorporated most of the peer’s feedback into his writing and improved his essay by attending all peer’s corrections on vocabulary. Interestingly, Lightning chose to not accept corrections of 4 errors in grammar though the peer had corrected them during peer review session for Lightning.
As for the first peer review session online, the peer feedback on the first Lightning’s writing online referred only to the areas for improvement. All feedback was in the form of corrections within brackets. This way the peer made the areas for improvement in the writing obvious to the author in a similar way to the providing feedback on the paper in the form of highlighting, underlining, or circling. The corrections addressed Lightning’s errors in

- grammar (8);
- vocabulary (1);
- spelling (3);
- punctuation (1).

When revising his writing, Lightning chose to accept 11 out of 13 peer’s corrections. According to my observation field notes, the participant considered every correction and chose to not incorporate peer feedback only for two areas for improvement both with grammar errors.

As for the second peer review session online, the peer brought to Lightning’s attention 22 areas in the writing that needed revision. The peer feedback addressed errors in

- development of ideas (1 suggestion);
- cohesion (1 correction);
- grammar (15 corrections);
- vocabulary (1 correction);
- spelling (1 correction);
While revising his essay, the participant took into account most of the peer’s feedback. According to my observation field notes, the participant attentively considered every comment/suggestion/correction from the peers and worked hard at the revision of his writing. He addressed 17 areas for improvement and chose to not revise 5 areas: 3 corrections of grammar errors, 1 issue with cohesion, and 1 formatting error. Interestingly, he needed further details on one peer’s comment and had to ask the peer the follow up question, which showed the need for discussion of the feedback between peers.

Unfortunately, due to contextual limitation, the peers could have the discussion only in the written form, and the participant received the answer and clarification for his question in the written form but not immediately, which would have been possible over Skype or any other audio-/video-teleconferencing tool.

Overall, during all peer review sessions, Lightning received 2 comments on the strong areas in his writing and feedback on 82 areas for improvement. Figure 13 shows all types of peers’ comments on Lightning’s writing based on their content and the number of peer reviewers’ comments for each category (see p. 168). Most of the peers’ comments on Lightning’s writing were on errors in grammar. Most of grammar errors (29) were in proper ending of verbs in Present and Past Simple while others were in the use of ending “-s” for plural form of nouns, use of prepositions, personal pronouns (Biber, Conrad, & Leech, 2002). The peers also addressed areas for improvement on spelling, capitalization, vocabulary, punctuation, formatting, development of ideas, and cohesion.
Figure 13. Peer feedback for Lightning: Content types and number. The figure shows various types of comments the peers made about Lightning’s writing. In addition, it includes the number of comments for each type.

Figure 14 shows the types of revisions based on their content and the number of revisions for each type Lightning made in his drafts due to peer feedback in face-to-face setting and online (see p. 169). Though Lightning was first cautious about peer review and did not spend much time revising his writing based on the peer feedback, with more practice the participant started considering it more seriously. Over the course of the semester, he had peer review sessions several times and seemed to consider feedback from peers more towards the end of the semester. Having received peer feedback on 82 areas for improvement in his writing, the participant addressed 58 of them.
Figure 14. Types and number of revisions in Lightning’s writing. The figure shows various types of revisions Lightning made in his writing due to peer review. In addition, it provides the number of revisions for each type.

According to Figure 14, in his revisions Lightning focused on the errors in grammar. This is not surprising because peers’ feedback addressed many areas for improvement on grammar. The participant also revised spelling of words, vocabulary, punctuation, formatting, capitalization, and development of ideas. The participant chose to not follow peers’ feedback on:

- 15 areas for improvement on grammar;
- 5 areas in capitalization;
- 1 area in cohesion;
- 1 area in punctuation;
- 1 area in formatting.

Thus, in general Lightning chose to employ the affordance of receiving peers’ feedback and revised his writing taking into account 58 peers’ comments and ignoring 24 of
them. The large number of peers’ comments on areas for improvement reflects
Lightning’s gaps in L2 proficiency while the number of unattended comments is in
alignment with the participant’s statement about difficulties he faced when trying to
revise his drafts based on peer feedback.

In Table 4, I provide excerpts from Lightning’s original and revised drafts in
order to shed light on the participant’s process of revision.

Table 4

Examples of Lightning’s Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content type of feedback</th>
<th>Original draft</th>
<th>Revised draft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of ideas</td>
<td>“The other of my symbol is TV. TV is one of my other symbol because it's like away. I mustly enjoy myself and relax. I remember the time I was watching that show on TV. I was so laughing I couldn’t stop laughing that time.”</td>
<td>“The other of my symbol is TV. TV is one of my symbols because because it a way I mustly enjoy myself and relax. I remember the time I was watching Spongebob squarepants. The SpongeBob and Patrick was playing the wisly thingi something and keep bordering squideero. By watching that it make me forgot all those problem I have with this person and it’s was like a relax time for me also.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>“I choose to be in AVID because it help me with the class I specially need help in, and its kinds of help me with my struggle in taking test, quiz or exam.”</td>
<td>“I choose to be in AVID because it help [no revision] me with my struggle in my classes, and also help me learn how to take quiz, test [no revision] or exams.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>“stuff”</th>
<th>“method”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization</td>
<td>“I Picked music as one of my symbols…”</td>
<td>“I picked music as one of my symbols…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>“So by seeing one of the famous architecture designing in the world i was world.”</td>
<td>“So by seeing one of the famous architecture designing in the world i was world.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>“So by seeing one of the famous architecture designing in the world i was world.”</td>
<td>“So by seeing one of the famous architecture designing in the world i was world.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formatting</td>
<td>“My uncle was always come by and play with me and teach me stuff that he does for life, he was a police officer but now he is working in my country.”</td>
<td>“My uncle was always come by and play with me and teach me stuff that he does for life, he was a police officer but now he is working in my country.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 4 provides examples of Lightning’s revisions due to peer feedback. The first column is the content type of area for improvement and revision. The second column contains the excerpts from the original draft, which the peer identified as areas for improvement. The third column includes the relevant excerpts with revisions, which Lightning chose to make due to peer feedback.

**Maria, a soccer player.** Among all the participants, Maria was the one who most favorably saw the peer feedback. Having had extensive experience with peer reviewing, she was ready to agree to all peer’s suggestions and revise her writing accordingly. The participant said, “I want to improve my writing skills so I would agree with my peer” (Interview 1 with Maria). Analysis of the data from written artifacts showed that the participant not only stated it during the interview, she indeed incorporated almost all of the peer feedback when working at the revisions of her essays.
During the first peer review session in the face-to-face classroom setting, Maria was present and was ready for the peer review activity. Nevertheless, the participant unfortunately did not have a chance to participate and receive peer feedback because she was called to the Student Affairs office. According to my observation filed notes, Maria came back at the end of the class looking disappointed and did not have time to catch up with peer review activity. Such an event during my data collection only provided me with another evidence on how important it was to consider all the affordances and contextual factors while studying a peer review. Due to the call from the office, the participant did not have an affordance of receiving peer feedback like other students in the class had. That, in its turn, resulted in the lack of action on the part of the participant in terms of the revision of the essay.

During the second peer review session in the face-to-face classroom setting, the peer chose to focus on the areas for improvement in Maria’s writing and did not provide any feedback on the strong aspects of the essay. In particular, Maria received peer feedback on 10 areas for improvement in terms of

- development of ideas (1 question and 4 suggestions);
- organization of ideas (1 statement);
- cohesion (1 suggestion);
- grammar (1 statement and 1 correction with statement);
- vocabulary (1 question).

Thus, the majority of peer feedback addressed the development of ideas. The peer also identified errors in grammar, organization of ideas, cohesion, and vocabulary. When
revising the essay, Maria chose to incorporate all peer’s feedback and made the relevant changes in her writing.

During the third peer review session in the face-to-face classroom setting, the peer chose to not write any feedback on the Life Goals essay, but only use peer-editing checklist for the comments. In particular, the peer commented on two strong aspects of the essay and on six areas for improvement. The positive feedback addressed the proper capitalization of words and formatting of the essay. In addition, the peer commented on 4 areas for improvement in terms of development of ideas, 1—in terms of grammar, and 1—in terms of punctuation. All peer feedback was in the form of comments. Mostly Maria had to focus on the development of ideas in her essay, as suggested by the peer. The other two types of feedback were on grammar and punctuation single errors. All the feedback was in the form of comments on the peer-editing checklist. As in the previous case, Maria chose to fully employ the affordance of receiving peer feedback, accepted all changes, and revised her essay accordingly.

As for the first peer review session online, Maria received a positive feedback from the peer in the form of the comment about the content of her writing. In addition, the peer provided feedback on 21 areas for improvement on

- development of ideas (1 correction with explanation);
- grammar (4 corrections with explanations);
- vocabulary (2 corrections with explanations);
- formatting (14 corrections with explanations).
Therefore, the peer suggested Maria mostly working at formatting during revision. The rest of the peer feedback was on errors in grammar, vocabulary, and development of ideas. Surprisingly, Maria did not accept all peer’s corrections when revising in that case. She did accept 19 out of 21 corrections in her writing, but chose to ignore two—on the development of ideas and grammar. Nevertheless, the participant revised her writing based on peer’s feedback and incorporated most the correction into her final draft.

As for the second peer review session online, Maria received peer feedback on 14 areas for improvement. The peer chose to not comment on strong aspects of Maria’s writing. Instead, the peer provided feedback in 14 areas for improvement in terms of

- development of ideas (1 suggestion and 1 correction with explanation);
- grammar (4 corrections with explanation);
- vocabulary (1 suggestion);
- spelling (4 corrections with explanation);
- capitalization (2 corrections with explanation);
- formatting (1 correction with explanation).

The whole peer feedback was in the form of corrections with explanation except for 2 cases when the peer chose to state what should be improved. For example, the peer wrote, “I think you should elaborate more about why students should be required to learn a different language. I suggest that you change your sentences so that they have variation because it sounds like you're saying the same thing over and over” (Online peer review 2, December 3, 2012). As a result of peer review, Maria worked at the revision of her paper and incorporated all peer’s suggestions.
Overall, during all peer review sessions, Maria received 3 comments on the strong areas in her writing and feedback on 51 areas for improvement. Figure 15 provides information on all types of peer comments on Maria’s writing in terms of their content and the number of areas for improvement the peers pointed out to the participant in the feedback.

![Pie chart showing peer feedback for Maria](image)

Figure 15. Peer feedback for Maria: Content types and number of areas for improvement. The figure shows various types of comments the peers made about Maria’s writing. It also provides information on the number of areas for improvement for each type.

Thus, the peers mostly addressed areas for improvement in formatting, development of ideas, and grammar. All 15 errors in formatting were the missed spaces between words in the drafts online. In terms development of ideas, the peers commented on the need for more details and deletion of the redundant information. All 11 grammatical errors were in the use of Future and Present Simple tenses (Biber, Conrad, & Leech, 2002). The rest of
the feedback was on spelling, vocabulary, capitalization of words, punctuation, organization of ideas, and cohesion.

Having participated in many peer reviews in the middle school and getting more experience with it in high school, Maria had positive perception of the activity and viewed it as beneficial. Moreover, from the beginning she said she trusted her peers because when peer reviewing they were helping her improve her writing in ESL (Interview 1 with Maria). Not only she believed in her peers in words, she also showed it in her actions. Indeed the participant considered peer feedback seriously and revised 49 areas for improvement and chose to not incorporate feedback only on two areas for improvement because she did not know how to improve them.

Table 5 provides examples from Maria’s drafts, which show her revisions of various types of areas for improvement.

Table 5

*Examples of Maria’s Revisions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content type of feedback</th>
<th>Original Draft</th>
<th>Revised Draft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of ideas</td>
<td>“Another reason why my dad to come home is my greatest wish is because my family needs my father too.”</td>
<td>“Another reason why I wish my dad would come home is my greatest wish is because my family needs my father too.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of ideas</td>
<td>“They give you money as well as financial support. One reason why my family is important to me is because they give me financial support.”</td>
<td>Maria deleted redundant content and chose to leave the second sentence. “One reason why my family is important to me is because they give me financial support.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Type</th>
<th>Original Draft</th>
<th>Revised Draft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>“When I need new materials for school like <strong>notebooks</strong> or <strong>pencils</strong>, my family is always supporting me with that.”</td>
<td>“When I need new materials for school like <strong>notebooks</strong> or <strong>pencils</strong>, my family is always supporting me with that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>“Without my family’s financial support I <strong>would not</strong> have a good education in the future.”</td>
<td>“Without my family’s financial support I <strong>will not</strong> have a good education in the future.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>“<strong>maintain</strong>”</td>
<td>“<strong>advise</strong>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization</td>
<td>“That is why I think that students need to learn a foreign language before graduating high school.”</td>
<td>“That is why I think that students need to learn a foreign language before graduating high school.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>“If you don’t know english <strong>than</strong> how are you going to be able to get that job?”</td>
<td>“If you don’t know english <strong>then</strong> how are you going to be able to get that job?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>“My dad is somebody very important to me in this <strong>world</strong> He is important to me because he works hard for our family to have food in the table and have a good home to live in so we could be protected and healthy.”</td>
<td>“My dad is somebody very important to me in this <strong>world</strong>. <strong>He</strong> is important to me because he works hard for our family to have food in the table and have a good home to live in so we could be protected and healthy.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formatting</td>
<td>“I think they miss him as much as I miss him because we love <strong>him</strong>. <strong>The</strong> reason why my dad is not living with us is because he is in another state working.”</td>
<td>“I think they miss him as much as I miss him because we love <strong>him</strong>. <strong>The</strong> reason why my dad is not living with us is because he is in another state working.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Table 5 provides examples of Maria’s revisions due to peer feedback. The first column names the content type of area for improvement and revision. The second column shows the excerpts from the original draft which the peer suggested improving. The third column includes the relevant excerpts Maria revised due to peer feedback.
Cross-case analysis of findings for Research Question 3. All four adolescent ELLs participating in the study viewed peer review activity as beneficial for their development of literacy in L2 (Interview 1 with participants). Moreover, they all claimed that though there could be some difficulties associated with the peer review, they would still consider peer feedback when revising the writing. In this part of Chapter 5, I aimed at describing and explaining how four adolescent ELLs chose to employ the affordance of receiving peer feedback in writing that is, what revisions the participants made in the text due to peer review. Having focused on each case separately allowed me to provide more evidence that the participants did take peer feedback into account and made relevant changes in their writing. In addition, in this section of the chapter, I aim at “putting pieces of mosaic together” in order to create a big picture of the findings for Research Question 3.

