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English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students in traditional second language (L2) writing classrooms are not provided sufficient opportunities for giving and receiving peer feedback. To compensate for this limitation, blended learning has been suggested in the L2 writing classroom. However, there has been little research on peer feedback in blended learning in L2 writing. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the patterns of peer feedback and the impact of peer feedback on revisions in blended learning in L2 writing. The subjects for the qualitative study consisted of three university students, representing low- intermediate, intermediate, and advanced levels of English writing proficiency. Data sources included student-produced feedback in online and offline sessions, 18 drafts in process-oriented writing, classroom observations, and the interview. The major findings of the study are as follows. First, the students produced more online peer feedback than offline peer feedback. Second, they provided more form-focused feedback in online sessions, but more meaning-focused feedback in offline sessions. Third, they incorporated online peer feedback in their second drafts more than offline peer feedback in the final drafts. Based on the findings, implications are considered and suggestions are made for the effective use of peer feedback in blended learning in L2 writing.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, emphasis has been put on developing second language (L2) writing skills as well as spoken skills, and through it, learners are given the opportunities to use English, to express thoughts, to develop cognitive ability, and to interact with others (Campbell, 1998; Ferris & Hedgecock, 2005; Hyland, 2002; Leki, 1992; Raimes, 1983; Silva & Matsuda, 2001). In order to get students to be immersed in writing, the process-oriented approach to writing instruction has been popularized in writing classes in university. However, the process-oriented approach is not easy to implement in traditional classroom settings because of the limited number of sessions and time limitation for students to engage in the full writing processes (Yoon, 2011; Yoon & Lee, 2010). These constraints can be resolved by providing students with blended learning environments so that students can get involved in the whole writing process actively and effectively, both online and offline.

In the process-oriented approach, peer feedback plays one of the most important roles during writing (Emig, 1983; Flower & Hayes, 1981; Zamel, 1987). Students are able to give and receive peer feedback not only face-to-face in the classroom but also online with the advance in computer technology and Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) tools (Cha, 2007; Cha & Park, 2010; DiGiovanni & Nagaswami, 2001; Ho & Savignon, 2007; Jeong, 2010).

A number of studies have been conducted on peer feedback to investigate affective benefits (Zhang, 1995) and effects on revision and writing quality in the traditional classroom settings and online settings (Berg, 1999; Cha, 2007; Cho, 2005; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Han, 2003; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Min, 2006; Moon, 2000; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Paulus, 1999; Villamil & DeGuerrero, 1996; Yoon, 2011). However, there is little research on the patterns and impact of peer feedback on EFL students’ writing skills in blended learning at university level. Therefore, this study aims to identify the patterns of peer feedback, to investigate the impact of peer feedback on revision, and to provide suggestions and implications for effective implementation of peer feedback in blended learning in L2 writing.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Peer Feedback in L2 Writing

The use of peer feedback has been very common in L2 academic writing classrooms. Peer feedback provides more audience than the teacher for students, and more responses from
authentic readers. In the writing process, peer feedback can be seen as a means of providing feedback that is at their level of development, making it more informative than teacher feedback (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Liu & Hansen, 2002; Mittan, 1989). By using peer feedback, the writers are able to revise their drafts, considering both writers’ own voices and readers’ understanding. Through peer feedback, writers can interact with each other within an authentic communicative context and construct meaning together as well.

In L2 writing, students were found to provide more form-focused feedback rather than meaning-focused feedback (Ashwell, 2000; Cha, 2007; Cho, 2005; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Kim, 2010; Moon, 2000; Park, 2004). Especially, in Korean EFL academic contexts, students were found to provide more feedback on form than content (Cha, 2007; Cho, 2005; Moon, 2000; Park, 2004). Since Korean EFL students were not trained in giving peer feedback, and they were not used to peer feedback itself, they tended to focus on forms of writing (Park, 2004). Also, Moon (2000) pointed out that more cognitive effort was required from students when giving feedback on content.

