Quantifying Incorporation of Feedback on Written Essays

Joel HENSLEY

Abstract

This small-scale study is an initial examination of both peer and teacher feedback and its incorporation into revisions on short essays produced by undergraduate EFL students as part of the requirements of an essay writing course. This exploratory investigation is part of ongoing research into the order and incorporation of both global peer comments and local teacher corrections on a series of essays in an introductory undergraduate writing course at a public university in Japan. The current study examined, globally from peer review and locally from teacher correction, both the amount of feedback given on and the extent to which students incorporated said feedback into future versions of essays, and whether they did so successfully. By quantifying peer and teacher feedback, the current study was able to examine the change exhibited by a small group of students over the course of five essays. Results indicate that students do not regularly incorporate every instance of feedback into their writing, and that they frequently do not incorporate feedback correctly. However, the extent of each type of feedback's incorporation and accuracy varied across writing assignments and time.

Key Words: writing feedback, peer review, writing process, error correction

This study is partially the result of the kind of casual comment often made between teachers. Several years ago, I was talking with Dr. Richard Hodson, a current colleague, about how our respective sections of an essay writing course were going, when one of us mentioned the order in which we give feedback to the students during the revisions in the writing process. We discovered, almost by accident, that the first and second drafts' feedback was being administered in reverse order in our respective classes. In my class, students peer reviewed their first draft for global issues, revised to a second draft, received local error feedback from me, and then produced a third, final draft: my class did a global check and then a local. In Dr. Hodson's class, however, the global peer review and local teacher corrections were carried out in reverse order: his class did a local check and then a global. Once we realized this was the case, we felt it was only natural to try and work out a way to compare the two classes' performance and see if the order of feedback made a difference in the final essays being produced.

We carried out an initial study in an attempt to quantify, for comparison, our classes' changes in performance on their essays across a semester (Hensley & Hodson 2011). We did this by quantifying the global criteria into 12 common elements expected on all of the essays in the course. This included questions such as (a) Is there enough background information in the introduction?, (b) Does every body

paragraph contain a topic sentence with a topic and focus?, and (c) Has the essay been formatted correctly? (see Appendix for the full list of global criteria). These 12 criteria we quantified in a simple binary yes/no checklist. Thus, each essay received a score out of 12. Additionally, first individually and then averaged together in discussion, we gave each essay a holistic score out of 10. Likewise, for the local criteria, in order to quantify student performance on each essay, we used three criteria: the percent of sentences in each essay which, by averaging our assessments together, were error-free; a Gunning-Fog readability score (Flynn & King 2013) to gauge the level at which students were writing; and average sentence length, which served as a measure of fluency. We discovered that, regardless of L2 (second language) level (English, in this case, as measured by the TOEIC), students performed higher throughout the semester on the criteria (global vs. local) for which feedback was provided first in the writing process. Hence, for my class, on global feedback, which came first in the writing process, my students out-performed their counterparts, who were receiving the local feedback first, and vice versa.

This was only an initial look into the effect of feedback on students' essay writing. While we discovered some promising avenues in which to continue our study of this writing feedback, it soon became clear that a closer look at just how much of the received feedback students were attempting to incorporate into the subsequent versions of their essays was necessary. Our initial study (Hensley & Hodson 2011) did not collect data on this aspect of the revision process, so we knew that a future study would be necessary; we knew what order each class was carrying out the writing process in, but we had no way to measure just to what extent students actually incorporated the feedback they were receiving into improving subsequent drafts of their essays. That, as it were, is where the current, and most recent, study derives from.