Overall, the participants received peer feedback on 9 aspects of their writing: (a) development of ideas, (b) organization of ideas, (c) cohesion, (d) grammar, (e) vocabulary, (f) capitalization, (g) spelling, (h) punctuation, and (i) formatting. Table 6 shows how many areas for improvement the peers identified in their feedback for each aspect of writing in the face-to-face setting and online and the number of revisions the participants made based on peer review. The participants did consider feedback from peers when revising their writing. Most of the revisions concerned grammar, which constituted about one third of all revisions. The other areas that the participants addressed in their revisions were development of ideas, spelling, and formatting. The content types of peer feedback, which received least of attention from the peer feedback givers, were
cohesion and organization of ideas. Therefore, it was not surprising to find few revisions in these areas.

Table 6

_Peer Feedback and Revisions_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Peer feedback</th>
<th>Participants’ revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of ideas</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of ideas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formatting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Table 6 shows all types of peer feedback on the areas for improvement the participants received during peer review sessions face-to-face and online. In addition, it provides information about the revisions of areas for improvement the participants made in their writing due to peer feedback both in the face-to-face context and online.

Finally, according to Table 6, the participants seemed to consistently consider the feedback on all areas for improvement due to peer review and did not favor one over the other. This adds to the findings because the participants reported about difficulties when revising their writing in terms of spelling (Interview 2 with Lightning), vocabulary
(Interview 1 with Anni), overall content of the essay (Interview 1 with BravoWolf), and development of ideas (Interview 1 with Maria). Nevertheless, they all incorporated peers’ feedback into their writing in these areas.

In addition, all four participants could transfer their knowledge about peer review and skills from the face-to-face to online context. According to my observation field notes and researcher’s e-journal, they had no difficulty providing feedback online and working at revisions of their writing which was not associated with any school assignments. When working online, they also stayed on task all the time as in the face-to-face classroom context and revised their writing based on the peer feedback.

Summary

In Chapter 5, I described and explained the findings for Research Questions 1, 2, and 3. In particular, I provided a rich description of the following categories for Research Question 1: (a) benefits of peer review, (b) difficulties, (c) face-to-face versus online peer review, and (d) peer feedback versus teacher feedback. According to the findings, the benefits of the peer review for the adolescent ELLs were improvement of writing in ESL and development of communication skills. The difficulties included (a) difficulties with prompts, (b) concern about peer’s feelings and critique, and (c) difficulties with revision.

As for findings for Research Question 2, I described and explained affordances, which the adolescent ELLs chose to employ in face-to-face and online contexts. When in face-to-face classroom context, the participants chose to employ the following six affordances: (a) sitting in groups/pairs, (b) listening to the teacher’s explanation about peer review, (c) reading peer’s essay, (d) asking questions while reading the peers’
writing, (e) writing notes on peer’s essay, (f) writing notes on the peer-editing checklist, and (g) providing and receiving oral feedback. In the online context, the employed affordances during peer review included (a) using computers in the computer lab, (b) participating in the training on Web 2.0 websites, (c) writing online, (d) reading the peer’s writing, and (e) providing feedback in a written form.

Regarding Research Question 3, I described the revisions each participant chose to make in their writing and further described and explained the cross-case analysis findings. After peer review sessions in the face-to-face and online contexts, the adolescent ELLs chose to revise their drafts in order to improve their writing in L2 and addressed most of the peer’s feedback in terms of

- development of ideas;
- organization of ideas;
- cohesion;
- grammar;
- vocabulary;
- capitalization;
- spelling;
- punctuation;
- formatting.

In the next chapter, I present (a) summary of findings, (b) discussion of findings, (c) implications, and (d) future research directions, and (e) conclusion. First, I summarize findings for this study based on the research questions. Further, I discuss the findings and
highlight their contribution of this study to the existing research literature on peer review practices of adolescent ELLs. Finally, I address the implications and recommendations for further research.
Chapter Six: Discussion and Implications

The purpose of the study was to describe and explain peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs in online and face-to-face contexts. The exploratory questions, which guided the study, were

1. How do four adolescent ELLs perceive peer review in face-to-face and online contexts?

2. What affordances do four adolescent ELLs choose to employ during peer review in face-to-face and online contexts?

3. What revisions do four adolescent ELLs choose to make in their writing due to peer feedback in face-to-face and online contexts?

Four adolescent ELLs volunteered to participate in the study. I collected data during Fall 2012 in Purple High School in Green County. I observed the participants in AVID 1 class multiple times. During observations I took detailed field notes and audio-recorded participants’ interaction during peer review sessions. In addition, I was writing reflective entries in my researcher’s e-journal minimum once a week. I also conducted and audio-recorded two face-to-face semi-structured interviews with every ELL and the teacher. Finally, I collected the four adolescent ELLs’ written artifacts such as drafts of their essays, peer-editing checklists, and entries in their individual participants’ e-journals. Overall, the written artifacts for every focal participant included guidelines for their
school assignments, 3 drafts of Mandala essay, 2 drafts of Life Goals essay, 3 peer-editing checklists, and a reflection on peer review and their progress for face-to-face context. For online context, every participant submitted 2 drafts of their writing with their subsequent revisions after peer review sessions and 2 reflective entries in the participant’s e-journal.

Data analysis started with thorough data preparation and organization. It was simultaneous and intertwined with data collection. In particular, during Fall 2012, I transcribed all audio-recordings and organized data chronologically for each participant. During data analysis, I looked for meaningful units, relevant to my research questions, which further merged into categories. After within-case analysis with the focus on each separate case, I proceeded to cross-case analysis aiming at similarities and differences between ELLs’ peer review practices.

This chapter consists of four sections (a) summary of findings, (b) discussion of findings, (c) implications, (d) future research directions, and (e) conclusion. First, I provide a summary of findings for this study in light of the research questions. Further, I discuss the findings in terms of their contribution to the existing research on peer review practices of ELLs and address the implications of the findings for educators who use peer review in their language instruction. I end the chapter with recommendations for further research and conclusion.

**Summary of Findings**

In this section of Chapter 6, I summarize findings for each research question separately, following the same order as I presented them in Chapter 5. Therefore, for
Research Question 1, I provide the summary of participants’ perceptions of peer review in online and face-to-face contexts in terms of (a) benefits of peer review, (b) difficulties, (c) face-to-face versus online peer review, and (d) peer feedback versus teacher feedback. For Research Question 2, I first summarize findings on affordances that the participants chose to employ in their writing due to peer feedback in the face-to-face context and then proceed to the summary of affordances for the online context. For Research Question 3, I provide a summary of findings on participants’ revisions of writing.

**Participants’ perceptions of peer review in face-to-face and online contexts.**
Regarding ELLs’ perceptions of peer review in face-to-face and online contexts, four categories emerged (a) benefits of peer review, (b) difficulties, (c) face-to-face versus online peer review, and (d) peer feedback versus teacher feedback. The category of benefits of peer review includes two subcategories: improvement of writing in ESL and development of communication skills. Finally, the category of difficulties consists of three subcategories: difficulties with prompts, concern about peer’s feelings and critique, and difficulties with revision.

**Benefits of peer review.** All four participants considered peer review as beneficial for their L2 learning. When sharing their perceptions, the ELLs mainly focused on how peer review positively influenced their writing in L2. In addition, they stated that peer review activity helped them develop their communication skills in ESL.

**Improvement of writing in ESL.** According to the participants, the major benefit of peer review activity was improvement of writing in ESL. All four participants stated that it helped them learn how to write better in ESL. Specifically, the participants could share
and receive an additional perspective or another point of view on their writing. Therefore, the ELLs felt more confident in the process of working at their papers and associated peer review with additional help and support in their learning of how to write in L2. Finally, taking peer review activity rather seriously, the participants developed the feeling of responsibility for the peer’s writing and trust to their peers. While reviewing, the participants viewed peers as “second you” with the text as a semiotic object in between the two agents of the action.

In addition, the ELLs perceived peer review as important because they could receive feedback on what they could improve in their writing and possibly how they could improve it. Specifically, the participants viewed the feedback on areas for improvement as crucial because they could address their errors in the revision process, submit the draft of better quality, and learn from their errors for future. Repeatedly, the participants reported about becoming more confident in their writing due to peer review practices and high expectations they had in terms of quality of peer feedback.

The ELLs appreciated peer’s feedback on various aspects of their writing. In particular, BravoWolf considered feedback on the development of ideas, organization of ideas, and such genre requirements as length of an essay helpful. Lightning believed he needed peer feedback on spelling, grammar, and vocabulary. Anni added punctuation to the list of areas while Maria did not point out any specific aspect of writing, but viewed all peers’ comments as important for her future revisions. The findings for Research Question 3 provide more information on what feedback the participants received during peer review sessions and how they incorporated it into their writing.
Development of communication skills. Another benefit that the participants associated with peer review was development of communication skills. The ELLs thought about peer review as an affordance that helped them converse more in L2, initiate more details and clarifications in terms of feedback from peers, and learn how to discuss various aspects of writing effectively. In addition, according to the teacher, discussions of peer feedback allowed the ELLs getting more comfortable with speaking in L2 in front of others. It was an excellent transition for them from expressing their opinion in pairs to making presentations in front of the whole class.

Difficulties. While the participants viewed peer review as beneficial for the development of their writing and communication skills in L2, they also talked about difficulties they had faced in their writing process in general and with peer review in particular. Considering peer review from the ecological perspective that is, holistically, allowed me to include difficulties with prompts and revision in this category because they both were a part of the writing process, and the participants chose to talk about them while sharing their perceptions about peer review. Thus, the ELLs faced (a) difficulties with prompts, (b) concern about peer’s feelings and critique, and (c) difficulties with revision.

Difficulties with prompts. Two ELLs, BravoWolf and Lightning, expressed their concern about prompts for writing they had been given during testing and for other assignments. In particular, they explained that occasionally it had been difficult for them to generate ideas for their papers because the prompts were not the topics the ELLs could relate to or they were not a part of the participants’ funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti,
Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). Thus, the ELLs could not build their writing based on the knowledge or experience from their past.

**Concern about peer’s feelings and critique.** The major difficulty that all participants shared about was their concern about peer’s feelings when providing peer feedback on areas for improvement. The ELLs shared that during every peer review they had to face the dilemma of providing an honest feedback and risking to hurt their peer’s feelings or choose to not comment on the areas for improvement in order to not make their peers upset about the errors in their writing. The participants elaborated on how difficult writing could be for ELLs; therefore, they could easily identify themselves with peers who might be hurt by critique.

According to the participants, one of the factors that could influence how the students might interpret peer feedback was the relationship between the peers. In particular, if the peers were friends, they would treat the feedback as help rather than a critique. However, if the peers did not know each other well, it could undermine the success of peer review activity because the students would not consider it seriously and would not revise their writing accordingly.

The ELLs were also concerned about the subjective or opinionated nature of peer feedback. Moreover, the participants were concerned about hurting their peer’s with their feedback that could contain a different perspective on the content of the writing. The differences in peers’ opinion could lead to disagreement between peers, argument, and aggressive feelings. As Anni pointed out, in case of disagreement, the author of the
writing frequently chose to ignore the feedback and to not incorporate any of it into the writing.

Interestingly, the teacher also addressed this difficulty during Interview 1. Ms. Smith was convinced that peer review sessions were an excellent affordance to learn how to treat critique and how to provide feedback without the fear of hurting their peers and not being treated as negative. Furthermore, the teacher advised the students to be honest in their feedback and share it with the best intentions that is, to help their peers in the development of their literacy skills in L2.

**Difficulties with revision.** The participants also found it difficult to revise their writing after receiving peer feedback. It helped them see the areas for improvement in their writing; however, they often could not address the identified error and incorporate the peer’s feedback because of the gap in the language proficiency. In addition, the ELLs saw disagreement during peer feedback discussion as a detrimental factor for subsequent revision. The participants stated that if they disagreed with peer’s opinion about any aspect of their writing, they would not make any revisions on that area because they would not improve their paper. Thus, the ELLs occasionally faced difficulties with revisions after receiving peer feedback because of their gaps in knowledge or due to disagreement.

**Face-to-face versus online peer review.** The ELLs found peer reviewing in the online context easier than in the face-to-face-context. They explained it by the convenience of using the computer and their comfort and frequent use of technology at home. In addition, the ELLs found wikispaces.com and penzu.com user-friendly so it was
easy for them to peer review, provide and receive feedback, make revisions, and share their reflections in an online context. Another benefit of peer reviewing online was the flexibility of working at peer’s writing at own pace, not feeling the pressure of time. The ELLs felt that in the classroom, there was the pressure of the peer waiting for them to finish the review of their work. While online, the peers could work at providing feedback and making revisions in their writing independently, at their own pace. Finally, the participants could transfer peer-reviewing skills from face-to-face context to online that is, they focused on strong aspects of peer’s writing as well as areas for improvement, not having the peer-editing checklist for the online peer review.