Several studies have been conducted to investigate the impact of peer feedback on revision in process-oriented writing (Berg, 1999; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Min, 2006; Paulus, 1999). These studies have shown different results, but most findings indicated that peer feedback had impact on revisions, and the students seemed to accept peer feedback selectively (Cho, 2005; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Min, 2006; Moon, 2000; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Park, 2004; Paulus, 1999; Villamil & DeGuerrero, 1996). In Korean EFL environments, peer feedback was selectively incorporated into revisions (Moon, 2000; Cho, 2005). Among feedback on content and form, feedback on form was more readily accepted by students than feedback on content. In Moon’s (2000) study, 70% of feedback on form was incorporated into revisions whereas 52% of feedback on content was incorporated. The students in Cho’s (2005) study were found to accept 67.8% of feedback on form and 66.6% of feedback on content. The students in two studies were found to consider some peer feedback incorrect and inappropriate, which was why they did not use peer feedback for revisions (Cho, 2005; Moon, 2000).

2. Teaching L2 Writing and Blended Learning

Blended learning has been defined as a combination of online and offline instruction (Dudeny & Hockly, 2007; Graham, 2006; Osguthorpe & Graham, 2003). However, this definition tended to be general, applied to a variety of courses and fields. Yoon and Lee (2010) indicated that it was essential to define blended learning for the ELT field. Yoon and Lee (2010) defined blended learning as:

bringing together the positive attributes of online and offline education,
including instructional modalities, delivery methods, learning tools, etc., in relation to language teaching and learning approaches and methods in order to reinforce learning process, to bring about the optimal learner achievement, and to enhance the quality of teaching and learning (p. 180).

This definition provides a comprehensive outline for implementing blended learning, suggesting that there are a number of issues for not only teachers but also learners to consider such as instructional modalities, methods, and tools, language teaching and learning approaches and methods, and learner needs.

Yoon and Lee (2010) investigated the perspectives of Korean university students and the effectiveness of blended learning in L2 writing, and developed the model for Blended Learning in L2 Writing (BLW) for creating an effective blended learning environment for the students. The writing scores of the students increased in terms of mechanics, content, organization and structure, and the students had positive perspectives on peer feedback as well as teacher feedback in blended learning. In addition, Yoon (2011) found that the students reflected feedback that they received, acknowledged problems in writing, recognized improvements, and set new goals for further improvements in blended learning in L2 writing. Based on the findings, she modified the BLW model, and proposed the Optimal BLW model to foster interaction between the students and to increase their awareness of writing features.

3. Peer Feedback and Computer Mediated Communication

A variety of CMC tools, including a Bulletin Board System (BBS), chatting, e-mail, and blogs, were used for peer feedback in online sessions. Since these CMC tools enable students to interact with peers regardless of time and space, students get more opportunities for giving and receiving peer feedback in a less threatening environment (DiGiovanni & Nagaswami, 2001; Ho & Savignon, 2007; Jones et al., 2006). Especially, the CMC tools are considered useful because of their practicality and accessibility in Korean EFL contexts (Cha, 2007; Han, 2003; Jeong, 2010; Jun, 2005; Kim, 2010; Lee, 2000; Lee, 2002; Park, 2004; Yoon & Lee, 2010).

Cha (2007) compared the differences between Korean EFL students’ peer feedback patterns in chatting and BBS modes. It was found that the students produced more feedback on the BBS than chatting, and the students in both modes focused on grammar and mechanics rather than meaning and organization. Jeong (2010) found out that EFL students in synchronous CMC with peer feedback could improve their accuracy through conscious awareness of grammatical forms provided from peer feedback. Students in CMC modes seem to have focused on surface features not meaning-focused features (Cha,
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2007; Jeong, 2010; Park, 2004), as students in traditional settings focused on formal features (Ashwell, 2000; Cho, 2005; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Moon, 2000).

III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purposes of this study are to examine three Korean university students’ peer feedback patterns and to investigate their influence on revisions in blended learning in L2 writing. Therefore, the main research questions for this investigation are as follows: 1) What is the frequency of peer feedback in four writing components, mechanics, content, organization, and structure in blended learning in L2 writing?; 2) What are the patterns of peer feedback in blended learning in L2 writing?; and 3) How does peer feedback influence EFL students’ revisions in blended learning in L2 writing?