The Current Study

As mentioned in the previous section, the current study was an attempt to quantify just to what extent students are receiving and then incorporating both global and local feedback into their writing. For clarification, in the current study, global feedback was defined as that addressing overall structure, style, and content of the essay. Local feedback included mechanics such as grammar, vocabulary, word choice, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation. The study was carried out in an essay writing class I taught in the autumn semester (October 2012 to February 2013), which met once a week for 90 minutes. The total enrollment of the class was low at only 12 students. It is a basic introduction to essay writing course, and thus covers topics such as a review of basic paragraph structure, the five-paragraph essay, thesis statements, and different types of essays (classification, compare/contrast, cause/effect, etc.). Over the course of the semester, students wrote a "cold" diagnostic essay, a paragraph, five mid-term essays, and a final essay. The writing process, consisting of a first draft, a peer review of global criteria, a second draft, a teacher check of local criteria, and a final third draft, was carried out on the paragraph and five mid-term essays.

For the purposes of data collection on the current study, however, not all of the above course work was utilized. The diagnostic essays were not included because their purpose was only to provide an idea of students' capabilities coming into the class, and therefore no revisions took place. The final essay was also not included as it, being the final assessment of the course, was not put through the full revision process either (although students were encouraged to work with a partner and try to apply what they had learned about the writing process during the course). Also, while the full writing process was carried out upon it, the paragraph assignment was not included in the current data set. This is due largely to the fact that the

criteria checked on the paragraph were rather different from the essays (no thesis statement, etc.). This left the five mid-semester essays.

Unfortunately, as classes often go, not all 12 students completed all the course work by the end of the semester. Since including students who had not participated in large portions of the feedback process could potentially skew the data, any student with more than two absences (out of 15 class meetings) or missing more than two parts of any mid-term essay assignment (draft, peer review, etc.) was left out of this study. Ultimately, six students remained that met the full criteria for inclusion in the study. Of these six, all were Japanese females, between the ages of 19 and 21. Five of the six were third year students at the time, and one was a second year. All six of the students maintained a positive attitude in class and made an effort to complete all the assignments throughout the semester. This naturally may also have affected the data collected, since such motivated students are more likely to do what is asked of them, which in this case meant incorporating feedback into their essays. There is no doubt that, were this same study carried out with a group of less-motivated students, the results would likely be different. Still, as this study is exploratory in nature and merely an initial attempt to quantify essay revisions, and allowing that the course in which it was conducted is an elective with a TOEIC requirement for admission, it is worth proceeding in order to determine if said quantification is indeed plausible.

Data Collection

Five mid-term essays and six eligible students allowed for a total of 30 essays which were able to be quantified for use. Average word count for the 30 essays was 440 words, and most essays were of the standard five-paragraph style. Some compare/contrast essays, which were done in the block style, were only four paragraphs in length, but this did not alter the feedback process or the quantification of the data collected.

All data were collected by manually adding up criteria on students' essays. As in the writing process used in the course itself, global criteria data were quantified first. This was done in two parts using photocopies of the peer review checklist handouts that students completed in class to check one another's first drafts. As mentioned above, the checklist criteria were binary in a yes/no format and worded so that any *no* answer was an issue that students were to address when revising their second drafts. Thus, the first data quantified were simply the number of *no* checks per essay. This number could then be averaged across the six students to give an average number of *no* checks per essay.

The global peer review handout also included a section for student comments. This was a free space in which students could give general advice, praise, or make suggestions to their peer review partner. This was also quantified for each essay. However, the way in which quantification was carried out was different than the binary *no* checks from above. For the student-to-student comments, each comment was counted separately. For instance, one student may have suggested that her partner add details/examples to a particular body paragraph as well as check to make sure her body paragraphs have concluding sentences. These two suggestions were counted as separate points. Next, using the comment from the peer review handout, I compared the first and second drafts of the essay. Based on how the author chose to address the feedback she received from her partner, one of three possible scores was given. If the author did not address the issue raised by her peer review, that point received a score of zero (0). If the author attempted to address the point which had been raised, but did not do so successfully or appropriately, it received

a score of one (1). And if the author correctly addressed the point which had been raised, it was given a score of two (2). This provided a score out of two where the closer the score was to two, the more the author had (correctly) addressed the point raised. Naturally, the closer to zero the score, the less the author had successfully revised her first draft based on her peer reviewer's comments. For example, if four peer reviewer comments were given, and three of these were addressed correctly by the author, but one was not altered in any way, then she would receive six out of eight possible points. This would average to a score of 1.5, and this quantified score was used to evaluate the incorporation of peer comments.