**Peer feedback versus teacher feedback.** In addition to comparing peer review in online versus face-to-face contexts, the participants shared their perceptions of peer feedback when comparing it to the teacher feedback. The participants’ opinions did not agree on this matter. Maria expressed her preference for receiving feedback from peers to the one from teachers because it was easier to explain her thoughts to the peers due to the same level of vocabulary knowledge and use. In addition, the girl felt that the peers would understand her experiences better and could relate to them because they went through the similar or the same situations in the past. On the contrary, Anni trusted teacher feedback more because she believed it was the teachers’ responsibility to help students while it was not the case with the students.

**Affordances in face-to-face and online contexts.** In order to summarize findings for Research Question 2 efficiently, I first provide a summary of affordances that the participants chose to employ during peer review in the face-to-face context. Further, I summarize findings on the affordances the ELLs chose to employ in the online context.
Affordances of the face-to-face context. When participating in peer review sessions in the classroom face-to-face setting, all four participants chose to employ seven affordances. Figure 16 provides the visual representation of affordances the ELLs chose to employ in AVID 1 class.

Figure 16. Affordances in the face-to-face classroom context. The figure shows various affordances the ELLs chose to employ during peer review session in the face-to-face context in the order they participants encountered them during peer review.

The participants of the study had had the prior experience with peer review from their middle school years; nevertheless, they actively participated in all stages of peer review and writing process. The first affordance they eagerly employed was sitting in pairs/groups. The ELLs chose to accept teacher’s arrangement of desks in the room as well as their assignment into peer pairs. They further followed teacher’s guidelines and work with the peers sitting next to them during peer review. During peer review training,
the ELLs actively listened to the teacher’s explanation about peer review: its goals, benefits, and procedure. Though they had prior knowledge and experience with peer review, the participants chose to employ this affordance in order to notice and pick the new information about this activity for the AVID course.

*Reading peer’s essays* could seem an easy affordance to pick and task to fulfill. However, reading for peer review combined not only the practice of reading in L2, grammar, vocabulary, critical thinking skills, the ELLs also had to refer back to the guidelines of the assignment, knowledge of the genre requirements of essays in ESL, focus on the aspects of writing included on the peer-editing checklist, etc. Therefore, while reading, the participants chose to immediately *ask the authors of the writing questions* regarding the areas for improvement rather than waiting for the peer feedback discussion sessions. That signified the participants’ high level of awareness, which progressed from noticing an error to taking an action of active control and developing a critical awareness (van Lier, 2004).

While reading and stopping to ask clarification question from their peers, the participants were actively *writing notes on peer’s essays*. Noteworthy, the ELLs did not provide feedback using common proofreading marks and just identify areas for improvement with symbols, as suggested by the teacher. Instead, they chose to write words/phrases/sentences, make suggestions, correct the peer’s errors, and draw smiley faces to soften the feedback. In addition, the ELLs *filled out the peer-editing checklist* and wrote the summary of their feedback. It afforded them another attempt of going over the peer’s writing and finalizing their feedback.
Finally, the ELLs engaged in oral feedback discussion sessions. Out of four participants, Anni, BravoWolf, and Lightning chose to employ the affordance of *providing and receiving peer feedback*. In particular, BravoWolf and Anni chose to receive the feedback from their peers and agreed to all the comments, which were in the form of the oral summary of the written feedback. Lightning, in his turn, also chose to employ the affordance of oral feedback session to ask the peer about unfamiliar words he had encountered in the peer-editing checklist. Unfortunately, Maria chose to not engage in the discussion of peer feedback because of being shy and quiet, missing the first peer review session, and having incomplete drafts for peer review.

**Affordances of the online context.** When peer reviewing online, the ELLs chose to employ five affordances. Figure 17 shows affordances that the ELLs chose to employ in the online context during peer review (see p. 194). As shown on Figure 17, the five affordances that the adolescent ELLs chose to employ due to peer review in online context were (a) using computers in the computer lab, (b) participating in the training on Web 2.0 websites, (c) writing online, (d) reading the peer’s writing, (e) providing feedback in a written form.

The initial differences between face-to-face and online contexts for peer review sessions were in the use of the computer and the lack of oral peer feedback sessions. The adolescent ELLs eagerly chose to employ the affordance of *using the computers in the computer lab* at Purple High School for peer review online. Though they were comfortable with using computers for studying and social networking purposes, the ELLs needed training on the use of Web 2.0 tools for peer review and participant e-journal purposes. Therefore, they chose to actively *participate in the training on such Web 2.0
websites as wikispaces.com and penzu.com. During the training, the ELLs needed additional mediation and help with login in to the websites and properly spelling the passwords though I explained everything in details and provided them with the step-by-step handouts (see Appendix B); therefore, my presence and mediation was beneficial during peer review sessions online.

Figure 17. Affordances in the online context. The figure shows various affordances the ELLs chose to employ during peer review session online in the order the participants encountered them while peer reviewing.

After the training, all four participants opened each of their individual pages on wikispaces.com and employed the affordance of writing online. To make it available for the participants, I prepared an individual page for every participant, chose a number of writing prompts as examples, and developed handouts to enhance the training. Therefore, the participants’ writing online was initially mediated by my preparation, my training on the use of the websites. Furthermore, the ELLs asked clarification questions and chose to stay on the task of writing online all the time.
During the second and fourth visits to the computer lab, the adolescent ELLs employed the affordance of *reading the peer’s online writing*. All four ELLs found it easy and exciting. The participants knew that they were doing it for the peer review so they did not have many questions about the steps in the peer review procedure. Evidently, the participants were able to successfully transfer the knowledge of peer review procedure from face-to-face to online context. In particular, the four adolescent ELLs read the peers’ online writings once; then while reading them for the second time, they were simultaneously inserting their feedback for the peers on the peers’ pages.

Finally, the ELLs *exchanged the feedback in the written form*. As I stated before, due to the contextual limitations, it was not possible for the participants to exchange the peer feedback orally. Therefore, they actively used a variety of strategies for providing feedback for their feedback in writing. The strategies included underlining, commenting and highlighting the comments in various colors, typing the feedback as summary at the end of writing and/or inserting the feedback in parentheses, and correcting peer’s writing. Overall, the four participants of the study actively perceived all affordances for online peer review and chose to employ them and proceed to relevant actions.

**Participants’ revision of writing due to peer feedback.** After peer review sessions in the face-to-face and online contexts, the adolescent ELLs chose to revise their drafts in order to improve their writing in L2. Overall the participants received the feedback on the following areas for improvement:

- development of ideas;
- organization of ideas;
• cohesion;
• grammar;
• vocabulary;
• capitalization;
• spelling;
• punctuation;
• formatting.

In the face-to-face context, the peers chose to provide feedback mostly in writing in the form of comments or corrections inserted in the ELLs’ paper, while in the online context, most of the feedback was in the form of corrections.

The four adolescent ELL participants perceived peer feedback as beneficial and chose to incorporate most of it during the revision process. Only Lightning who had little experience with peer review prior to Fall 2012 chose to make few revisions of his writing based on the peer feedback during the first peer review in the face-to-face session. Nevertheless, over the course of time, he developed a better understanding of the activity, its procedure, benefits and difficulties. Therefore, during the subsequent peer review sessions in face-to-face and online contexts, the participant chose to incorporate most of peer’s feedback in his writing. Among the participants, Maria was the one who trusted the peer feedback most; consequently, after all peer review sessions, she chose to revise her writing accordingly and accepted all of the peer feedback in her revisions.

Both BravoWolf and Anni considered peer feedback seriously and considered it while revising their papers after the peer review sessions. Nevertheless, both participants were critical when choosing to revise or to not revise their writing due to peer feedback.
BravoWolf viewed peer feedback mostly beneficial when it addressed the development of ideas in his writing. Therefore, the participants did attend the peer feedback on this category attentively and revised his writing accordingly. Anni also considered and incorporated most of the peer’s feedback; however, she did choose to not incorporate one peer’s correction when it contained a grammar error or when she did not agree with it overall. Thus, the participants addressed all types of areas for improvement as suggested by their peers during peer review sessions in face-to-face and online contexts. Overall, they chose to incorporate most of the peer feedback in the revision of their papers.

**Discussion of Findings**

In this section, I discuss the findings in light of their contribution to the existing research on L2 Literacy development and peer review practices of four adolescent English language learners. First, I redefine the concept of L2 literacy from the ecological perspective in order to provide foundation for the second theme of the discussion section—the role of peer review in L2 literacy development. In the discussion of this theme, I focus on such subthemes as (a) the power of the peer, (b) self and identity, (c) affordances, and (d) activity. Further, I discuss the role of technology in L2 literacy practices. Figure 18 provides a visual representation of all themes and subthemes for the section (see p. 198).
Redefining L2 literacy

The role of peer review in L2 literacy development

Technology and literacy practices of adolescent ELLs

Figure 18. Themes and subthemes in the section of discussion of findings. The figure shows the four major themes of the section as well as relevant subthemes.

Redefining L2 literacy. Having conducted this dissertation study with the focus on peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs in face-to-face and online contexts from the ecological perspective allowed me to explore and observe the participants’ literacy practices in AVID classroom holistically as peer review sessions were one of the stages in the ELLs writing process during Fall 2012. Moreover, the focus on peer review afforded deeper understanding of the concept of L2 literacy. Thus, in this part of Chapter 6, I revisit the existing definitions of L2 literacy and attempt to redefine the concept based on the findings of the current study in order to situate peer review as one of the activities for adolescent L2 literacy development.

As discussed in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 of the dissertation, there have been many attempts to define literacy and L2 literacy. The researchers first viewed literacy with reference to two skills on an individual level: reading and writing (Perez, 1998). In the
21st century, researchers started defining literacy as a social and cultural phenomenon (Bartlett, 2007; Gee, 1996; Huang, 2011; New London Group, 1996). Researchers of social literacies, situated literacies, New London group, and critical literacies defined literacy from different perspectives and with different foci (see p. 25-28). Nevertheless, there is still the need of definition of L2 literacy that would cover its cognitive and social aspects. Furthermore, the definition of L2 literacy should include the use of technology because of the adolescent ELLs’ growing use of technology for literacy purposes (Williams, 2005). In my attempt to redefine the concept, by no means I aim at undermining the quality of prior definitions of L2 literacy, but rather I base my definition of L2 literacy on the existing ones and complement it with my findings on adolescents ELLs’ L2 peer review practices which involve L2 literacy practices.

When engaging in peer review practices, the adolescent ELLs went through a number of processes and actions both cognitive and social in nature. The participants as agents were actively interacting with the semiotic resources of the environment (e.g. peer review training). They were actively employing affordances (e.g. writing notes on the peer-editing checklist) and progressing from noticing affordances to developing critical awareness of L2 with the subsequent actions (revising their writing based on peer’s feedback; van Lier, 2004). Therefore, it would be hard to separate individual from social and vice versa during peer review sessions. Moreover, peer review practices involved the participants’ engagement in reading, writing, listening, and speaking in L2 (Hu, 2005). In addition, the ELLs had to activate their funds of knowledge on the topics discussed in peer’s papers, evaluate peer’s essays in terms various aspects of writing such as
development of ideas, grammar, vocabulary, etc. Such a complexity of intertwined processes and actions in its whole contributed to my interest in redefining L2 literacy.

Mainly, I view L2 literacy as a person’s ability to perceive and interpret semiotic resources in the context that is, to employ contextual affordances and develop critical awareness of various aspects of L2 starting from prosodic features up to critical perspective on various aspects of L2, with its further use to become autonomous in all social contexts. Thus, in the definition I include the personal or individual level of L2 literacy, recognizing the presence of cognitive processes such as perception of affordances and individual progress in development of critical awareness for the new information. In addition, I complete the definition with the social level of processes and actions, which includes “interaction” with semiotic objects, other agents, and affordances. Furthermore, I extend the definition to all social contexts including online, mobile, and any others. Finally, I acknowledge the multi-faceted nature of L2 literacy, which is based on the perception and interpretation of meaningful signs from the environment with its further use, resulting in the variety of processes and actions, which constitute L2 literacy.

Adolescent L2 writing. With L2 writing as a constituent of L2 literacy and adolescents as focal participants, the present study contributes to scarce research on adolescent L2 writing due to its focus on peer review activity as a part of writing process in the face-to-face high school context and online. As discussed in Chapter 2, the previous studies on adolescent L2 writing mainly focused on emergent literacy practices of elementary-age students (Fu & Matoush, 2006; Samway, 2006) and transition of L2 writers from high school to college (Harklau, 2011). Therefore, the study fills the gap in the research literature with the findings on how adolescent ELLs perceived peer review
practices, employed affordances during peer review sessions, and incorporated peer feedback in their writing during revision process.

In particular, through the emic voices of the participants, it became possible to identify the difficulties the ELLs faced when they were assigned writing prompts, which were not a part of their funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). The participants found it difficult to relate to some of the topics in the writing prompts for the standardized tests and faced it as a challenge to write a paper on the topic they knew little information. Such findings support Lee’s (2008a, 2008b) studies on the influence of various factors on adolescent L2 writing. Moreover, the findings, discussion, and implications sections of the study add to the research literature on the development of adolescent L2 writing skills. Thus, the current study is the only one, to the best of my knowledge, which describes and explains adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices in face-to-face and online contexts.

Furthermore, the participants’ major concern about hurting peers’ feelings when providing feedback on areas for improvement shed light on the participants’ process of projecting the “right” self that is, construction of adolescent ELLs’ identity through social interaction with their peers and reflecting the correct image of the participants’ “self” to the peers (Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011; van Lier, 2004). While I further discuss the participants’ self and identity (see pp. 204-206), identity construction and negotiation is one of the major characteristics of adolescence and factors which influence adolescent ELLs’ writing (Ortmeier-Hooper & Enright, 2011). Thus, the findings of the present study supports the conceptual framework by Ortmeier-Hooper and Enright (2011) and is in alignment with researchers who situate research on adolescent L2 writing separately
but within L2 literacy or writing field due to acknowledgement of the age of adolescence as the time of exploring their self, questioning, learning to establish their identity through social interaction with other agents in the environment (Christenbury, Bomer, & Smagorinsky, 2009; Erickson, 1986; van Lier, 2004).