1. Subjects

The subjects consisted of three university students in a Korean university. They were enrolled in a two-credit course entitled ‘Logical Thinking and Writing in English’ for pre-service English teacher students taught by a Korean bilingual teacher. They met once a week for two hours for 16 weeks. The three students who participated in the study were Eun, Hyun, and Jin as seen in Table 1. They were in one group for feedback. They built up a rapport with each other, as they had more interaction along with feedback activities throughout the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Information of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eun was a 34-year-old male junior majoring in English Literature. He was very...
sociable and talkative, considering intimacy with people important. His English writing proficiency level was low-intermediate based on the score of his first essay in process-oriented writing, and he liked English very much. He had not taken any writing classes before, and he had not been taught English grammar. He had not taken many English classes in the current university since he was a transfer student.

Hyun was also a transfer student majoring in English Linguistics. He was 34 and had majored in English Literature in his former university. He had transferred to the current university in order to study English more in depth despite the fact that he already had an English teaching certificate. He was very friendly and considerate to his group members during group activities, and was very careful in giving feedback. His English writing proficiency was intermediate based on the score of his first essay in process-oriented writing, and he seemed to be eager to study English, showing a positive attitude toward English.

Jin was a 21-year-old female student who was a sophomore majoring in English Literature. Her proficiency level was advanced based on the score of her first essay in process-oriented writing. She had taken a couple of writing classes before and was taking two other writing classes at the same time. She preferred English writing to listening and speaking English. She was very punctual and hard-working, thus showing a high amount of participation.

2. Data Collection Instrument

1) Observation Recordings

The participants produced peer feedback was recorded in both online and offline sessions in order to find out patterns and to count the number of peer comments. They had six online feedback sessions and six offline feedback sessions. Each participant produced online and offline feedback in Korean. They gave feedback on their peers’ first drafts through the tag-line function in the class BBS, and feedback was automatically saved on the system. In the offline classroom, all the peer feedback sessions were voice recorded. Peer feedback produced in online and offline sessions was transcribed and translated into English.

2) Writing Assignment

The participants’ writing drafts in process-oriented writing were examined in order to assess the impact of peer feedback on the participants’ revisions. The participants wrote six essays following process-oriented writing. In each essay, the participants produced three
drafts. They wrote the first draft outside of the classroom, and revised it after getting feedback online using the tag-line function provided in the class BBS. With the second draft, the participants had offline peer feedback sessions and got teacher feedback as well. They revised the second draft, implementing feedback from peers and the teacher, and then produced the final draft. Throughout the entire course, the participants wrote 6 essays, so 18 drafts were produced. The topics were: 1) The difficulty of translation; 2) The advantage of using multimedia in EFL classrooms; 3) The features of corpus-based dictionaries and the rationale for using them; 4) An educational biography in chronological order; 5) The effects of Teaching English Through English (TETE); and 6) Comparing and contrasting an “A” student with a “C” student.

3) Classroom Observation

Both offline and online classroom observations were conducted throughout the entire course as non-participatory and unstructured observation. Offline classroom observation was conducted every week by the researcher. Observation notes and reflective observation logs were written by the researcher in each class. In online classroom observation, feedback provided through the tag-line function in the BBS and interaction among the participants were mainly observed.

4) Interview

At the end of the course, an interview was carried out with all three participants to obtain a level of in-depth information on learning experiences in the course and thoughts on blended learning in L2 writing. It was conducted as a semi-structured interview in Korean. The interview was voice recorded and notes were taken.

3. Procedures

This study was conducted for one semester from March to June 2011 in a two-credit class entitled ‘Logical Thinking and Writing in English.’ This course was designed to improve pre-service teachers’ academic English writing skills. In this course, different types of essays were taught to students based on the process-oriented writing approach by the teacher. The textbook *Writing Academic English* by Oshima and Hogue (2006) was used, and the contents addressed in the course ranged from paragraph structure, unity and coherence, and transitional signals to different types of essays such as argumentative essays, chronological essays, cause and effect essays, and comparison and contrast essays.

