摘　　要

近年来，同伴反馈作为英语写作教学过程中一种新的评价方式，在二语习得和外语教学领域日益引发关注。大量研究从多个角度考察了不同写作背景下的同伴反馈，包括其有效性和益处、影响因素、学生的立场和动机等方面。研究结果表明，同伴反馈能较为有效地促进学生学习。然而，部分研究者认为只有当学生自身真正投入同伴反馈时，他们才能从中受益。

鉴于此，本研究试图探究高中英语写作课堂中学生对同伴反馈的投入。研究问题如下：（1）高中生在写作中提供哪些类型的同伴反馈？（2）高中生是如何在情感上、行为上和认知上投入同伴反馈的？（3）高、低水平的高中生对同伴反馈的投入有何差异？本研究的研究对象为 86 位来自浙江省某重点高中高一的两个平行班学生。根据学生不同的英语水平，将他们分为高水平组和低水平组。每位学生参与相同的应用文写作任务，完成初稿后进行同伴反馈活动，并根据同伴所给反馈修改作文。

通过对学生作文初稿和终稿、问卷、口头报告以及访谈数据的定量和定性分析，本研究主要得出以下结论：（1）高中生在同伴反馈中提供形式反馈、内容反馈与评价性反馈。具体而言，形式反馈大多为直接纠正拼写、措词、时态等错误；内容反馈更关注作文的结构；评价性反馈均为称赞之词。在这三种类型的反馈中，高中生倾向于提供形式反馈。这与他们有限的认知水平和语言能力，以及以往学习经历中对语法的重视程度有关。（2）高中生能够在情感上积极投入、行为和认知上广泛投入同伴反馈。在情感投入方面，他们有兴趣并有意愿参加同伴反馈活动，认为这是一次有益的经历，表现出积极的情绪和感受；在行为投入方面，他们接受了大多数的形式反馈和内容反馈，并通过询问同伴或老师、查询词典等方式修改作文；在认知投入方面，他们能够理解同伴反馈，经常使用比较、分析等认知策略和评价、监测等元认知策略。(3）高、低水平学生对同伴反馈的投入在情感、行为、认知维度均存在较大差异。对于低水平学生而言，情感投入的子维度间存在不平衡现象。虽然他们认可同伴反馈活动的价值，但对其表现出较低的兴趣和意愿，并伴有消极情绪。另外，他们对同伴反馈的行为和认知投入相对来

说处于表层水平。相较而言，高水平学生对同伴反馈普遍持积极的态度。他们能较为充分、深入地利用同伴反馈，在修改过程中也会采取多种认知和元认知策略。

基于上述发现，本研究提出以下教学启示：首先，教师应强调写作中内容的重要性并引导学生提供全面的同伴反馈。其次，教师可以教授学生如何有效利用各种资源和策略来修改作文，如情感调解策略、认知和元认知策略等，从而提高他们对同伴反馈的情感、行为和认知投入。最后，教师要充分了解学生的语言水平，并为不同层次的学生提供有针对性的指导和帮助。