**The role of peer review in L2 literacy development.** According to the findings of the study, peer review turned out to be an essential part of writing process and a crucial aspect in L2 literacy development. Both the participants and the teacher viewed peer review as beneficial for development of L2 writing and literacy. While many researchers have studied the benefits and disadvantages of peer review, the majority of studies focused on adult L2 learners’ peer review practices (Grami, 2010; Hu & Lam, 2010; Zhao, 2010), and only one—on adolescent EFL students’ peer review abroad (Tsui & Ng, 2000). The present study contributes to the knowledge on existing research literature on peer review practices because the focal participants of the study were adolescent ELLs in the high school, and it is the only study, to my knowledge, which describes and explains peer review practices of ELLs in K-12 setting in the USA. Moreover, the participants engaged in peer review practices face-to-face and online.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the existing literature on potential benefits of peer review sessions has listed the development and improvement of students’ revising skills (Berg, 1999b; Min, 2006), learning how to provide feedback (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; McGroarty & Zhu, 1997; Nguyen, 2008; Stanley, 1992), efforts to achieve intersubjectivity (Carr, 2008; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996), development of critical thinking skills and providing constructive feedback (Hyland, 2000), and improvement of writing performance (Kamimura, 2006). Therefore, while the research studies focused
primarily on the influence of peer review sessions on L2 adults’ development of writing, the emic voices of the focal participants in the present dissertation study allowed me as a researcher to obtain a deeper insight into how the ELLs as agents in the activity viewed the role of peer review in their L2 literacy development.

Having the ultimate goal of improving their L2 literacy in mind, the adolescent ELLs found peer review beneficial for the development of their writing in L2 because it allowed them to (a) obtain an additional perspective on their writing, (b) identify areas for improvement, and (c) become more confident about their writing in L2. Thus, it partially aligns with the findings of prior studies on peer review practices (Kamimura, 2006; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009), but also complements the existing knowledge about the potential benefits of peer review. In the further discussion of the power of the peer, self and identity, affordances, and activity, I continue discussing the role of peer review in L2 literacy development based on the findings of the present dissertation study.

**The power of the peer.** According to the ecological perspective, the peer during the peer review session is another agent in the environment who may serve as a provider of semiotic resources and can be a semiotic resource him/herself. While I discuss the affordances due to the peer review on pp. 206-209, it is crucial to address how the participants viewed the role and importance of the peer in the peer activity as none of the studies, to my knowledge, has focused on this aspect before.

The adolescent ELLs viewed a peer as the person who acquires the responsibility of reading their papers, identifying areas for improvement, and possibly provides suggestions on how to address the errors. Moreover, the participants viewed the peers’
role close to being co-authors of their papers. For example, BravoWolf’s concept of “second you,” Anni’s high expectations of the quality of the paper after revisions due to peer review raises the need to discuss the authorship of the paper and the power of the peer in the peer review sessions. It is not only the issue of the efforts which the ELLs put into achieving intersubjectivity (Carr, 2008), but also the co-construction of knowledge and the influence an agent (a peer) in the environment may have on other agents and their actions.

According to the findings of the study, the only aspect of peer feedback that the ELLs questioned was the subjective opinion about the content of their writing. Anni also mentioned that the peers might not feel the same responsibility of providing detailed and honest feedback, as the teacher would have. Nevertheless, the focal participants of the study did consider the peer’s feedback seriously and incorporated most of it in their revisions. They viewed their peers as those who would help them improve their paper. Thus, the participants recognized the important role of the peer in the development of their literacy in L2.

**Self and identity.** Though not foci of the present study, the concepts of “self” and “identity” appeared to be a part of the findings. As discussed in Chapter 1, self may be defined as a “real entity,” which every person constructs socially and dialogically while identity is the projection of self in the society through interaction with others (van Lier, 2004, p. 107). The major difficulty that the ELLs faced during peer review sessions was the concern about hurting the peer’s feelings through critique while the teacher stated that it was necessary for them to learn to accept critique and to criticize each other’s writing, not being negative or not perceiving the peer feedback as negative. Such finding reveals
the need to discuss how the adolescent ELLs struggled with constructing their identity when providing feedback to their peers.

During peer review sessions, the ELLs faced the challenge of dichotomy—being honest and provide feedback about the areas for improvement to their peers while risking to offend them versus choose not to comment on areas for improvement and be perceived by the peer/author of the writing as positive. Such finding reveals the struggle of the adolescent participants with establishing their identity among other peers and supports the study of Ortmeier-Hooper and Enright (2011). The ELLs being in the adolescent stage were in the on-going process of constructing their self and simultaneously establishing their identity among other peers and the teacher. The awareness of the issue and the gaps in L2 knowledge created the challenge for the adolescent ELLs to reflect their “self” the way they wanted it. Meanwhile, the teacher viewed such struggle as a necessary challenge for students to overcome in the adolescent stage because it would help them to provide and receive feedback successfully in their future educational and professional life. Thus, peer review sessions served as challenges for students in learning how to successfully portray their self to other agents in the context. In addition, peer review sessions served as “global” affordances for establishing their identity.

Furthermore, going through the stage of self-exploration, identity construction and negotiation, the adolescent ELLs in the study were facing another difficulty—negative attitude towards them and bullying from other students and possibly by the teachers. According to Wortham (2006), social identification has an influence on students’ learning. During interviews with the teacher and multiple observations at school throughout Fall 2012, I learned that ELLs felt the pressure of assimilation, which implies
the negative aspect of partial or complete loss of the ELLs’ cultural and linguistic heritage (Yoon, Simpson, & Haag, 2010). Moreover, the ELLs’ background was not appreciated, and in many cases, the adolescent ELLs were not understood and felt disrespect from other students. As in the story with Lightning, the NS of English laughed at him because Lightning had been asked to leave for ESOL class. Such incidents revealed the gap in understanding between native speakers of English and ELLs in Purple High School. Thus, bullying and negative attitude contributed to difficulties ELLs faced. They also had an influence on ELLs’ identity construction and negotiation and on their learning during all activities at school, including peer review sessions.

**Affordances.** Having elaborated on the affordances of peer review sessions in Chapter 5, I provided the detailed description and explanation of what the participants experienced during the process of peer review. I specifically described them in the order the peer review developed and in the order the participants employed them so that the readers would be able to transfer the findings to their context more easily. If looking holistically at the findings for Research Question 2, I would like to focus the discussion of the affordance on the two aspects of peer review, which, to my knowledge, have not been discussed before. They are the concept of “mediation” in the process of employing affordances and the concept of “immediacy” due to employing affordances during peer review sessions.

First, mediation was an essential aspect of all stages in peer review sessions. If necessary, it would be challenging to categorize the affordances as immediate or mediated due to the presence of mediation throughout the activity of peer review. According to van Lier (2004), there are two criteria for language learning to happen:
access and engagement. The peer review sessions in the present study served as meaningful activities, which afforded the participants with the access to the information to pick up and affordances to engage in the activity. The teacher’s thorough preparation for the activity such as arranging desks to facilitate students’ participation during peer review, preparation of peer review checklist, peer review training, etc. served as semiotic resources of the environment and mediated the participants’ understanding and action during peer review.

Moreover, the peers’ feedback consisted of several layers because for some ELLs it was sufficient to read the peer’s feedback on the paper while for the others further negotiation and clarifications were necessary. Furthermore, the ELLs’ perceptions of peer review and peer feedback were already mediated by the teacher’s thoughts during peer review training. Therefore, employment of the ecological perspective in the present study allowed me to explore the participants’ peer review practices holistically and find the presence of mediation at all stages of the peer review activity. Moreover, it afforded the understanding of how intertwined the mediation is with every stage the participants go through during the peer review activity. Not only the participants’ understanding of the new information during peer review sessions was mediated by other agents and semiotic resources but it was also mediated by the participants’ activation of their funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). Based on this finding, I consider categorizing the affordances of peer review into immediate and mediated as problematic while the concept of mediation and its role during peer review activity deserves further attention.
Another concept, which appeared to be important in the participants’ employment of the affordances during peer review, was the concept of “immediacy.” During the peer review sessions, the teacher asked the students to first provide the feedback in the written form, then fill out the peer-editing checklist, and only afterwards discuss the feedback orally with the peers. Though the participants stayed all the time on task of peer reviewing, they did not follow the teacher’s guidelines and asked their peers for clarification about writing immediately after identifying the area for improvement. While the researchers focused on the immediacy with respect to teacher feedback, the immediacy in terms of peer review has not been discussed before.

According to the ecological perspective, the participants go through six levels of language awareness, when employing affordances. Specifically, they progress from perceiving the affordance to developing a critical awareness of social and political aspects of language (van Lier, 2004). Surprisingly, the participants did not show the need for immediate mediation during reading the written feedback and during oral feedback sessions. It is while reading the peers’ papers initially, the participants were coming across the areas for improvement, which they could identify, but which simultaneously were preventing them for understanding the content. Therefore, after perceiving the affordance, focusing on the specific aspect of writing, they needed further immediate mediation in order to progress to the practical awareness with respect to the specific area for improvement. Such mediation had to be immediate to allow the ELLs to further develop discursive awareness and finally critical awareness. Otherwise, without the immediate clarification on the part of the author of the writing, the ELLs could not provide the feedback on the paper and peer-editing checklist.
During peer review sessions online, the participants did not have a chance to ask their peers for clarifications when reading their writing, and they could not discuss their feedback with each other due to the contextual limitations. In particular, all four participants asked the researcher about the affordance of providing and receiving oral peer feedback online. Moreover, Lightning did need a clarification from the peer regarding peer’s written feedback. Only due to the synchronous work online at peer review, Lightning could receive the immediate reply from the peer. Otherwise, if the peers had worked only asynchronously and without the affordances of asking questions and discussing peer feedback, Lightning might have had difficulties proceeding with the revision of his work online. Thus, the role of immediacy in ELLs’ reading and writing in face-to-face and online contexts needs further attention on the part of researchers and educators.

Activity. Employing the ecological perspective in the study allowed the view of peer review as a part of the adolescent ELLs’ development of literacy in L2 and an affordance for development of writing and communication skills in L2. Moreover, the qualitative methodology of the study allowed me to describe and explain the emic voices of the ELLs, which is in alignment with the view of the participants in the ecological perspective. Specifically, the participants were viewed as autonomous that is active agents in the social contexts who have their own perceptions, choose to engage in activities, and have the voice to express their opinion within the community of practice (Wenger, 1998). Thus, based on the findings of the study, I further attempt to redefine peer review from the ecological perspective in order to complement the previous definition of the activity, which focused mainly on the stages of the activity, with the
view of the peers as autonomous agents. Thus, I believe peer review in L2 may be defined as a collaborative complex activity during which language learners read each other’s writing, provide and receive feedback, and co-construct knowledge during feedback discussions in order to develop L2 literacy skills and become successful in future educational and professional lives.

**Technology and literacy practices of adolescent ELLs.** Due to the scarcity of studies on adolescent ELLs’ literacy in general (Harklau, 2011) and on the use of technology for the development of adolescent ELLs’ literacy in particular (Black, 2006; Lam, 2004), the present dissertation study contributes to the existing research literature in this respect as well. In particular, two subthemes emerged for the discussion of this aspect: availability of technology for adolescent ELLs’ literacy practices and the role of Web 2.0 in L2 literacy practices of adolescent ELLs.

**Availability of technology for adolescent ELLs’ literacy practices.** Though ELLs turned out to frequently use technology for literacy practices out of school, they faced a number of limitations in terms of the use of technology when in school. Specifically, all four participants stated that they frequently used computer for typing homework, Google search, and social networking. On the school campus, however, the students’ use of computers and other technology was limited to the use of computer labs mainly for testing purposes. The students’ use of cell phones and other devices was restricted as well. Furthermore, the teacher had only one computer available for the use in the classroom. Thus, because of such contextual limitations, the students were short of affordances for the use of technology for peer review practices and the development of L2 literacy in the
school context, which partially explains scarcity of research on the ELLs’ use of Web 2.0 tools for the development of L2 literacy.

**Web 2.0 and adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices.** The findings on the adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices in face-to-face and online contexts are in alignment with the conclusions of other research studies, complement them with the emic voices of the participants on the use of wiki for peer review, and highlight the importance of considering various contextual factors for every activity and the beneficial use of Web 2.0 for peer review practices (Liou & Peng, 2009). In particular, while in online context, the ELLs chose to provide peer feedback mainly in the form of corrections instead of making comments or suggestions as in the face-to-face context because of the affordance of making changes in the text easily. Moreover, the revision process in the online context was easier as well due to the same affordance. The participants did not have to rewrite the whole paper to make it look neat after the peer review activity. Instead, they could make changes in their writing and save all the changes. Moreover, the use of Wiki allowed them to go back and track all the changes their peer made in their writing and all the revisions they made in their papers. Thus, the use of Web 2.0 tools enhanced peer review practices of adolescent ELLs by employment of the participants’ comfort of using the computer and Web 2.0 for literacy practices (Kamimura, 2006).

**Implications**

To continue the discussion of the findings, in this section of Chapter 6, I focus on the implications of the study for language teaching and learning. In particular, addressing the three research questions of the study on (a) the adolescent ELLs’ perspectives about
peer review practices in face-to-face and online contexts, (b) affordances which the ELLs chose to employ during peer review, and (c) revisions they chose to make in their writing due to peer feedback allows me to elaborate on how teachers could enhance the adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices and make peer review beneficial for their students’ language learning and L2 writing development. Therefore, in the next section of Chapter 6, I discuss implications in terms of “The power of a teacher” as I believe teachers contribute to the success of peer review practices of adolescent ELLs and can enhance students’ participation in peer review. Furthermore I elaborate on the “Lessons learned about technology use for peer review in K-12 contexts.”