Local criteria, which were teacher-checked on the second draft of the essays after students had revised their first drafts based on the peer review, were quantified differently than the global. There were essentially two kinds of local feedback given. One was in coded feedback where I did not provide the appropriate correction. Instead, the error was identified and an error code was provided. The error was identified by underlining if a word, or circling if punctuation, for example. The codes consisted of items such as *sp* for spelling error, *vt* for verb tense error, and *ww* for wrong word choice. In this type of feedback, it was the student's job to identify the code used, understand the error, and correct it accordingly. The total amount of coded feedback without corrections provided was counted. Moreover, similar to the addressing of peer comments in the global feedback, a score out of two was given based on whether the student author had revised her error correctly (2), revised her error, but did so incorrectly or inappropriately (1), or made no revision at all (0). Again, this averaged scored out of two provided a quantified value for how much students were incorporating revisions based on the teacher's local check of their second drafts.

The second type of local feedback was where the correction was provided by writing it directly on the essay paper without the use of any coding. This type of feedback was used for a variety of reasons, depending on the error, including issues such as incorrect word choice which the student was not likely to know, misused articles (*a*, *an*, and *the*), and the deletion of unnecessary words. The total number of corrections provided without coding was also counted. Likewise, the extent to which students incorporated the corrections into their essays on the third draft was quantified as a score out of two in the same way as the coded local feedback above.

Thus, quantification of the incorporation and accuracy of feedback and corrections at both the global and local levels was possible. The global level was assigned two values: a total number of *no* checks on the peer review handout, and an averaged value out of 2 reflecting the extent to which students incorporated (correctly) their peers' feedback and suggestions. Similarly, the incorporation of local corrections feedback was quantified in two values out of 2: the extent of (correctly) incorporated revisions based on coded feedback given without answers provided, and the extent of (correctly) incorporated revisions based on provided corrections without any kind of coding.

Results and Discussion

While the data collected were not extensive, coming from only 30 student essays, there do exist both expected and unexpected results which warrant discussion. This section is arranged in the order of the writing process used in class and the data collection described above, beginning with peer review global criteria and continuing on to my teacher's local corrections, both coded without any answers provided and uncoded corrections with answers supplied.

Global Peer Review

As might be expected, despite the fact that each peer review checklist handout consisted of about 12 *yes/no* items, most student peer reviewers gave *yes* responses for the majority of the criteria. Naturally, a profusion of *no* responses would have indicated students were not applying the studied course material, so few *no* responses were encouraging from a pedagogical perspective. Moreover, given the classroom culture of Japan, overly-critical peer reviews may have caused social issues affecting class and/or personal dynamics and were therefore most likely avoided by students. This is largely speculation on my part, as student motivation was not investigated in this study. From the standpoint of the current research, this paucity of *no* responses unfortunately does not lead to a very rich data set. Out of a possible 360 *yes/no* responses on the peer review handouts, only 17 *no* responses were given. Recall, however, that the peer review handout contained a comments section where students could add detailed feedback or suggestions. When the peer review data were analyzed, every *no* response checked was accompanied by a peer comment on the handout. In fact, more peer comments were given in total (29) than *no* responses on the handouts (17). Thus, for the remainder of this paper, students' incorporation of the 29 peer comments, which include the *no* checks, will be used.

The 29 peer comments averaged 0.967 comments given per essay. Of those 29 peer comments, 25 (86.2%) were addressed by the student authors, who attempted revisions based on said peer comments, when subsequently revising their essays. The remaining 4 (13.8%) unincorporated peer comments were not addressed by the student authors in revised versions. Of the 25 peer comments that were incorporated, 3 (12%) were addressed incorrectly; student authors did attempt to address what their peer reviewers had commented on, but their revisions did not appropriately revise the error. Lastly, 22 (88%) of the 25 incorporated peer comments were revised correctly by student authors. Thus, from a total of 29 peer comments (including no responses) given, 22 (75.9%) were addressed and incorporated correctly in revisions.