关键词：学生投入；同伴反馈；英语写作

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS I

ABSTRACT II

摘　　要 V

CONTENTS VII

LISTS OF TABLES IX

LISTS OF FIGURES X

Chapter One: Introduction 1

1.1 Research background 1

1.2 Research significance 3

1.3 Layout of the thesis 4

Chapter Two: Literature Review 5

2.1 Definitions of key concepts 5

2.1.1 Definitions of peer feedback 5

2.1.2 Definitions of student engagement 7

2.2 Theoretical foundations 10

2.2.1 Process writing 10

2.2.2 Cooperative learning 12

2.2.3 Zone of Proximal Development 14

2.3 Relevant studies at home and abroad 15

2.3.1 Relevant studies on peer feedback on writing 15

2.3.2 Relevant studies on student engagement with feedback 18

Chapter Three: Research Methodology 22

3.1 Research questions 22

3.2 Research subjects 22

3.3 Research instruments 24

3.3.1 Questionnaire 24

3.3.2 Verbal report 26
3.3.3 Interview 27
3.4 Data collection 27
3.5 Data analysis 30
Chapter Four: Results and Discussion 35
4.1 General patterns in peer feedback 35
4.2 Student engagement with peer feedback 39
4.2.1 Affective engagement 39
4.2.2 Behavioral engagement 43
4.2.3 Cognitive engagement 47
4.3 Differences in LP and HP students' engagement with peer feedback 51
4.3.1 Differences in affective engagement 52
4.3.2 Differences in behavioral engagement 55
4.3.3 Differences in cognitive engagement 59
Chapter Five: Conclusion 64
5.1 Major findings 64
5.2 Implications 66
5.3 Limitations and recommendations for further research 68
REFERENCES 69
APPENDICES 78
Appendix 1: Questionnaire 78
Appendix 2: Guide for verbal reports 81
Appendix 3: Guide for the semi-structured interviews 82
Appendix 4: Requirements of the writing task and the sample composition 83
Appendix 5: A sample of the original draft and the revised draft 84
浙江师范大学学位论文诚信承诺书 85
浙江师范大学学位论文独创性声明 86
学位论文使用授权声明 86

LISTS OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Three dimensions of student engagement with peer feedback 10

Table 3.1 Independent samples test of language proficiency between two classes 23

Table 3.2 Independent samples test of language proficiency between LP and HP groups 23

Table 3.3 Items about students' affective and cognitive engagement with peer feedback in questionnaire 25

Table 3.4 Reliability statistics of questionnaire (N=46) 25

Table 3.5 Factor analysis of questionnaire (N=46) 26

Table 3.6 Data collection procedures 28

Table 3.7 Coding schemes for peer feedback 32

Table 3.8 Revision analysis categories for form-focused feedback 33

Table 4.1 Feedback focus in peer feedback (N=86) 35

Table 4.2 Form-focused feedback (N=86) 36

Table 4.4 Descriptive analysis of affective engagement with peer feedback (N=80) . 40

Table 4.5 Revision operations in response to peer feedback (N=86) 44

Table 4.6 Descriptive analysis of cognitive engagement with peer feedback (N=80) 48

Table 4.7 Independent samples test of affective engagement between LP and HP groups 52

Table 4.8 LP students' revision operations in response to peer feedback (N=40) 56

Table 4.9 HP students' revision operations in response to peer feedback (N=46) 56

Table 4.10 Comparison of LP and HP students' revision operations 57

Table 4.11 Independent samples test of cognitive engagement between LP and HP groups 60

LISTS OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Ellis's framework for investigating feedback 8

Figure 2.2 Model of process writing 11

Figure 4.1 Example 1: An original copy of peer feedback to Guo (pseudonym) 37

Figure 4.2 Example 2: An original copy of peer feedback to Lu (pseudonym) 37

Figure 4.3 Example 3: An original copy of peer feedback to Li (pseudonym) 38

Figure 4.4 Example 4: An original copy of peer feedback to Zhou (pseudonym) 38

Figure 4.5 Example 5: An original copy of peer feedback to Gao (pseudonym) 44

Figure 4.6 Example 6: An original copy of peer feedback to Xu (pseudonym) 45

Figure 4.7 Example 7: An original copy of peer feedback to Wang (pseudonym) 45

Figure 4.8 Example 8: An original copy of peer feedback to Cao (pseudonym) 45

Figure 4.9 Example 9: An original copy of peer feedback to Zhou (pseudonym) 46

Figure 4.10 Comparison of affective engagement between LP and HP students 53

Figure 4.11 Comparison of awareness of peer feedback between LP and HP students60

Figure 4.12 Example 10: An original copy of peer feedback to Ge (pseudonym) 61

Figure 4.13 Comparison of meta-cognitive operations between LP and HP students 62

Figure 4.14 Comparison of cognitive operations between LP and HP students 62

Chapter One: Introduction

As a brief introduction to the thesis, this chapter comprises three parts: the research background, the significance of the study as well as the overall structure of the thesis.