The participants were required to write different types of essays in process-oriented
Writing, and to revise after getting peer and teacher feedback within two weeks, based on the Optimal BLW model, which is founded on the strong blended learning (SBL)\(^1\) (Yoon, 2011) as presented in Figure 1.

**FIGURE 1**
The Optimal BLW Model except for In-class Timed Writing (Yoon, 2011, p. 256)

---

\(^1\) SBL is defined as blended learning where both online and offline elements are necessary elements of the classroom, and they come together to construct meaningful and interactive environments (p. 239).
This model takes two weeks to finish all the processes from presentation of topic to discussion. On the first day of the class, the participants were given an instruction on the processes of writing and ways of using class BBS and tag-line function for giving and receiving feedback. The participants were informed of the topic in class, and they uploaded the first draft on the class BBS by the next day. They were asked to write the first draft by the next day because they needed enough time to give online peer feedback, to make revisions to the second draft, and to read peers’ second drafts in one week before the class met again offline. After uploading the first drafts, the participants had four days for giving online peer feedback and checking the feedback which they received through the tag-line function in the BBS at the same time. In addition to peer feedback, teacher feedback was also provided through the BBS. Given the online feedback from peers and the teacher, the participants made revisions in two days by using online web contents such as web concordances, online dictionaries, search engines and so on. Then, they were asked to upload the second draft on the BBS and to read their group members’ second drafts to give feedback effectively in the second offline class. When the class met again, the participants were required to bring their printed copies and give offline feedback to each other for about an hour. The participants could have more chances to provide online feedback using chat programs or instant messengers if the offline feedback was not enough. After the second offline class, the participants were given a week to revise the second drafts using both teacher and peer feedback. Then they were required to upload their final drafts on the class BBS. When the class met again, they shared final drafts, discussing and summarizing the activities and feedback before starting a new cycle. At the end of the process, the participants gathered all the feedback that they had received and wrote reflective learning journals.

4. The Methods of Data Analysis

Data sources for the study, including recorded peer feedback in online and offline sessions, writing assignments, observation, and interviews, were analyzed as follows. The participant-produced feedback was analyzed in terms of the four writing components presented in the rubric for academic writing presented in Table 2. The participant-produced comments online and offline were counted by the researchers and put into the four writing categories consisting of mechanics, content, organization, and structure to show which writing components the participants focused on.

A total of 18 drafts in process-oriented writing were examined to show the participants’ revisions after getting feedback from both peers and the teacher in online and offline sessions. The revisions made in each of the first and second drafts were analyzed to find out whether each participant incorporated peer feedback into revisions. When the change
could be traced to peer feedback, a revision was considered to be the result of the peer feedback. In other cases where revisions were not made from peer feedback, the revision was considered to be the result of teacher feedback or others, including the writers themselves. In addition, the revisions were analyzed into mechanics change, content change, organization change and structure change based on the scoring rubric for academic writing, to illustrate which components among the four were revised. Data from observation and interviews were also analyzed descriptively.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring criteria</th>
<th>Mechanics</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periods, commas, and other punctuations are used correctly.</td>
<td>The content of the paragraph fits the assigned topic.</td>
<td>The paragraph has a topic sentence with a topic and one or more controlling ideas.</td>
<td>Grammar usage is correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling is accurate.</td>
<td>The paragraph is interesting and easily understandable.</td>
<td>The paragraph has supporting sentences with at least one example.</td>
<td>Sentence structure is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title is centered and capital letters are used correctly.</td>
<td>The content is carefully thought out and is related to the topic.</td>
<td>The paragraph has a concluding sentence.</td>
<td>Simple, compound, complex, and compound-complex sentences are used correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The first line is indented and font and size are appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The paragraph is organized appropriately according to the content.</td>
<td>The paragraph is free of fragments, run-ons, and comma splices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Frequency of Peer Feedback in Blended Learning in L2 Writing