The amount of peer comments given on any one essay ranged rather widely: some essays received neither *no* responses on the checklist nor any peer comments. Only one student received at least one peer comment on all five essays, and no student received zero *no* checks (12 *yes* checks) on all five essays. Across all of the six students in the current study, the peer comments per essay ranged from four (0.667 per student) to nine (1.5 per student). Total numbers of peer comments across the five essays were as follows: 9, 6, 4, 6, 6. The overall trend was thus a decrease in the number of peer comments given, with an average of 6.2 per essay across the six students. Naturally, this may reflect students' improvement in their writing and signify a decreasing need for revisions of global criteria, but this cannot be determined according to the current study. At the same time, the number of students receiving 12 *yes* responses on the global criteria checklist increased from 3 (50%) on the first essay (average 11.3 *yes* responses) to 5 (83.3%) on the fifth essay (averaging 11.7 *yes* responses).

In order to compare students' incorporation of peer comments across the five essays equally, however, a weighted average was necessary. Weighted averages were determined by dividing the rate of incorporation (n/2) by the total number of peer comments for that essay. For instance, on the first essay, there were a total of nine peer comments, with an average incorporation rate of 1.67 out of 2. On the third essay, however, only two peer comments were given, with an average incorporation rate of 0.25 out of 2. Interestingly, while the total amount of peer comments given exhibited a downward trend, the amount of incorporation of peer comments demonstrated a slight upward trend during the semester. On the first essay,

the weighted average was 0.186 (1.67/2 average rate of incorporation on 9 peer comments), and the fifth essay's was 0.25 (1.5/2 average rate of incorporation on 6 peer comments). This means, of course, that students were, on average, attempting to incorporate peer comments more as the semester went on, and were doing so more accurately, albeit according to fewer overall peer comments.

To sum up, the total number of peer comments given on each essay across the six students decreased over the five essays, but the extent to which students attempted to incorporate peer comments into their revisions, and were able to do so correctly, increased to a limited extent. There exists the possibility that the act of performing peer reviews themselves for others may have affected students' own (correct) incorporation of peer comments, but this cannot be determined by the current study. It does compromise an avenue of possible future research, however.

Local Teacher Corrections

The first type of local teacher corrections, made on the second draft of students' essays following the global peer check, was those corrections given in code (*sp*, *vt*, *ww*, etc.) without the correct answer provided. The average number of coded corrections given per essay was 30.8. Taking into account that each coded correction received a score of n/2 based on how correctly it was incorporated in revisions, there was an average total of 61.6 incorporation points (30.8 coded corrections x 2 points each) available. The average number across all students and essays of coded corrections addressed (but not necessarily correctly) was 29.8 (96.8%), and the average number of coded corrections incorporated correctly was 25.6 (83.1%). This produced an average rate of correct incorporation of coded local feedback from the teacher of 1.79/2.

The average rate at which students incorporated coded local corrections displayed an overall upward trend across the five essays, beginning at 1.68/2 (84.0%) and ending at 1.83/2 (91.4%), a 0.15/2 (7.4%) average increase across the six students. Among the students, four out of six correctly addressed more coded local errors at the end of the semester than they did at the beginning.

Looking at total corrections incorporated in revisions (whether or not they were addressed correctly), 5/6 students began at a rate at or above 93%, and all six students ended on the fifth essay at a rate above 93%. The one student who began at a lower rate of incorporation of corrections was something of an outlier at 70.6% corrections incorporated. However, by the fifth essay, she increased to a rate equivalent to the other five students. Additionally, out of the 30 essays in the current study, on 14 of them (46.7%) students addressed 100% of coded local corrections (including those revisions which were carried out incorrectly). This number also displayed an upward trend, doubling from 2/6 students on the first essay to 4/6 students on the fifth essay.