**Power of a teacher.** Though the focal participants of the study were four adolescent ELLs, it is due to their willingness to share their perspectives and to participate in the study overall I could generate a number of implications for the teachers who include or consider including peer review sessions in their classes with adolescent ELLs. From an ecological perspective, a teacher is another agent in the environment with learners who can provide affordances and mediate learners’ perceptions and actions (van Lier, 2004). When analyzing peer review practices of the four adolescent ELLs as a part of writing process in AVID 1 classroom, I developed a list of semiotic resources, which the ELLs found meaningful and perceived as those, which provide affordances for the further actions. Thus, the teacher might consider working at these semiotic resources in order to enhance peer review practices of adolescent ELLs. Figure 19 below illustrates the semiotic resources, which the ELLs used during peer review practices.
Figure 19. Semiotic resources for peer review. The figure shows the six categories of semiotic resources, which the adolescent ELLs used during peer review practices in the face-to-face classroom context.

Specifically, Figure 19 lists such semiotic resources as (a) space, (b) assignment of peers, (c) training, (d) supplementary materials, and (e) teacher’s answers. The ELLs found the listed resources as meaningful, which provided them with affordances to engage into action and participate in the peer review practices in the face-to-face classroom context.

Based on the findings for research questions, Ms. Smith mediated every affordance during peer review practices, and the ELLs eagerly chose to employ them. In order to mediate the participants’ peer review practices, the teacher worked at preparing and enhancing the activity through the semiotic resources. Thus, I further elaborate on how teachers can facilitate adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices with the semiotic resources listed in Figure 19.
**Space.** In order to enhance and mediate the adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices, teachers need to consider how to prepare the space of the classroom in order to make it serve the function of a semiotic resource and enhance peer review practices of language learners in the classroom face-to-face context. In the present study, the teacher thoroughly planned the organization of desks into groups of four allowing students to engage in peer review practices first with the peer sitting next to the student and possibly to engage in the second round of peer review with the student sitting in front. Such desk organization facilitated participants’ interaction during peer review and allowed to save class time because the students did not have to move around the room to find and/or sit next to the partner. Thus, the effective use of space is one of the factors that teachers should consider when working at preparation for peer review activity in the face-to-face context.

**Assignment of peers.** Another semiotic resource in the study was the teacher’s assignment of the students into peer review groups and pairs. Both research literature on adult ELLs’ peer review practices and the findings of the present study raise the question of how to assign language learners into peer groups or pairs effectively. Carson and Nelson (1994, 1996) warned teachers about possible tension between the peers because of cultural differences. According to their findings, the students from collectivist cultures such as Japanese did not feel comfortable sharing their feedback on the areas for improvement in order to not ruin the harmonious atmosphere between the peers. On the contrary, students from individualist cultures were oriented at helping the peer achieve success. Thus, the researchers found that the attitude of ELLs towards working in a group had an influence on the dynamics of L2 learners’ participation in the peer review sessions.
In the present study, the adolescent ELLs stated that the assignment of the “right” peer was crucial for the success of the peer review activity. However, the participants did not focus on the importance of having the same level of L2 proficiency, sharing the same or similar cultural and/or linguistic background, as stated by Carson and Nelson (1996). Instead, they considered that friendship between peers facilitated peer review because the ELLs felt more comfortable providing and receiving feedback and because they trusted the peer in the quality of the feedback more. According to the findings, the participants had high expectations to peer feedback and incorporated most of it during the revision process. Therefore, they expressed the concern that if a peer was not comfortable or was just ignorant about the responsibility of providing feedback during peer review, the success of peer review would be questionable. Finally, the ELLs stated that in case of argument with the peer, they would be hesitant about incorporating revisions due to peer feedback in their writing.

In addition, in the present study the teacher carefully considered students’ assignment into peer review groups and pairs. According to the findings, when assigning students for peer review sessions, Ms. Smith considered such factors as relationship between students (friends or not) and proficiency in writing (stronger writers with the stronger). She saw her role in the classroom as a facilitator; therefore, while assigning students into groups and pairs for peer review sessions, she aimed at helping them feel more comfortable participating in the activity. According to the teacher, the students should develop rapport with her as a teacher and trust to the students in the class in order to provide rich detailed feedback for their peers. Thus, the teacher did not conduct peer review sessions at the beginning of the semester allowing time for students build rapport
and trust and considered relationships between peers as well as proficiency in writing when assigning students into peer review groups and pairs.

Thus, teachers who (plan to) use peer review session in their classroom with adolescent ELLs should consider the assignment of L2 learners into peer groups seriously and take into account such criteria as (a) ELLs’ cultural background, (b) students’ attitude towards each other, and (c) language learners’ proficiency in English and in literacy development. Moreover, the adolescent ELLs in the study pointed out the importance of responsibility the peers share with the authors of the paper. Therefore, such individual factors as students’ motivation for learning L2 in general and L2 literacy development in particular should be considered when planning the activity in order to provide students’ with the best possible experience of peer review.

**Training.** Peer review training is one of the major factors, which determine the success of peer review in language learning classes. As discussed in Chapter 2, the students may be hesitant about benefits of peer review for their development of literacy and L2 writing. While many factors may change students’ views of the activity, it is the peer review training, which seems to have been most influential in this respect (Hu, 2005; McGroarty & Zhu, 1997; Min, 2006; Nelson and Murphy, 1992; Stanley, 1992). In the prior research studies, teachers of L2 approached training in different ways and spending different amount of time; however, the common finding on the topic was that the peer review training led to more detailed feedback and increased number of revisions of enhanced quality on various aspects of L2 adult’s writing.
In the present study, the peer review training was not the major focus of research. The participants had prior experience of peer reviewing from middle school. Nevertheless, Ms. Smith conducted peer review training every time the students were to engage into peer reviewing. The peer review training in her AVID 1 classes was not extensive and did not take much of the class time. Primarily, it was a whole class discussion about the nature, purpose, benefits, and procedure of peer review. Nevertheless, the adolescent ELLs were not eager to speak up in front of the whole class, but chose to listen actively to the teacher. Such silent but active participation in the training is something that educators should consider when planning peer review training. Instead of finding the students’ silence as lack of understanding or motivation, teacher might consider developing materials or tasks to assess L2 students’ progress with the training. Such activities could include brief reflection on language learners’ attitudes toward the training, their views of what was helpful during peer review training, etc.

Another aspect teachers who conduct peer review training in their classes might find helpful is learning as much information about adolescent ELLs’ experiences with peer review practices as possible. The teachers might choose eliciting such information through questionnaires or surveys, teacher-student conferences, reflective journal entries, notes from students’ pair group discussions, etc. Providing students’ with an opportunity to learn the new information when building it on their funds of knowledge from the past is empowering for students, as they become autonomous learners and active agents in the environment. As an example, BravoWolf in the present study shared his frustration with the prompts for the essays because the participant could not relate to the content of the prompts. It was hard for him to generate ideas for the assignments as he could write about
topics which he either did not know about or he had little to say. Thus, knowing how much knowledge and experience the students have in terms of peer review is crucial for educators when making decisions about the length, content, and components of peer review training.

**Supplementary materials.** The use of supplementary materials for peer review purposes in L2 classes has not been the primary focus of prior research studies. Only few of them provide a rich description of handouts the teachers used for peer review (Hu, 2005). Nevertheless, discussion of the use of supplementary materials is an important implication of the study as the participants perceived them as semiotic resources because they provided them with an opportunity to engage in peer review and mediated the participants’ understanding of peer review procedure. The handouts for peer review purposes may include guidelines, materials for peer review training, peer-editing checklists, and activities for reflection purposes. Their content and use are heavily dependent on the particular course and objectives.

As with any activity, teachers might want to reflect on how they could facilitate and mediate students’ perception of the new material, engagement into action, and development of the critical awareness of the students of the material under study. Along with explicit oral instruction of guidelines or procedure of peer review, it is crucial to provide ELLs’ with supplementary materials which (a) help students understand the steps of peer review better, especially in case of students whose level of proficiency in comprehending the target language is lagging behind reading in ESL; (b) provide them with the affordance for further steps in peer review such as summarizing their feedback for the author of the writing or providing more details about their feedback; (c) recording
feedback for peers so that they did not have to take notes or attempt to remember oral feedback; (d) serve as an affordance to take notes on the peer feedback and, in this way, afford students an opportunity to practice such skills as summarizing and paraphrasing; (e) facilitate ELLs’ reflection of peer review experiences and the further use of peer feedback for the revision purposes; (f) afford students with an opportunity to justify their decision about the use of specific peer feedback for revision. While the content of such supplementary materials will depend on the course design, its content and objectives, the list of possible uses of supplementary materials above could help teachers choose which ones can enhance ELLs peer review practices in their classes.

Furthermore, when creating supplementary materials, teachers of ELLs should consider such aspect as immediacy, which turned out to be the reason why the adolescent ELLs in the present study followed the teacher’s guidelines only partially. In the present study, the participants chose to not wait until finishing reading the whole essay and providing written feedback on the peer-editing checklist. Instead, while reading, they kept writing their feedback on the peer’s papers. Moreover, in many cases, they asked the author of the writing if the error in the area for improvement prevented them from understanding the content of the sentence. Therefore, the participants did not follow the sequence of steps for the peer review as the teacher suggested. They still completed all of them, but in the different order because of the immediacy concept, rooted in students progressing from noticing an affordance to developing critical awareness of the specific linguistic feature or aspect in the writing. Thus, teachers might choose to consider the concept of immediacy when planning peer review sessions and creating supplementary materials.
In addition, the teachers might reflect if all the guidelines in the supplementary materials would help make peer review successful and useful for the ELLs. In the present study, the teacher advised the students to use specific symbols when marking areas for improvement in the peer’s writing because according to her, such symbols were widely used for peer review purposes. Nevertheless, the ELLs chose to not follow this guideline. Even though the teacher distributed the list of the symbols for the students use, the participants chose to write feedback in the form of words, phrases, sentences, pictures, corrections, underlining, and circling. For the participants, it turned out to be an additional step in the peer review, which would prevent them form being explicit and detailed in the feedback. Having the goal of helping the peer with the writing, the ELLs did not want to just to mark the areas of strength or areas for improvement, they wanted to share their suggestions, comments, and corrections on the particular aspect of the writing as in other prior research studies (Hu, 2005; McGroarty & Zhu, 1997). Thus, teachers’ reflection and evaluation of every step of peer review in terms of its usefulness is necessary.

**Teacher’s answers.** During peer review, the major role and attention falls on a student as an active agent who collaborates with the peer on improvement of writing. Nevertheless, as I have wrote before, other agents in the environment play an important role too when creating affordances and mediating students’ development of writing and literacy in L2. As I discussed in Chapter 5, teacher’s mediation of peer review practices was present at all stages of peer review sessions in the classroom. Ms. Smith created affordances for the participants, mediated their perception of affordances, and was present in case students might have any questions regarding the activity. In the present
study, the students did not ask the questions about the content of peer feedback; nevertheless, the participants asked individual questions about the procedure of peer review and mentioned during interviews that in case of disagreement with the peer on the content of peer feedback, they would turn to the teacher for support and opinion. Thus, the teachers who conduct peer review sessions in their classes should consider how important it is for the students to feel the support and assistance during peer review practices.

**Lessons learned about technology use for adolescent ELLs’ peer review.**

Technology use can facilitate peer review practices of adolescent ELLs. A variety of free Web 2.0 resources are available for language learners and their teachers. In the present study, I provided students with an opportunity of using wikispaces.com as a platform for writing and peer review online and penzu.com for participants’ reflective e-journal writing. Both websites were user-friendly and free for anybody’s use. Moreover, both websites had an option of making information private that is, it was not accessible to the public and could be seen only if the participants chose to share it with somebody. Furthermore, wikispaces.com allows using wiki by teachers for educational purposes. Wikispaces.com and penzu.com were excellent tools for peer review purposes, and the participants not only enjoyed using them, they acknowledged that peer review online was easier than peer review in the face-to-face format because of the features of the websites and because of the enhanced feeling of privacy and independence they had when peer reviewing online.

Unfortunately, not all the teachers have a choice of using technology at any point in their teaching. Some contextual factors and limitations may prevent teachers from the
use of various online resources to enhance their teaching and facilitate students’ learning. Though initially planning to ask students discuss their feedback online with the use of Skype as a teleconferencing tool, I found it impossible despite the teacher’s efforts and administration’s support to arrange time in the computer lab where students might have access to headphones and Skype. The computer labs on school campus were mostly used for testing purposes, and I acknowledge it as one of the contextual factors, which led to the limitation in my data collection and obstacle in the participants’ access to the affordance of discussing peer feedback online (van Lier, 2004).

Surprisingly, despite the vast spread of technology, increasing use of Web 2.0 tools, and the growing body of studies which emphasize the potential benefits of the use of technology for L2 teaching and learning, the teachers and students still feel the lack of such affordances due to the limited access to the computer laboratories and insufficient number of computers in the classrooms (Dippold, 2009; Ware, 2008). Moreover, even with the access to the hardware, the students may be not allowed to open certain websites. For example, the use of Skype or any other video-/audio-teleconferencing tool could have facilitated the adolescent ELLs’ peer review practices in the online setting (Liang, 2010). Thus, based on the critical nature of the study, there is a need for administrators and educators to reevaluate the policies of the use of technology at schools and address the issue of availability of technology in the classrooms.