1) Frequency of Peer Feedback in Online Sessions

(1) Frequency of Peer Feedback Provided

The participants were required to give feedback on the four components of writing: mechanics, content, organization, and structure in both online and offline sessions. In online sessions, Eun gave the least number of comments (48), and Hyun gave the most comments (106) as seen in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eun</th>
<th>Hyun</th>
<th>Jin</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60.42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eun provided 29 comments on structure (60.42% of total feedback) in online sessions, and his feedback was more concerned with sentence structure rather than grammar usage. In his feedback on structure, he commented on what he thought and felt about phrases or sentences in peers’ first drafts without any explanations or reasons. Eun seemed not to be able to explain the reasons for giving such feedback because of his lack of grammar knowledge, as he stated in the interview:

Eun: *I gave feedback to peers, depending on my intuition and my feeling. When I read the peers’ drafts, it was not easy to find their grammatical errors because I did not know grammar.*

Eun did not give any feedback on mechanics, and gave one comment on organization. The reason seemed to be due to his insufficient knowledge on writing conventions and organization. As for content, however, he provided 18 comments (37.50%). He seemed to
provide feedback on content more comfortably than feedback on mechanics and organization. The following are examples of feedback provided by Eun.

4th line: *I could not understand ‘had learned about myself’. What is the meaning?* (to Jin, Topic 4) [Feedback on content]

9th line: *Is ‘in addition to’ better than ‘in other words’ for the transition words?* (to Jin, Topic 3) [Feedback on organization]

3rd line: *‘use in the past’ is awkward* (to Hyun, Topic 5) [Feedback on structure]

As seen in Table 3, Hyun appeared to be trying to provide balanced feedback on all four writing components in online sessions, compared to Eun and Jin. In online sessions, he provided 53 comments on structure (50% of total feedback), 31 comments on content, 12 comments on organization, and 10 comments on mechanics, respectively. Although half of his feedback was on structure, he seemed to be aware of the significance of content and organization in writing. The examples of online feedback provided by Hyun are presented below.

*By the way, is the title, ‘paradime’ correct?* (to Eun, Topic 5) [Feedback on mechanics]

8th line in 1st paragraph: *I can’t understand ‘quotes United States Constitution’ I searched through Google, but I couldn’t find the content.* (to Jin, Topic 3) [Feedback on content]

Your essay is appropriately organized, and it is good to divide your essay into introduction, body, and conclusion. (to Eun, Topic 2) [Feedback on organization]

5th line in 2nd paragraph: *‘listening to’* (to Jin, Topic 2) [Feedback on structure]

According to Table 3, Jin focused mainly on structure in online sessions, providing 33 comments on structure (50.77%). In addition, she gave a number of comments on mechanics - 13 online (20%), compared to Eun (0%) and Hyun (9.43%). Since Jin had taken a couple of English writing classes prior to the study, she seemed to consider accuracy important in academic English writing. In addition, she had studied English grammar a great deal before, so it was likely for her to have more grammatical knowledge than the other participants. On the other hand, she seemed not to focus on the organization of writing, providing two comments on organization. As for content, she provided 15 online comments (23.08%). The following are the examples of feedback provided by Jin in offline sessions.

Jin: *In the second paragraph, you just wrote ‘movies, pictures sound materials’.*
Here you need to put 'and' between pictures and sound materials. (to Eun, Topic 2) [Feedback on mechanics]

Jin: I think 'catching lesson' can't deliver the meaning. (to Eun, Topic 2) [Feedback on content]

Jin: In the second paragraph, from 'especially' to last sentence, it is too long to follow easily. I can understand it anyway, but it is not easy to understand while reading. (to Hyun, Topic 5) [Feedback on structure]

As Jin put an emphasis on structure and mechanics, she seemed not to be concerned about organization and content in online sessions. In short, she appeared to focus on the formal features of writing rather than meaning while providing online peer feedback as she reported in the interview:

Jin: I think I was not a good reader, at first, because I gave most feedback on grammatical errors and mechanics in both online and offline. Especially, I was so obsessive in pointing out grammar in online.