Finally, the amount of coded local corrections that were revised correctly by the students, while overall less than the total amount addressed, presented a similar pattern. The amount of correct revisions ranged more widely, averaging 75.3% correct on the first essay, and 84.1% on the fifth essay, an increase of 8.8%. Five out of the six students correctly revised at least 71% of the coded local errors on the first essay, and the same number of students correctly revised at least 75% on the fifth essay. The outlying student described above correctly revised a lesser amount of errors (by an average of 17%) on 4/5 of the essays and only had a higher rate of incorporation than one other student on the fifth essay, further marking her as an outlier.

The second type of local teacher corrections were those given as-is without coding (e.g. adding articles, deleting words, and providing unusual or specialized vocabulary items). The average number of uncoded

corrections given per essay was 27.2 (with an average 54.4 total possible n/2 incorporation points: 27.2 uncoded corrections x 2 points each). The average number of uncoded feedback addressed (but not necessarily correctly) across all students and essays was 25.9 (95.2%), and the average number of uncoded feedback incorporated correctly was 25.4 (93.4%). This produced an average rate of correct incorporation of uncoded local feedback from the teacher of 1.87/2.

The average rate at which students incorporated uncoded local corrections also displayed an overall upward trend throughout the course. The average rate of incorporation of uncoded local feedback began at 94.0% (1.88/2) on the first essay and ended at 96.9% (1.94/2) on the fifth. The average increase was only 2.9% (0.06/2), but this is not surprising as students started at such a high rate. Five out of the six students' rate of incorporated uncoded corrections never dropped below 90% across all five essays. The same outlying student from the coded local corrections described above was also an outlier on these uncoded corrections. On her first essay, she incorporated corrections at a rate of 84%, which was higher than her rate of incorporation of coded local feedback (70.6%), but still 10% lower than average. Again, though, this student's rate of incorporation increased during the course and finished at 95.1%, just below average.

The difference between uncoded local teacher feedback which was addressed in total by students and that which was addressed correctly was much less than the above coded local feedback. On average across all five essays, students correctly incorporated 92.7% of uncoded local feedback. While this rate of incorporation did increase over the course, beginning at 93.6% on the first essay and ending at 95.9% on the fifth essay (an increase of 2.3%), it did so only gradually. Students' rate of incorporation was at or above 91% on 27/30 (90%) of the essays. The same outlying student performed lower than the others on her first two essays, averaging 84.3% uncoded local feedback revised correctly. Conversely, however, she outperformed 4/6 students on the third essay and 5/6 students on the fourth essay by correctly incorporating 100% of the uncoded local feedback. As discussed above, this outlying student began at a lower rate of incorporation than the others, but made a greater improvement across the five essays and ended at a rate just slightly less than average by the fifth essay.

Among the data for the uncoded local teacher feedback, there was an additional outlying essay. A different student from the outlier, which has been discussed thus far, addressed only just over half (52.6%) of uncoded local feedback on her third essay. Across the 30 essays, and across the global and both types of local criteria, this was the only instance of a student's revisions deviating so radically from the norm. Moreover, other than this single instance, this student demonstrated a rate of incorporation of both global peer and local teacher feedback at or above average. While the exact cause for this deviation cannot be derived from the collected data in the present study, it is likely safe to presume that it was due to some extenuating circumstance beyond the sphere of the course itself (e.g. other responsibilities or illness), and will not be given further consideration.

Global vs. Local

In the initial study carried out in this series of research (Hensley & Hodson 2011), it was discovered that in my class, where global peer feedback was given before local teacher feedback in the writing process, my class's students outperformed their local-then-global counterparts in the global criteria. In the present study, however, local revisions were more frequently, accurately, and consistently incorporated.

As stated above, the amount of peer comments given on the global feedback actually decreased

over the course of the five essays, the reason for this decrease being unclear. But the rate of students' incorporation of the global peer feedback did slightly increase. On the other hand, the amount of local feedback (both coded and uncoded) given by myself as the teacher did not significantly increase or decrease. This is according to the number of words per instance of coded and uncoded feedback, as different essays were different lengths. The local feedback averaged 7.7 words per correction in total, with an average of 14.7 words per coded correction and 16.2 words per uncoded correction. The number of coded corrections was, on average, 1.5 words more frequent than the uncoded. Still, neither of these averages significantly varied across the five essays, but remained relatively constant.