Thus, in considering the use of technology for peer review purposes, it is crucial to analyze the context, its affordances and limitations, access to particular hardware and software. If possible, such Web 2.0 tools as wikispaces.com and penzu.com could be used by teachers for assigning peer review sessions in the computer labs or including peer
review as a homework if the participants had sufficient knowledge and experience with peer review. If assigning peer review online, it is necessary to provide students with detailed, hands-on training in order to help them become familiar with the websites to be used for peer review. In the present study, the participants asked many questions when they started using the wiki and their e-journals though they used various websites for studying purposes. Thus, providing adolescent ELLs with detailed training and assistance with the use of technology for peer review purposes is crucial.

**Future Research Directions**

The purpose of the study was to describe and explain peer review practices of four adolescent ELLs in online and face-to-face contexts. In particular, I focused on (a) the four ELLs’ perceptions of peer review, (b) affordances four adolescent ELLs choose to employ, and (c) revisions four adolescent ELLs choose to make in their writing due to peer feedback in face-to-face and online contexts. Employing ecological perspective for the purposes of the study allowed me to complement the existing research literature on peer review and contextualize it as a part of L2 literacy development.

The findings for the first research questions with the focus on the ELLs perceptions of peer review practices raised a number of directions for further studies on peer review practices of adolescent ELLs. In particular, more research is needed on the (a) co-authorship of the writing which adolescent ELLs develop during collaborative work at peer review, (b) the influence of peer review on the development of adolescent ELLs’ communication skills, (c) transfer of peer review knowledge and skills from face-to-face to online contexts, (d) the influence of collaborative nature of the ELLs’
participation in social networking websites and other Web 2.0 tools on the view and expectations the ELLs have toward peer review activities, and (e) the differences between the content of peer and teacher feedback.

The findings for Research Question 2 with the focus on affordances the adolescent ELLs choose to employ during peer review in face-to-face and online contexts from ecological perspective may serve researcher and educators as the foundation for further exploration of semiotic resources of the context, interdependence of agents’ actions in the environment, and facilitation of the adolescent ELLs’ perception of the objects as semiotic resources with the further employment of contextual affordances, and L2 literacy development as an ultimate goal. Moreover, further research is needed on (a) adolescent ELLs’ progression through levels of awareness during various stages of peer review practices in face-to-face and online contexts, (b) immediacy as the factor in students’ employment of affordances and modification of teacher’s guidelines during peer review in the face to-face and online contexts, (c) oral peer feedback sessions of adolescent ELLs in an online context, and (d) the use of other technology tools such as mobile and teleconferencing for peer review purposes of adolescent ELLs.

The findings for Research Question 3 with the focus on revisions the adolescent ELLs make in their writing due to peer review in face-to-face and online contexts afforded the insight into what aspects of writing the adolescent ELLs address during revision due to peer feedback. The possible future directions based on these findings include (a) strategies the ELLs adopt in order to provide feedback in a written form, (b) differences between revision process due to peer review in face-to-face and online
contexts, and (c) synchronous and asynchronous peer review practices of adolescent ELLs in an online context.

Conclusion

In Chapter 6, I discussed the findings of the dissertation study from the ecological perspective and in light of three research questions, focusing on (a) four adolescent ELLs’ perceptions of peer review in face-to-face and online contexts, (b) affordances four adolescent ELLs chose to employ during peer review in face-to-face and online contexts, and (c) revisions four adolescent ELLs chose to make in their writing due to peer feedback in face-to-face and online contexts. The collection of data through interviews with the focal participants and the teacher, multiple observations, researcher’s and participants’ e-journals, and artifacts as well as the content within-case and cross-case analysis of the data allowed me to employ holistic view of the participants’ peer review practices in the classroom face-to-face and online contexts as a part of L2 literacy. This in its turn, led to the possibility to redefine L2 literacy as the concept. Specifically, based on the findings of the study I define L2 literacy as a person’s ability to perceive and interpret semiotic resources in the context that is, to employ contextual affordances and develop critical awareness of various aspects of L2 starting from prosodic features up to critical perspective on the social and political aspects of L2, with its further use to become autonomous in all social contexts.

Furthermore, I discuss the important role of peer review in adolescent ELLs’ literacy development in terms of (a) the power of the peer, (b) adolescent ELLs’ self and identity, (c) affordances with the discussion of concepts of immediacy and mediation, and
(d) the activity of peer review. In the latter section, I developed my own definition of peer review in L2 classes which complements the prior attempts to define the concept and contextualizes it not as a separate activity but as a part of L2 literacy development. In particular, I define peer review as a collaborative complex activity during which language learners read each other’s writing, provide and receive feedback, and co-construct knowledge during feedback discussions in order to develop L2 literacy skills and become successful in future educational and professional lives. In addition, I focused on discussing technology and literacy practices of adolescent ELLs. In this theme, I wrote about (a) availability of technology for adolescent ELLs’ literacy practices and (b) the role of Web 2.0 in L2 literacy practices of adolescent ELLs. I also discussed how such Web 2.0 tools as wikispaces.com and penzu.com enhanced ELLs’ engagement in peer review practices in an online context.

In the Implications for the study section, I elaborated on how teachers could enhance adolescent ELLs peer review practices in the face-to-face classroom context. I called this section “The power of a teacher,” offered the model of semiotic resources the teachers might consider when planning for peer review sessions with adolescent ELLs. In particular, I discussed such semiotic resources as (a) space, (b) assignment of peers, (c) training, (d) supplementary materials, and (e) teacher’s answers. In the other section of Implication, I elaborate on the lessons learned about technology use for peer review in K-12 contexts. Finally, I provide a list of possible future research directions based on the findings of the study.
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Appendices

Appendix A. AVID Program Application

Freedom High School AVID Program Application
NEW AVID Candidates

Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) is a program that helps students prepare and to get into college as well as become successful once they get there. AVID helps students improve their writing, reading, math and study skills that are so necessary to success in high school, college and in professional careers. In AVID, you will receive extra tutoring, field trips, career and college counseling, and extensive academic instruction. You will be working only with other students, who are working towards going to college and succeeding.

If you are interested in this challenging and rewarding class, please fill out this application and turn it in to Mrs. Knight (Morgan) in room 234. Once the application is reviewed, you will be contacted for an interview.

Name: __________________________ Grade: ______ Age: ______
Home Address: __________________________ ZIP Code: ______
City: __________________________
Teachers who know you best: __________________________
Your Previous School: __________________________
Do you plan to graduate? Yes No Do you plan to go to College? Yes No

Please answer the following questions in complete sentences.

1. What do you like most about school? ____________________________________

2. What do you like least about school? ____________________________________

3. What do you think is your strongest academic area? ________________________

4. What do you think is your weakest academic areas? ________________________

5. Why do you wish to be in the AVID program? ____________________________

6. How much time do you spend studying at home? ________________________
7. How do you make sure you use your time in class productively? __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________

8. Give an example of your use of self-discipline? __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________

9. Why do you want to go to College? __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________

10. Do your parents support you going to College? __________________________
    __________________________
    __________________________
    __________________________

11. What would you like to do in the future? __________________________
    __________________________
    __________________________
    __________________________

12. In what subject areas do you think you might like to major in college? __________________________
    __________________________
    __________________________
    __________________________

13. What kind of special help do you think you might need in the AVID program? __________________________
    __________________________
    __________________________
    __________________________

14. What else would you like us to know about you that will help us to evaluate your candidacy for the AVID program? __________________________
    __________________________
    __________________________
    __________________________

Signature: __________________________ Date: ____________________

Parent/Guardian’s Printed Name: __________________________

Parent/Guardian’s Signature: __________________________ Date: ____________________

Application Rcvd __________
Writing Sample __________
Interview Completed __________
Teacher Recommendation __________
Eligibility Rubric Completed __________
Acceptance/Denial Ltr sent __________
AVID Writing Sample

Name of Student ___________________ Incoming Grade ______

Using proper 3 - part essay format, explain your reasons for applying for AVID. You may want to consider the following topics in your essay:
- Why is AVID an important class to you?
- How do you think AVID will help you prepare for college?
- Explain any circumstances or experiences you may have that further explains your reasons for wanting to go to college.

You may attach your response on a separate sheet of paper, if you prefer.
Figure A1. Screen shot of the AVID program application. This Figure shows the complete AVID program application which every student need to submit in order to be considered for this elective.
Appendix B. Training Materials for Peer Review Online

How to Use L2 Literacy Wiki

1. go to http://l2literacy.wikispaces.com
2. click on “Sign in” in the top right corner of the screen.
3. type your username and password
4. read the message on the Home page of the wiki
5. click on the page with your name on the left side of the screen.
6. Choose one of the topics and write a short essay about it.

How to Create an Online Journal in Penzu.com

1. Go to www.penzu.com
2. Click on “Sign Up” at the top right of the screen.
3. Submit your first and last names, email, and password. Agree to the Terms of use and Privacy Policy and click on “Submit.”

Congratulations, you have just created your personal online journal!!

Peer Editing Online

1. go to http://l2literacy.wikispaces.com
2. click on “Sign in” in the top right corner of the screen;
3. type your username and password;
4. click on the page with your peer’s name on the left side of the screen;
5. read his/her essay from the beginning till the end;
6. click on “edit”;
7. read his/her essay and write down your comments (using a different color of the font);
8. click on “save”;
9. revise your writing (you may choose to use your peer’s suggestions or not). For this, click on “edit,” make changes, if necessary, and click on “save.”
10. open your new journals in Penzu.com and write your reflection. In the reflection, please write about
    • What you think about peer review;
    • benefits and disadvantages of peer editing;
    • Your experience with peer editing.
    • Other thoughts about peer editing.
11. When you are done writing your reflection, click on “Save”.

12. Click on “Share” and type the following email: ovorobel@usf.edu

13. Click on “Share.”

Thank you!!!
Appendix C. Interview 1 Protocol (Questions to Participant Students)

1. Please, describe what you think about the peer review process.

2. When you were giving and negotiating feedback to your peer, what was hard and what was easy during peer review process? Why?

3. When you were receiving and negotiating feedback from your peer, what was hard and what was easy during peer review process? Why?

4. What suggestions of your peer did you follow during the revision of your writing? Why?

5. What suggestions of your peer did you not follow during the revision of your writing? Why?

6. Is there anything else you wish to tell me at this time?
Appendix D. Interview 2 Protocol (Questions to Participant Students)

1. When did you start learning English?

2. What was your experience of learning English as an L2?

3. What technologies do you use for studying?

4. What is your experience in learning how to write in English?

5. What else would you like to add about your experience with peer review?

6. Is there anything else you wish to tell me at this time?
Appendix E. Interview 1 Protocol (Questions to Participant Teacher)

1. Could you please tell me a few words about yourself?

2. Why have you decided to include peer review in your classroom?

3. Why have you chosen such steps in peer review training?

4. What are your experiences of using peer review for ELLs’ literacy development?

5. Is there anything else you wish to tell me at this time?
Appendix F. Interview 2 Protocol (Questions to Participant Teacher)

1. What factors influence the adolescent ELLs’ literacy development in L2?

2. What would you add about peer review as a stage in the adolescent ELLs’ literacy development in L2?

3. What do you think about peer review online?

4. What difficulties have you faced when administering peer review in your class?

5. Is there anything else you wish to tell me at this time?
Appendix G. Field Notes

*By Oksana Vorobel (2012), University of South Florida*

Date:

Time:

Location:

Type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Note.* I adopted this form from Janesick (2011).
Appendix H. Sample of Researcher’s Reflective Journal Entry

Figure H1. Screen shot of the researcher’s reflective e-journal in penzu.com. This Figure shows one of the entries in the private e-journal where the researcher makes entries on the reflections during conducting the dissertation study.
Appendix I. Peer Editing Handouts

Peer-Editing Instructions

- Make sure that everyone in the group has a different colored writing utensil. Use the same color for each paper you read.

- Staple a blank editing sheet to the top of the first essay you receive. Write the author’s name where it belongs on the editing sheet. Write your name as the first editor.

- Read through the essay once. At this point do not make any marks on the paper; you are simply getting an overview of the essay.

- Reread the essay, this time noting any composition errors. Mark these clearly (using proofreader's marks), but do not correct the mistakes—only the author does that!

- Read the essay yet again, this time looking for structural problems or stylistic concerns. Write comments in the margins suggesting ways to improve the paper.

- Complete the Peer editing checklist – BE POSITIVE
Figure II. Screen shot of the peer editing instructions and checklist. This Figure shows the handouts the teacher distributed for peer review purposes in AVID 1 class.
Appendix J. Certificate of Completion

Certificate of Completion

Oksana Vorobel

Has Successfully Completed the Course in

Foundations in Human Research Protections at USF

On

Thursday, July 22, 2010

Figure J1. Screen shot of the researcher’s certificate of completion of the course in Foundations in Human Researcher Protections at USF.
Appendix K. Assent to Participate in Research (for ELL Participants)

Information for Persons under the Age of 18 Who Are Being Asked To Take Part in Research

IRB Study # 6946

Title of study: Peer Review Practices of Adolescent English Language Learners

Why am I being asked to take part in this research?

You are being asked to take part in a research study about peer review practices of English language learners. You are being asked to take part in this research study because you are an adolescent (12-17-year-old) English language learner who participates in peer review practices at school, writes for school assignments, and enjoys out-of-school writing. If you take part in this study, you will be one of about 7 English language learners at this site.

Who is doing this study?

The person in charge of this study is Oksana Vorobel. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Deoksoon Kim.

What is the purpose of this study?

By doing this study, we hope to learn

- what English language learners think about peer review as a part of school assignment and about peer review as a part of out-of-school writing.
• what opportunities from the context English language learners choose to use during peer review;

• what changes English language learners choose to make in their writing due to peer review practices.

Where is the study going to take place and how long will it last?

The study will take place at Freedom High School and online. It will last approximately 1 semester. The total amount of time you will be asked to volunteer for this study is approximately 20 hours over the next semesters in 2012.

What will you be asked to do?