(2) Frequency of Peer Feedback Received

Among the participants, Eun received the most number of comments from the others (102) whereas Hyun received the least (46). Jin received 71 comments from Eun and Hyun. Hyun was very eager to provide feedback for the others on the BBS, so Eun and Jin received more feedback than Hyun. Table 4 presents the frequency of received peer feedback from the other participants in online sessions.

| TABLE 4 |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| **Frequency of Received Peer Feedback on Writing Components in Online Sessions** | **Eun** | **Hyun** | **Jin** | **Total** |
| **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
| Mechanics | 18 | 17.65 | 3 | 6.52 | 4 | 5.63 | 25 | 11.41 |
| Content | 18 | 17.65 | 15 | 32.61 | 31 | 43.66 | 64 | 29.23 |
| Organization | 6 | 5.88 | 1 | 2.17 | 8 | 11.27 | 15 | 6.85 |
| Structure | 60 | 58.82 | 27 | 58.70 | 28 | 39.44 | 115 | 52.51 |
| Total | 102 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 71 | 100 | 219 | 100 |

Eun received 60 comments on structure (58.82%), followed by 18 on mechanics and content, and six on organization. It should be noted that Eun was given 18 comments on
mechanics whereas Hyun and Jin received only three and four on mechanics, respectively. As Eun made a number of errors and mistakes consistently in his first drafts, Hyun and Jin appeared to give more feedback on mechanics to Eun. In addition, Eun was provided 60 comments on structure because of his errors in grammar and sentence structure. Of the total 115 comments on structure which the participants produced, half of the feedback was given to Eun, with Hyun and Jin getting 27 and 28 comments on structure respectively.

Hyun, who received the lowest amount of online feedback among the three participants, received 27 comments on structure, followed by 15 on content, three on mechanics, and one on organization. He received only one comment on organization while Eun and Jin got six and eight respectively. In online sessions, Hyun was the main participant who gave feedback on organization, so Eun and Jin were able to receive that feedback. On the other hand, Hyun was not able to get feedback on organization.

According to Table 4, Jin was given the most feedback on content (31) unlike Eun and Hyun, although she received 28 comments on structure. Eun and Hyun tended to give feedback on content as they seemed not to focus on grammatical errors in Jin’s drafts. Jin was more knowledgeable in grammar and sentence structure, so she did not make many grammatical mistakes in the first drafts.

2) Frequency of Peer Feedback in Offline Sessions

(1) Frequency of Peer Feedback Provided

The participants produced approximately half of the feedback (53.63%) on content, followed by structure (36.87%), mechanics (5.59%), and organization (3.91%) in offline sessions. They appeared to provide feedback in content areas, but there were some differences among the participants as presented in Table 5.

<p>| TABLE 5 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eun</th>
<th>Hyun</th>
<th>Jin</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79.41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eun provided 27 comments on content (79.41%), but he only gave four on structure and three on organization. Because he was not confident in grammar, he seemed not to be able to give feedback on grammar and sentence structure face-to-face. Instead, he tended to focus on content, asking for the meaning of words and sentences, and requesting the others to change the tone of their writing. The following are the examples of feedback on content:

Eun: *I feel, here ‘enacted rule’ is awkward.* (to Jin, Topic 5)
Eun: *You wrote as you usually did. But, I have one question. In conclusion, you wrote TETE could improve students’ listening skills. Right? So, this means that TETE is good for listening only?* (to Jin, Topic 5)

Hyun provided 37 comments on content, 27 on structure, and four on organization in offline feedback sessions. He provided 53 online comments on structure, but 27 in offline sessions. As the number of offline comments on structure decreased, the number of comments on content increased. It is also worth noting that Hyun did not give any feedback on mechanics in offline sessions. It may be attributed to the possibility that he thought he had already provided sufficient feedback on mechanics in online sessions, and that there were fewer mistakes on second drafts after making revisions using online peer feedback. The following are examples of Hyun’s offline feedback on content, organization, and structure.