1.1 Research background

As a conventional tool deployed by second language instructors, feedback, which refers to a kind of input from the reader to the writer (Keh, 1990), has been extensively studied and hotly debated in a wide range of fields like second language acquisition and foreign language writing. Established literature has provided a plethora of theoretical discussions, empirical studies and pedagogical recommendations for different sources or methods of feedback. Traditionally, teacher feedback is the most prevalent assessment in English writing classes. Students hand in their compositions and then teachers review every piece of the written text and correct the linguistic errors or content-related issues. There is no gainsaying that it is a "tedious and unrewarding chore" for teachers on occasions. Though teacher feedback plays a significant role in students' writing improvement, a part of researchers begin to question whether the benefits of teacher feedback can justify its drawbacks.

With a substantial shift from a teacher-centered approach to a learner-centered approach, peer feedback, as a brand new method of assessment, is gradually gaining ground in recent years. Drawing support from process writing theory, cooperative learning theory and sociocultural theory, peer feedback puts a premium on students' active involvement in assessment. In a real communicative context, students make evaluations on the level, value or quality of each other's writing products or performance (Topping, 2009). Each of them plays a dual role both as a reviewer and a receiver. They review peers' drafts and offer various comments; meanwhile, they receive peer feedback and make corresponding revisions. As supported by multitudinous studies, peer feedback serves as the facilitation and propeller of

students' learning. On the one hand, students can draw on others' merits to offset their own weaknesses; on the other hand, they tend to be more confident in writing and more motivated and self-driven in learning (Chong, 2017).

According to General Senior High School Curriculum Standards (2020), the development of writing ability is one of the important curriculum objectives of English instruction in China. Nevertheless, students' relatively low writing ability seems to be a major obstacle to the overall development of their language ability for a long time. Considering the positive effects of peer feedback on promoting students' writing, there are chances that peer feedback can provide an effective solution to the long-standing problems in English writing instruction (Cui et al., 2019). As suggested in New Curriculum Standards, high school teachers are highly expected to emphasize the dominant position of students in evaluation and guide them to take an active part in peer feedback activities with proper methods and feasible tools.

Though peer feedback is recommended by a host of educators and researchers, big question marks still hang over how and to what extent students engage with peer feedback activities. As a critical link that associates the provision of feedback with its effects on students' writing performance, the construct of student engagement proves to have great potential in improving learning (Han & Hyland, 2015; Zheng & Yu, 2018; Zhang & Hyland, 2022). With a view to providing a comprehensive picture of student engagement with feedback, Ellis (2010) proposed a tripartite framework. Specifically, student engagement with feedback can be investigated from three perspectives: affection, behavior and cognition. These three dimensions are interdependent as a dynamic continuum and will be mediated by a wide range of variables such as individual factors (e.g. age, language ability) and contextual factors (e.g. the classroom context).

Against the above background, the present study attempts to explore how high school students engage with peer feedback affectively, behaviorally and cognitively. Furthermore, the types of peer feedback and the variation of language proficiency are investigated as the contextual factor and the individual factor to offer a more thorough

understanding of student engagement with peer feedback in high school English writing classes.

1.2 Research significance

The present study, which intends to examine how students engage with peer feedback in the high school English writing context, is of great theoretical and practical significance.

From the theoretical perspective, this study is expected to have a nuanced understanding of high school students' engagement with peer feedback. While existing literature has already shed some light on peer feedback, more efforts are still required to revisit its effectiveness in different writing contexts. As to studies on student engagement with feedback, a majority of research has primarily focused on the sole dimension, which is insufficient to uncover the intricate nature of student engagement. Apart from the above, most are naturalistic case studies at the university or college level. There is a scarcity of research delving into student engagement with peer feedback in the high school English writing context, thereby leaving a sizable gap in this field. Considering that, this multidimensional investigation is likely to provide more references for future studies on the relevant topic.

In terms of practical aspects, the current research can not only facilitate students' involvement in their writing but also provide teachers with some pedagogical implications for enhancing student engagement with peer feedback in high school English writing classes. Despite an ever-growing number of theoretical and empirical support for peer feedback, it has not turned into a common practice for high school students, particularly those who speak highly of the role of the teacher and are accustomed to relying on teacher feedback due to their long-term learning experiences. As a new attempt, unfamiliarity and doubts about peer feedback are inevitable. By investigating student engagement with peer feedback, teachers can have a deeper understanding of students' responses to peer feedback and take effective and targeted measures to improve their feedback uptake, thereby maximizing the pedagogical

value of peer feedback and exploring its potential benefits for students' writing development.