• You will be asked to

  a) Participate in all peer review sessions in class that will be conducted by your teacher. The peer review sessions will not be additional assignments; they will be a part of the class you are taking.

  b) Write at least two drafts on any topic online and peer review other English language learner’s writing. Your writing and peer review online will not be a part of your school assignments. I will also ask you to make changes in your writing each time after peer review.

  c) Participate in about 4 interviews. Each of the interviews will last approximately 1 hour and will be conducted online through Skype.

  d) Create your own private e-journal in penzu.com which you will share with Oksana Vorobel. In your e-journals, you will write about any ideas or thoughts you may have about peer review sessions. I will ask you to write e-journal entries
after each peer review practice and after making revisions in your writing after peer review.

e) Allow me to analyze changes that you make in your writing due to peer review.

When you peer review other student’s writing, I will audio-record your conversation. In addition, I will record every interview in order to not forget or miss what you tell me. In the interviews, I will ask you about your opinion of different steps in peer review process, things you like or dislike about peer review practices, the process of peer review in general online and in the classroom, and so forth.

What things might happen if you participate?

To the best of our knowledge, your participation in this study will not harm you.

Is there benefit to me for participating?

We cannot promise that you will receive benefit from taking part in this research study.

What other choices do I have if I do not participate?

You have the alternative to choose not to participate in this research study. You should participate in the study only if you volunteer. You can drop out of the study at any time. Your decision to participate in the study or not to participate in the study will not affect your grade.

Do I have to take part in this study?

You should talk with your parents or guardian and others about taking part in this research study. If you do not want to take part in the study, that is your decision. You should take part in this study because you want to volunteer.

Will I receive any compensation for taking part in this study?

You will not receive any compensation for taking part in this study.
Who will see the information about me?

Your information will be added to the information from other people taking part in the study so no one will know who you are.

Can I change my mind and quit?

If you decide to take part in the study you still have the right to change your mind later. No one will think badly of you if you decide to stop participating. Also, the people who are running this study may need for you to stop. If this happens, they will tell you when to stop and why.

What if I have questions?

You can ask questions about this study at any time. You can talk with your parents, guardian or other adults about this study. You can talk with the person who is asking you to volunteer. If you think of other questions later, you can contact Oksana Vorobel at (813)481-1477 or IRB at USF at (813)974-5638.

Assent to Participate

I understand what the person conducting this study is asking me to do. I have thought about this and agree to take part in this study.

__________________________________________  ____________
Name of person agreeing to take part in the study             Date

__________________________________________
Signature of person agreeing to take part in the study

__________________________________________  ____________
Name of person providing information (assent) to subject             Date
Appendix L. Parental Permission to Participate in Research Involving Minimal Risk
(for Parents of ELLs)

Information for parents to consider before allowing their child to take part in this research study

IRB Study # 6946

The following information is being presented to help you and your child decide whether or not your child wishes to be a part of a research study. Please read this information carefully. If you have any questions or if you do not understand the information, we encourage you to ask the research.

We are asking you to allow your child to take part in a research study called:

**Peer Review Practices of Adolescent English Language Learners**

The person who is in charge of this research study is **Oksana Vorobel**. This person is called the Principal Investigator. However, other research staff may be involved and can act on behalf of the person in charge. She is being guided in this research by **Dr. Deoksoon Kim**.

The research will be conducted at **Freedom High School.**
Why is this research being done?

In this research I explore adolescent English language learners’ peer review practices. Peer review may be defined as “a collaborative activity involving students reading, critiquing, and providing feedback on each other’s writing, both to secure immediate textual improvement and to develop, over time, stronger writing competence via mutual scaffolding” (Hu, 2005, p. 321-322, based on Tsui & Ng, 2000; Zhu, 2001).

In particular, the purpose of this study is to find out

- what English language learners think about peer review as a part of school assignment and about peer review as a part of out-of-school writing.
- what opportunities from the context English language learners choose to use during peer review;
- what changes English language learners choose to make in their writing due to peer review practices.

Your child is being asked to take part in this research study because she/he is an adolescent English language learner who participates in peer review practices at school, writes for school assignments, and enjoys out-of-school writing.

Should your child take part in this study?

This informed consent form tells you about this research study. You can decide if you want your child to take part in it. This form explains:

- Why this study is being done.
- What will happen during this study and what your child will need to do.
- Whether there is any chance your child might experience potential benefits from being in the study.
• The risks of having problems because your child is in this study.

Before you decide:

• Read this form.

• Have a friend or family member read it.

• Talk about this study with the person in charge of the study or the person explaining the study. You can have someone with you when you talk about the study.

• Talk it over with someone you trust.

• Find out what the study is about.

• You may have questions this form does not answer. You do not have to guess at things you don’t understand. If you have questions, ask the person in charge of the study or study staff as you go along. Ask them to explain things in a way you can understand.

• Take your time to think about it.

The decision to provide permission to allow your child to participate in the research study is up to you. If you choose to let your child be in the study, then you should sign this form. If you do not want your child to take part in this study, you should not sign the form.

What will happen during this study?

Your child will be asked to spend about 20 hours during the next 2 semesters in 2012 in this study. In order to explore English language learners’ peer review practices in school and out of school, when peer review is a part of school assignment and when English
language learners do peer review for their writing, it will take us approximately one semester to collect data.

During the study, I will

- Observe classrooms with English language learners who will participate in the study approximately 3 hours per week. I will not interrupt the classes or disrupt the natural flow of classes.
- Observe and audio-record classes with peer review activities. I will also record English language learners’ conversations during peer review.
- Ask the participants to write at least two drafts on any topic online and peer review other English language learner’s writing. The writing and peer review online will not be a part of school assignments.
- Ask the participants to participate in about 4 interviews. Each of the interviews will last approximately 1 hour and will be conducted online through Skype and audio recorded.
- Ask the participants to create their own private e-journal in penzu.com which they will share with Oksana Vorobel. In e-journals, the participants will write about any ideas or thoughts you may have about peer review sessions. I will ask the participants to write e-journal entries after each peer review practice and after making revisions in your writing after peer review.
- Analyze English language learners’ revisions due to peer review after getting access to their first and subsequent drafts, written feedback for each other, and so forth.
Your child will need to attend school on the regular basis and be present for peer review activities. Your child will participate in all other activities online.

**How many other people will take part?**

About 7 English language learners and their teachers will take part in this study Freedom High School.

**What other choices do you have if you decide not to let your child to take part?**

If you decide not to let your child take part in this study, that is okay. Instead of being in this research study your child can choose not to participate.

**Will your child be compensated for taking part in this study?**

You will receive no payment or other compensation for taking part in this study.

**What will it cost you to let your child take part in this study?**

It will not cost you anything to let your child take part in the study.

**What are the potential benefits to your child if you let him/her take part in this study?**

We do not know if your child will gain any benefits by taking part in this study.

**What are the risks if your child takes part in this study?**

There are no known risks to those who take part in this study.

---

**Privacy and Confidentiality**

We will keep your child’s study records private and confidential. Certain people may need to see your child’s study records. By law, anyone who looks at your child’s records must keep them completely confidential. The only people who will be allowed to see these records are:
The research team, including the Principal Investigator, study coordinator, research nurses, and all other research staff.

Certain government and university people who need to know more about the study. For example, individuals who provide oversight on this study may need to look at your records. This is done to make sure that we are doing the study in the right way. They also need to make sure that we are protecting your rights and your safety.

Any agency of the federal, state, or local government that regulates this research. This includes the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP).

The USF Institutional Review Board (IRB) and its related staff who have oversight responsibilities for this study, staff in the USF Office of Research and Innovation, USF Division of Research Integrity and Compliance, and other USF offices who oversee this research.

We may publish what we learn from this study. If we do, we will not include your child’s name. We will not publish anything that would let people know who your child is.

What happens if you decide not to let your child take part in this study?

You should only let your child take part in this study if both of you want to. You or child should not feel that there is any pressure to take part in the study to please the study investigator or the research staff.

If you decide not to let your child take part:

• Your child will not be in trouble or lose any rights he/she would normally have.
• You child will still get the same services he/she would normally have.

You can decide after signing this informed consent form that you no longer want your child to take part in this study. We will keep you informed of any new developments which might affect your willingness to allow your child to continue to participate in the study. However, you can decide you want your child to stop taking part in the study for any reason at any time. If you decide you want your child to stop taking part in the study, tell the study staff as soon as you can.

• We will tell you how to stop safely. We will tell you if there are any dangers if your child stops suddenly.

Even if you want your child to stay in the study, there may be reasons we will need to withdraw him/her from the study. Your child may be taken out of this study if we find out it is not safe for your child to stay in the study or if your child is not coming for the study visits when scheduled. We will let you know the reason for withdrawing your child’s participation in this study.

You can get the answers to your questions, concerns, or complaints.

If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this study, call Oksana Vorobel at 813-481-1477.

If you have questions about your child’s rights, general questions, complaints, or issues as a person taking part in this study, call the USF IRB at (813) 974-5638.
Consent for My Child to Participate in this Research Study

It is up to you to decide whether you want your child to take part in this study. If you want your child to take part, please read the statements below and sign the form if the statements are true.

I freely give my consent to let my child take part in this study and authorize that my child’s information as agreed above, be collected/disclosed in this study. I understand that by signing this form I am agreeing to let my child take part in research. I have received a copy of this form to take with me.

_________________________________________________________  __________
Signature of Parent of Child Taking Part in Study                      Date

_________________________________________________________
Printed Name of Parent of Child Taking Part in Study
**Statement of Person Obtaining Informed Consent**

I have carefully explained to the parent of the child taking part in the study what he or she can expect from their child’s participation. I hereby certify that when this person signs this form, to the best of my knowledge, he/she understands:

- What the study is about;
- What procedures/interventions/investigational drugs or devices will be used;
- What the potential benefits might be; and
- What the known risks might be.

I can confirm that this research subject speaks the language that was used to explain this research and is receiving an informed consent form in the appropriate language. Additionally, this subject reads well enough to understand this document or, if not, this person is able to hear and understand when the form is read to him or her. The parent signing this form does not have a medical/psychological problem that would compromise comprehension and therefore makes it hard to understand what is being explained and can, therefore, give legally effective informed consent. The parent signing this form is not under any type of anesthesia or analgesic that may cloud their judgment or make it hard to understand what is being explained and, therefore, can be considered competent to give permission to allow their child to participate in this research study.

___________________________________________                          _______________
Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent                                   Date

___________________________________________
Printed Name of Person Obtaining Informed Consent
Appendix M. Informed Consent to Participate in Research (for Teachers of ELLs)

Information to Consider Before Taking Part in this Research Study

IRB Study # 6947

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Research studies include only people who choose to take part. This document is called an informed consent form. Please read this information carefully and take your time making your decision. Ask the researcher or study staff to discuss this consent form with you, please ask him/her to explain any words or information you do not clearly understand.

We are asking you to take part in a research study called:

Peer Review Practices of Adolescent English Language Learners

The person who is in charge of this research study is Oksana Vorobel. This person is called the Principal Investigator. However, other research staff may be involved and can act on behalf of the person in charge. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Deoksoon Kim.

The research will be conducted at Freedom High School.

Purpose of the study

In this research I explore adolescent English language learners’ peer review practices.

Peer review may be defined as “a collaborative activity involving students reading,
critiquing, and providing feedback on each other’s writing, both to secure immediate
textual improvement and to develop, over time, stronger writing competence via mutual

In particular, the purpose of this study is to:

• investigate adolescent English language learners’ perceptions of peer review for
school-based writing tasks and out-of-school writing;
• explore opportunities in the context that adolescent English language learners
choose to use during peer review;
• examine what changes adolescent English language learners choose to make in
their writing due to peer review practices.

Acknowledging the vast spread and use of technology, the focus of the study will be
on English language learners’ peer review practices in face-to-face classes as a part of
school-based writing process and in an online context where English language
learners will engage in peer reviewing each other’s writing.

The study will be conducted by the Ph.D. Candidate, University of South Florida –
Oksana Vorobel.

**Study Procedures**

If you take part in this study, you will be asked to:

• allow the Principal Investigator to explain the purpose of the study and the
informed consent procedures to the English language learners in your classroom.
It will take approximately 25 minutes and may be done during class time or
during the break between classes.
allow the Principal Investigator to observe your classes minimum 3 hours per week.

allow the Principal Investigator to audio-record peer review sessions in your classes.

provide the Principal Investigator with access to the written artifacts that are related to English language learners’ peer review procedures. Such artifacts may include English language learners’ first drafts, their final drafts, and participants’ written feedback for each other.

participate in interviews. The Principal Investigator will conduct interviews with participating teachers based upon necessity and until saturation in order to check information collected through observations and to supplement data collected from the ELLs. Each interview will last approximately one hour and will be scheduled based on convenience in terms of time for both the participants and the researcher. All interviews will be conducted online using Skype video-/audio-conferencing tool and will be audio-recorded. The Principal Investigator will conduct the training on how to use Skype if necessary.

Total Number of Participants

About 7 adolescent English language learners and maximum 7 teachers will take part in this study at Freedom High School.

Alternatives

You do not have to participate in this research study.

Benefits

We are unsure if you will receive any benefits by taking part in this research study.
Risks or Discomfort

This research is considered to be minimal risk. That means that the risks associated with this study are the same as what you face every day. There are no known additional risks to those who take part in this study.

Compensation

You will receive no payment or other compensation for taking part in this study.

Cost

There will be no additional costs to you as a result of being in this study.

Privacy and Confidentiality

We will keep your study records private and confidential. Certain people may need to see your study records. By law, anyone who looks at your records must keep them completely confidential. The only people who will be allowed to see these records are:

- The research team, including the Principal Investigator, study coordinator, research nurses, and all other research staff.

- Certain government and university people who need to know more about the study. For example, individuals who provide oversight on this study may need to look at your records. This is done to make sure that we are doing the study in the right way. They also need to make sure that we are protecting your rights and your safety.