Hyun: *What’s your point in the second paragraph?* (to Eun, Topic 6) [Feedback on content]
Hyun: *I think the main topic of the third paragraph needs to locate in the last sentence like the second paragraph* (to Eun, Topic 5) [Feedback on organization]
Hyun: *The second line in the third paragraph, you have to write ‘need to appreciate’* (to Eun, Topic 3) [Feedback on structure]

Jin focused on structure in offline sessions as she did in online sessions. She provided 35 offline comments on structure (45.45%) and 10 on mechanics (12.99%). However, she showed more concern for content in offline sessions than online sessions. She provided 32 comments on content in offline sessions (41.56%) while providing 15 in online sessions (23.08%). It seemed that she was more able to consider content because of the amount of feedback on mechanics and structure that was given to peers in online sessions, and she perceived content to be important as she provided offline feedback. The examples of feedback on mechanics, content, and structure in offline sessions are presented below.
Jin: *In the second paragraph, you just wrote ‘movies, pictures sound materials’. Here you need to put ‘and’ between pictures and sound materials.* (to Eun, Topic 2) [Feedback on mechanics]

Jin: *What is the meaning of ‘which resulted in students silent’? The students remain silent? Right?* (to Hyun, Topic 5) [Feedback on content]

Jin: *In the first sentence in the first paragraph, ‘instead it will becomes’ here, I think there is no complement.* (to Eun, Topic 2) [Feedback on structure]

(2) Frequency of Peer Feedback Received

In offline feedback sessions, Eun received the greatest amount of peer feedback from the others (92). Eun provided the least amount of peer feedback in both online and offline sessions, but he received the most peer feedback in both environments. Eun had not received instruction in writing and grammar, so his writing proficiency was lower than that of Jin and Hyun. Eun made errors on mechanics and structure frequently, so Jin and Hyun provided much feedback to Eun.

Hyun received 36 comments, and Jin received 51. Much of the time in offline feedback sessions was spent on discussing Eun’s second drafts, so Hyun and Jin got relatively little feedback from the others. The frequency of peer feedback received offline is presented in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Received Peer Feedback on Writing Components in Offline Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eun was given 42 comments on structure, followed by 39 comments on content, nine on mechanics, and two on organization. Although he received a number of online comments on structure, he still made grammatical errors in his second drafts. He also got 39 comments on content. Since Hyun and Jin had provided feedback on his first drafts, and Eun made revisions based on feedback, there seemed to be less mistakes in the second drafts compared to the first drafts.
Hyun received 24 comments on content, which accounted for 66.67%. Unlike the online feedback, he had many chances to discuss content because Eun and Jin appeared to be concerned with content rather than structure. This tendency was observed in the feedback which Jin received. Jin was given 33 comments on content (64.71%) whereas she received 13 on structure (25.49%). Since Hyun and Jin made structural changes when revising their first drafts after getting online feedback, more chances to get feedback on content were provided for Hyun and Jin.

2. Patterns of Peer Feedback in Blended Learning in L2 Writing

The participants produced 219 items of peer feedback through the tag-line function provided in the online BBS, and 179 comments in offline feedback sessions during the entire semester. Table 7 shows the different patterns of peer feedback in the four writing components, in online and offline sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns of Peer Feedback in 4 Writing Components in Blended Learning</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Offline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>52.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In online sessions, the participants produced the greatest amount of feedback on the structure of writing (52.51%), followed by content (29.23%), mechanics (11.41%), and organization (6.85%). In online feedback, form-focused feedback, including structure and mechanics, accounted for 63.92%. This result is congruous to previous studies that found students gave more feedback on formal features (Ashwell, 2000; Cha, 2007; Cho, 2005; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Kim, 2010; Moon, 2000; Park, 2004). The participants seemed to focus on formal features, as Liu and Hansen (2002) asserted that language learners in foreign language contexts tended to be concerned about accuracy and linguistic correctness. Also, this result can be attributed to the fact that giving feedback on content and organization required more cognitive effort (Moon, 2000).

On the other hand, in offline feedback sessions, they produced the most feedback on content (53.63%), followed by structure (36.87%), mechanics (5.59%), and then
organization (3.91%). After receiving online peer feedback, the participants were required to make revisions based on the peer feedback that they had received. They were to revise their first drafts, focusing on the structure and mechanics which the participants provided through feedback in online sessions. In offline peer feedback sessions, consequently, the participants could have more opportunities to discuss content, whereas they tended to give suggestions on structure, mechanics and accuracy in online sessions.