1.3 Layout of the thesis

Five chapters make up this thesis. Chapter One serves as an introductory part, briefly describing the research background, the significance of the study as well as the overall structure of the thesis. Chapter Two starts with the definitions of peer feedback and student engagement, followed by the explanation of the theoretical foundations including process writing, cooperative learning and Zone of Proximal Development. Previous studies on peer feedback and student engagement at home and abroad are also reviewed in this chapter. Chapter Three elaborates on the overall design of the study in terms of the research questions, subjects, instruments, along with data collection and analysis. Chapter Four provides a discussion on the results of data analysis, together with possible explanations. Chapter Five summarizes major findings and proposes some implications. At the end of this chapter, the limitations of the study are acknowledged and recommendations for further research are supplied as well.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

This chapter, aiming to present a comprehensive and detailed literature review, consists of three parts. Specifically, the definitions of key concepts are introduced first, including the definitions of peer feedback and student engagement. Then the theoretical foundations of this study are elaborated, followed by a review of previous studies both at home and abroad.

2.1 Definitions of key concepts

The core concepts of this study relate to peer feedback and student engagement. In this section, a variety of views aired by both domestic and foreign scholars are reviewed.

2.1.1 Definitions of peer feedback

Universally acknowledged as an indispensable step in the process of English writing instruction, feedback serves as a catalyst for students' writing improvement. According to Keh (1990), feedback on writing refers to a kind of input from the reader to the writer with the provision of comments, questions, and suggestions to modify the composition. With regard to the source of feedback, there are teacher feedback, peer feedback, self-feedback as well as computer-mediated feedback (Liu et al., 2020). Traditionally, teacher feedback is ubiquitous in English writing classes. Nevertheless, with a remarkable transformation from a teacher-centered approach to a learner-centered approach, peer feedback has gradually gained ground in the field of second language writing since the 1980s.

Peer feedback, also known as "peer assessment", "peer evaluation", "peer response" or "peer review", has aroused great attention among academics both nationally and internationally. According to Falchikov (2007), peer feedback on writing relates to an integrated activity in which learners participate in responding to writing. They provide and receive grades or comments on each other's writing

products or performance based on the established criteria. In doing so, learners are set in a real communicative context to practice language, which calls for their interactive skills including reading, writing, speaking, listening and thinking. Peer feedback can also be identified as "an arrangement for equal-status learners to consider and specify the level, value, or quality of their writing products or performance" by Topping (2009). Based on the definitions of peer feedback given abroad, researchers at home have also shown their understandings. Yang et al. (2013) indicated that in a peer feedback session, learners work in pairs or groups to read each other's drafts, pose questions and provide comments or suggestions. In addition, Wu (2013) reckoned peer feedback as a paradigm of social interaction in which the writer and the reader co-negotiate and co-construct the composition.

Considering the wide range of views expressed above, the definition of peer feedback provided by Liu and Hansen (2002) is adopted in the present study. That is, "peer feedback" refers to an interactive activity of commenting on and critiquing each other's compositions in either oral or written way. In the whole process, each learner plays a dual role as a reviewer and a receiver alike. On the one hand, the reviewers peer-review others' drafts and offer a variety of comments and advice; on the other hand, they receive feedback from peers and deal with it in subsequent revisions.

With regard to the mode of providing feedback, there are oral peer feedback and written peer feedback. Written feedback from peers can be further classified into various types in terms of feedback scope, feedback focus and feedback strategy.

Feedback scope, referring to the extent to which feedback is provided, can be categorized into comprehensive, focused and unfocused feedback (Van Beuningen et al., 2012). Comprehensive feedback relates to an all-round correction of every error in writing. Unfocused feedback consists of feedback on a wide range of errors. In contrast, focused feedback involves feedback only on a selective number of errors.

According to the focus and functional type, feedback can be classified into two types: local and global feedback (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019). Local feedback refers to

以上内容仅为本文档的试下载部分，为可阅读页数的一半内容。如要下载或阅读全文，请访问：https://d.book118.com/116045154132010202