- Any agency of the federal, state, or local government that regulates this research. This includes the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP).
• The USF Institutional Review Board (IRB) and its related staff who have oversight responsibilities for this study, staff in the USF Office of Research and Innovation, USF Division of Research Integrity and Compliance, and other USF offices who oversee this research.

We may publish what we learn from this study. If we do, we will not include your name.

We will not publish anything that would let people know who you are.

**Voluntary Participation /Withdrawal**

You should only take part in this study if you want to volunteer. You should not feel that there is any pressure to take part in the study. You are free to participate in this research or withdraw at any time. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits you are entitled to receive if you stop taking part in this study.

**You can get the answers to your questions, concerns, or complaints**

If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this study, or experience an adverse event or unanticipated problem, call Oksana Vorobel at 813-481-1477.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, general questions, or have complaints, concerns or issues you want to discuss with someone outside the research, call the USF IRB at (813) 974-5638.
Consent to Take Part in this Research Study

It is up to you to decide whether you want to take part in this study. If you want to take part, please sign the form, if the following statements are true.

I freely give my consent to take part in this study and authorize that my information as agreed above, be collected/disclosed in this study. I understand that by signing this form I am agreeing to take part in research. I have received a copy of this form to take with me.

__________________________________________  __________
Signature of Person Taking Part in Study                              Date

__________________________________________
Printed Name of Person Taking Part in Study
Statement of Person Obtaining Informed Consent

I have carefully explained to the person taking part in the study what he or she can expect from their participation. I hereby certify that when this person signs this form, to the best of my knowledge, he/she understands:

- What the study is about;
- What procedures will be used;
- What the potential benefits might be; and
- What the known risks might be.

I can confirm that this research subject speaks the language that was used to explain this research and is receiving an informed consent form in the appropriate language.

Additionally, this subject reads well enough to understand this document or, if not, this person is able to hear and understand when the form is read to him or her. This subject does not have a medical/psychological problem that would compromise comprehension and therefore makes it hard to understand what is being explained and can, therefore, give legally effective informed consent. This subject is not under any type of anesthesia or analgesic that may cloud their judgment or make it hard to understand what is being explained and, therefore, can be considered competent to give informed consent.

_____________________________________________                         _____________
Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent                       Date

_____________________________________________
Printed Name of Person Obtaining Informed Consent
Appendix N. Assent to Participate in Research (for Native Speakers of English)

Information for Persons under the Age of 18 Who Are Being Asked To Take Part in Research

IRB Study # 6946

Title of study: Peer Review Practices of Adolescent English Language Learners

Why am I being asked to take part in this research?

You are being asked to take part in a research study about peer review practices of English language learners. You are being asked to take part in this research study because you will participate in peer review practices with English language learners.

Who is doing this study?

The person in charge of this study is Oksana Vorobel. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Deoksoon Kim.

What is the purpose of this study?

By doing this study, we hope to learn

- what English language learners think about peer review as a part of school assignment and about peer review as a part of out-of-school writing.
- what opportunities from the context English language learners choose to use during peer review;
• what changes English language learners choose to make in their writing due to peer review practices.

Where is the study going to take place and how long will it last?

The study will take place at Freedom High School and online. It will last approximately 1 semester. The time you will spend on the participation in the study will be a part of your participation in peer review at school. You will spend no additional time on this research study.

What will you be asked to do?

• You will be asked to
  
  f) Allow Oksana Vorobel to record your peer review interaction with English language learners and use it for research purposes.
  
  g) Allow Oksana Vorobel to have access to all the written feedback you may give to English language learners during or after peer review and use it for research purposes.

What things might happen if you participate?

To the best of our knowledge, your participation in this study will not harm you.

Is there benefit to me for participating?

We cannot promise that you will receive benefit from taking part in this research study.

What other choices do I have if I do not participate?

You have the alternative to choose not to participate in this research study.
Do I have to take part in this study?

You should talk with your parents or guardian and others about taking part in this research study. If you do not want to take part in the study, that is your decision. You should take part in this study because you want to volunteer.

Will I receive any compensation for taking part in this study?

You will not receive any compensation for taking part in this study.

Who will see the information about me?

Your information will be added to the information from other people taking part in the study so no one will know who you are.

Can I change my mind and quit?

If you decide to take part in the study you still have the right to change your mind later. No one will think badly of you if you decide to stop participating. Also, the people who are running this study may need for you to stop. If this happens, they will tell you when to stop and why.

What if I have questions?

You can ask questions about this study at any time. You can talk with your parents, guardian or other adults about this study. You can talk with the person who is asking you to volunteer. If you think of other questions later, you can ask them.
**Assent to Participate**

I understand what the person conducting this study is asking me to do. I have thought about this and agree to take part in this study.

__________________________________________  _____________
Name of person agreeing to take part in the study  Date

__________________________________________
Signature of person agreeing to take part in the study

__________________________________________  _____________
Name of person providing information (assent) to subject  Date
Appendix O. Parental Permission to Participate in Research Involving Minimal Risk (for Parents of Adolescent Native Speakers of English)

Information for parents to consider before allowing their child to take part in this research study

IRB Study # 6946

The following information is being presented to help you and your child decide whether or not your child wishes to be a part of a research study. Please read this information carefully. If you have any questions or if you do not understand the information, we encourage you to ask the research.

We are asking you to allow your child to take part in a research study called:

Peer Review Practices of Adolescent English Language Learners

The person who is in charge of this research study is Oksana Vorobel. This person is called the Principal Investigator. However, other research staff may be involved and can act on behalf of the person in charge. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Deoksoon Kim.

The research will be conducted at Freedom High School.
Why is this research being done?

In this research I explore adolescent English language learners’ peer review practices. Peer review may be defined as “a collaborative activity involving students reading, critiquing, and providing feedback on each other’s writing, both to secure immediate textual improvement and to develop, over time, stronger writing competence via mutual scaffolding” (Hu, 2005, p. 321-322, based on Tsui & Ng, 2000; Zhu, 2001).

In particular, the purpose of this study is to find out

• what English language learners think about peer review as a part of school assignment and about peer review as a part of out-of-school writing.
• what opportunities from the context English language learners choose to use during peer review;
• what changes English language learners choose to make in their writing due to peer review practices.

Your child is being asked to take part in this research study because she/he will participate in peer review practices with English language learners.

Should your child take part in this study?

This informed consent form tells you about this research study. You can decide if you want your child to take part in it. This form explains:

• Why this study is being done.
• What will happen during this study and what your child will need to do.
• Whether there is any chance your child might experience potential benefits from being in the study.
• The risks of having problems because your child is in this study.
Before you decide:

- Read this form.
- Have a friend or family member read it.
- Talk about this study with the person in charge of the study or the person explaining the study. You can have someone with you when you talk about the study.
- Talk it over with someone you trust.
- Find out what the study is about.
- You may have questions this form does not answer. You do not have to guess at things you don’t understand. If you have questions, ask the person in charge of the study or study staff as you go along. Ask them to explain things in a way you can understand.
- Take your time to think about it.

The decision to provide permission to allow your child to participate in the research study is up to you. If you choose to let your child be in the study, then you should sign this form. If you do not want your child to take part in this study, you should not sign the form.

What will happen during this study?

The time your child will spend on the participation in the study will be a part of his/her participation in peer review at school. Your child will spend no additional time on this research study.

During the study, I will

h) record your child’s peer review interaction with English language learners and use
it for research purposes.

i) have access to all written feedback your child may give to English language learners during or after peer review and use it for research purposes.

Your child will need to attend school on the regular basis and be present for peer review activities.

**How many other people will take part?**

About 7 English language learners and their teachers will take part in this study Freedom High School.

**What other choices do you have if you decide not to let your child to take part?**

If you decide not to let your child take part in this study, that is okay. Instead of being in this research study your child can choose not to participate. Participation or nonparticipation in the study will not affect your child’s grade.

**Will your child be compensated for taking part in this study?**

You will receive no payment or other compensation for taking part in this study.

**What will it cost you to let your child take part in this study?**

It will not cost you anything to let your child take part in the study.

**What are the potential benefits to your child if you let him/her take part in this study?**

We do not know if your child will gain any benefits by taking part in this study.

**What are the risks if your child takes part in this study?**

There are no known risks to those who take part in this study.
Privacy and Confidentiality

We will keep your child’s study records private and confidential. Certain people may need to see your child’s study records. By law, anyone who looks at your child’s records must keep them completely confidential. The only people who will be allowed to see these records are:

- The research team, including the Principal Investigator, study coordinator, research nurses, and all other research staff.
- Certain government and university people who need to know more about the study. For example, individuals who provide oversight on this study may need to look at your records. This is done to make sure that we are doing the study in the right way. They also need to make sure that we are protecting your rights and your safety.
- Any agency of the federal, state, or local government that regulates this research. This includes the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP).
- The USF Institutional Review Board (IRB) and its related staff who have oversight responsibilities for this study, staff in the USF Office of Research and Innovation, USF Division of Research Integrity and Compliance, and other USF offices who oversee this research.

We may publish what we learn from this study. If we do, we will not include your child’s name. We will not publish anything that would let people know who your child is.
What happens if you decide not to let your child take part in this study?
You should only let your child take part in this study if both of you want to. You or child should not feel that there is any pressure to take part in the study to please the study investigator or the research staff.

If you decide not to let your child take part:

- Your child will not be in trouble or lose any rights he/she would normally have.
- You child will still get the same services he/she would normally have.

You can decide after signing this informed consent form that you no longer want your child to take part in this study.

You can get the answers to your questions, concerns, or complaints.

If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this study, call Oksana Vorobel at 813-481-1477.

If you have questions about your child’s rights, general questions, complaints, or issues as a person taking part in this study, call the USF IRB at (813) 974-5638.
Consent for My Child to Participate in this Research Study

It is up to you to decide whether you want your child to take part in this study. If you want your child to take part, please read the statements below and sign the form if the statements are true.

I freely give my consent to let my child take part in this study and authorize that my child’s information as agreed above, be collected/disclosed in this study. I understand that by signing this form I am agreeing to let my child take part in research. I have received a copy of this form to take with me.

__________________________________________________________    ____________
Signature of Parent of Child Taking Part in Study                Date

__________________________________________________________
Printed Name of Parent of Child Taking Part in Study
Statement of Person Obtaining Informed Consent

I have carefully explained to the parent of the child taking part in the study what he or she can expect from their child’s participation. I hereby certify that when this person signs this form, to the best of my knowledge, he/she understands:

- What the study is about;
- What procedures/interventions/investigational drugs or devices will be used;
- What the potential benefits might be; and
- What the known risks might be.

I can confirm that this research subject speaks the language that was used to explain this research and is receiving an informed consent form in the appropriate language. Additionally, this subject reads well enough to understand this document or, if not, this person is able to hear and understand when the form is read to him or her. The parent signing this form does not have a medical/psychological problem that would compromise comprehension and therefore makes it hard to understand what is being explained and can, therefore, give legally effective informed consent. The parent signing this form is not under any type of anesthesia or analgesic that may cloud their judgment or make it hard to understand what is being explained and, therefore, can be considered competent to give permission to allow their child to participate in this research study.

____________________________________  ______________
Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent  Date

___________________________________________
Printed Name of Person Obtaining Informed Consent
Appendix P. Peer Reviewer and Critical Friend Forms

I, Elizabeth Visedo, have served as a critical friend for “A Case Study of Peer Review Practices of Four Adolescent English Language Learners in Face-to-Face and Online Contexts” by Oksana Vorobel. In this role, I have worked with the researcher throughout the study in capacities such as providing support, challenging the researcher in the process of conducting the study, and assisting in emerging issues.

Signed: Elizabeth Visedo
Date: April 29, 2013

I, Alessandro Cesarano, have served as a peer reviewer for “A Case Study of Peer Review Practices of Four Adolescent English Language Learners in Face-to-Face and Online Contexts” by Oksana Vorobel. In this role, I have worked with the researcher throughout the study in capacities such as assessing the accuracy of the findings.

Signed: Alessandro Cesarano
Date: April 30, 2013
Appendix Q. IRB Approval

From: <eirb@research.usf.edu>
Date: Tue, Apr 3, 2012 at 7:16 AM
Subject: eIRB: Study Approved
To: ovorobel@mail.usf.edu

IRB Study Approved

To: Oksana Vorobel

RE: Peer Review Practices of Adolescent English Language Learners

PI: Oksana Vorobel

Link: Pro00006946

You are receiving this notification because the above listed study has received Approval by the IRB. For more information, and to access your Approval Letter, navigate to the project workspace by clicking the Link above.

WARNING: DO NOT REPLY. To ensure a timely response, please do not reply to this email. Direct all correspondence to Research Integrity & Compliance either through your project's workspace or the contact information below.

University of South Florida
Division of Research Integrity & Compliance - Office of Research and Innovation
3702 Spectrum Blvd Suite 155 - Tampa, FL 33612
About the Author

Oksana Vorobel received her Master Degree in English and German Languages and Foreign Literature from Precarpathian National Vasyl Stefanyk University, Ukraine in 2004. After teaching English as a foreign language and other courses to pre-service teachers at the same university for three years, she decided to pursue her Doctorate in Second Language Acquisition/Instructional Technology at the University of South Florida.

Her current research interests include second language literacy and writing and the use of technology for language learning and teaching. Teaching is her passion, driving her research activities and informing the research agenda. Her teaching experiences are multifaceted. She has taught various undergraduate university-level courses in the USA and abroad and worked as a Graduate Teaching Associate in the English Language Institute at USF. Her teaching experiences include teaching courses in face-to-face and online contexts, working with homogeneous classrooms where students share cultural and linguistic background and teaching multicultural student populations with different first languages and cultural, linguistic, and demographic backgrounds.