That being said, the rate at which local feedback was incorporated by students averaged much higher than the global feedback. Across the five essays, the incorporation of global feedback averaged 1.4/2. Incorporation of total local feedback (coded and uncoded) averaged 1.82/2. Students' unweighted average of incorporation of global feedback began at 1.75/2 on the first essay and ended at 1.5/2 on the fifth essay. At the same time, local feedback was 1.78/2 on the first essay (coded = 1.68/2; uncoded = 1.88/2) and 1.88/2 on the fifth essay (coded = 1.83/2; uncoded = 1.94/2). The average rate of incorporated local feedback never dropped below 1.78/2 across all five essays, and was below 1.8/2 on only 5/30 essays. Incorporation of global feedback was much more variable, as 9/30 essays did not receive any peer comments (or *no* checks) at all. Thus, while global peer feedback was incorporated when it was given, the amount to which it was given varied greatly from essay to essay and student to student. Naturally, there was less variation in local feedback, as I was the only one providing it. Again, students' motivation for whether or not to incorporate feedback into their revisions was not investigated in the current study. The discrepancy between the incorporation of global peer feedback and local teacher feedback may simply be because one came from the teacher and students thus focused on it more. This is a potential avenue for more qualitative research in the future.

Coded vs Uncoded Local Corrections

While students' incorporation of both coded and uncoded local feedback was consistently higher than that of the global feedback, both an expected and uexpected result emerged concerning the incorporation of these two types of local feedback. First, as would be expected, students correctly revised the uncoded feedback, where the correct answers were provided, more consistently than the coded feedback, where they had to come up with the correct revisions on their own. Revisions made correctly averaged 92.7% for uncoded feedback, while coded feedback revisions averaged 81.7%. Correctly revised uncoded feedback began at 93.6% on the first essay and ended at 95.9% on the fifth essay. However, correctly revised coded feedback began at 75.3% on the first essay and ended at 84.1% on the fifth essay. On 6/30 essays, students correctly revised 100% of uncoded feedback. With coded feedback, though, only one essay of the 30 was revised 100% correctly.

This result seems to make it plain that, in addition to incorporating the local feedback from the teacher at a higher rate than the global feedback from peers, students also find it less cognitvely taxing or perhaps simply easier to make revisions by copying the corrections provided by the teacher. This may appear to be a commonsense finding, but the fact remains that students were correctly revising roughly half of their local errors an average of 92.7% of the time. These corrections may have been provided for the students, but the act of going through their writing and conducting revisions may have a positive effect on their

linguistic awareness. It may also be the case that providing corrections which students would probably not be able to work out on their own is better than either forcing the students to struggle to revise a difficult grammar point or leaving it uncorrected and in error, potentially entrenching it thus in the learner's language system. This aspect of revisions would likely benefit from further study, possibly including students' thought processes when carrying them out. It is also interesting to note that, even when provided with the correct answers, students did not correctly incorporate them into ther revisions 100% of the time. It is likely the case that some students simply forgot or mistook their revisions. Regardless, the fact remains that, according to the results of the current study, when conducting writing revisions, students are usually not going to revise all their errors correctly, even if the correct revisions are supplied by the teacher.

The unexpected finding from the local feedback data results regards the coded feedback revisions. While it is true that students correctly incorporated the uncoded local feedback (with answers provided) more often than the coded local feedback (on which students were responsible for coming up with corrections on their own), it is also the case that students attempted to address the coded local feedback at a higher rate than the uncoded local feedback. On 4/5 essays, students attempted to address the coded feedback more than the uncoded. On average, across the 30 essays, students addressed coded feedback 95.8% of the time, and uncoded feedback 94.3% of the time. On coded feedback, students addressed 100% of their errors on 14/30 essays. On uncoded feedback, this number was 9/30. Surprisingly, students appear to have made more of an effort to address the coded feedback, where the impetus was upon them to produce an accurate correction. Granted, the rate at which revisions were carried out correctly was lower than that for the uncoded feedback where corrections were provided. Still, from a pedagogical standpoint, it is encouraging to think that these six students put such effort into carrying out their revisions. It goes without saying that, when a student came across a coded correction (e.g. *vt* for "verb tense"), she had to reconsider her initial linguistic choice and reflect on the error she had made, creating a potential opportunity for noticing to take place (Schmidt 1990). This is especially encouraging in an EFL context such as Japan, where the more students can be made to reflect on their own language use the better, in particular outside of the classroom, since opportunities for language use away from class can be few and far between. In addition, students' addressing of coded local errors was more consistent than that of the uncoded local errors, which demonstrated more variation. In fact, other than the two outlying students' discrepancies discussed above, 23/30 essays' coded errors were addressed at a rate above 95%. The average standard deviation on students' addressing of coded feedback, if outlying students are disregarded, was 2.1%, and that of uncoded feedback was 3.1%. Since it is probable that students were not deliberately ignoring uncoded feedback, it may simply be the case that it was easier for students to miss the uncoded corrections. This is another aspect of the current study that deserves attention in future research.

Conclusion

On a small scale, this paper has been an attempt to quantify the extent to which students incorporate both global peer feedback and local teacher feedback when revising their essays in the writing process. The current study found that, across 30 essays completed by six third-year Japanese EFL students in an introductory essay writing course, global peer feedback was incorporated into subsequent essay revisions an average of 86.2% of the time. Furthermore, 72.4% of the time, students successfully incorporated the peer comments they had received to make correct revisions on their essays. Thus, it can be said that

students are utilizing the peer comments received in order to attempt to revise their writing.

To an even greater extent, it was revealed that students incorporated the local teacher feedback into their essay revisions an average of 91.1% of the time. And 88.3% of the time, students' incorporation of local feedback was correct. This differed for coded and uncoded local feedback, however. Students attempted to address the coded local feedback, where it was their responsibility to determine the correct way to revise their error, more consistently than they did the uncoded local feedback. However, as the uncoded local feedback consisted of the correct answers being provided and the students only needing to copy them, the amount of uncoded local feedback that was revised correctly was more than that of the coded local feedback.

This paper and the current study are only a small step in the current research being conducted by my colleague, Dr. Hodson, and I. However, this step is also an important one, as it has been shown that students' incorporation of feedback in their writing can be quantified. What remains to be seen is how the extent to which students incorporate feedback into their revisions can be improved upon, and whether its accuracy can be increased. Likewise, further investigation into students' motivation for incorporation (or lack thereof) of feedback in the writing process seems necessary in order to better comprehend how to encourage more proactive reflection on and incorporation of feedback in order to improve student writing performance.

References

Flynn, R. and King, A. 2013. *Text Analyser*. Retrieved from http://www.usingenglish.com

Hensley, J. and Hodson, R. 2011, November. *Writing feedback: Does order make a difference?* Paper presented at the 2011 JALT International Conference, Tokyo, Japan.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-58.

Appendix

Global Criteria for Peer Review

Introduction
- Is there enough background information?
- Has the author used at least one introduction technique (anecdote, etc.)?
- Thesis Statement:
    - Has the subject been given?
    - Has the focus (main ideas) been provided?
    - Is there a clear purpose (not necessarily in the Thesis Statement itself)?

Body
- Does every body paragraph contain a Topic Sentence with topic and focus?
- Does every body paragraph provide adequate support to develop and prove the thesis?
- Do the body paragraphs achieve unity (no irrelevant, vague, or repetitive sentences)?
- Are the body paragraphs arranged in a logical order?

Conclusion
- Has the Thesis Statement been summarized or restated in different words?
- Has the author used at least one conclusion technique (question, etc.)?

Other
- Has the essay been formatted correctly?