The participants produced more online peer feedback than offline peer feedback. They seemed to have more time to read their peers’ drafts and to think about feedback which they tried to give in online sessions. In contrast, the participants appeared to spend more time discussing problematic expressions in offline peer feedback sessions. While the participants provided one-way feedback in online sessions, they discussed the addressed points through feedback in offline sessions. The following shows how the participants discussed one problematic expression in a second offline feedback session.

Jin: Eun, in the last sentence, the conclusion sentence is awkward to me. I think it is better to write ‘teachers need to use multimedia in teaching’ rather than ‘multimedia in EFL class should be one of the best teaching methods’.

Hyun: I think, the word, ‘should’ is used for guess.

Jin: Is ‘might’ used for guess?

Hyun: ‘Should’ can be used for strong guess, I think.

Jin: Eun, that’s what you thought?

Eun: I wrote this sentence for indicating that multimedia is going to be one of the best tools.

Jin: For that meaning, ‘will be’ is better, I think.

Eun: Oh, really? I just wrote it intuitively.

Jin: Ah...I see.

In this excerpt of transcribed offline feedback, Jin provided feedback to Eun. Although Jin gave feedback to Eun first, Hyun joined the conversation. Through the discussion, Eun appeared to be able to find more appropriate expressions. As seen in the example above, the participants spent more time discussing problematic expressions in offline sessions than online sessions.
3. Influence of Peer Feedback on Revision

1) Frequency of Revisions in Blended Learning in L2 Writing

The participants were required to make revisions after receiving online and offline feedback. The second drafts were made after the participants received online feedback, and the final drafts were made after the participants had offline feedback sessions. The participants made a total of 418 revisions to their drafts while writing six sets of essays, consisting of three drafts each. The participants made 127 revisions after receiving peer feedback in online sessions and 291 revisions after getting peer feedback and teacher feedback in their offline class.

Eun made 155 revisions altogether, 42 revisions to the first drafts and 113 revisions to the second drafts. Eun made a number of errors on mechanics and grammar usage, so he had to revise the erroneous phrases and expressions, based on peer feedback and teacher feedback. For Hyun, 36 revisions were made to the first drafts and 80 revisions were made to the second drafts, totaling 116 revisions. Hyun made the least number of revisions among the participants. Whereas he provided the greatest amount of peer feedback, he received the least amount of feedback. Because of the relatively small amount of feedback, Hyun appeared to revise his drafts the least. Jin made a total of 147 revisions to her first and second drafts, 49 and 98 revisions respectively.

The participants made far more revisions to the second drafts than the first drafts since they had more substantial discussions on their second drafts in offline sessions. They were able to explain the reasons for their feedback in offline sessions, whereas in online sessions they tended to mention only the problematic areas or simply provided appropriate expressions. Also, they received a great amount of teacher feedback on their second drafts. With the participants having more resources for revising the second drafts, more revisions were made to the second drafts than the first drafts.

2) Incorporation of Peer Feedback into Revision

(1) Incorporation of Peer Feedback into Revision for Second Drafts

In order to investigate the influence of peer feedback on the participants’ revision, the revisions made in 18 drafts were analyzed. Eun made a total of 42 revisions to his first drafts. All the revisions were influenced by peer feedback. He appeared to make all revisions based on peer feedback since he had little knowledge of academic English writing, including grammar usage and mechanics. Among the 36 revisions to Hyun’s first drafts, 23 (63.89%) were the result of peer feedback, and 13 (36.11%) revisions were made
by himself or other sources. Hyun made the least number of revisions to the first drafts, and this can be attributed to the fact that he received the least number of online peer comments. Jin made 49 revisions to her first drafts. Among the revisions, 36 (73.47%) were peer influenced, and 13 (26.53%) were teacher or other influenced. Jin was very hard-working and active in revising her drafts, so she made the most number of revisions among the participants.

The revisions which Hyun and Jin made were mainly influenced by peer feedback, but they also revised their drafts by themselves or used other sources. Since Hyun and Jin had taken writing classes before and had knowledge of mechanics and grammar, they were able to revise the expressions which the peers did not address through online feedback. It is seen that these results support the thesis that the students selectively incorporated peer feedback into revisions (Cho, 2005; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Moon, 2000; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Paulus, 1999; Villamil & DeGuerrero, 1996). Also, the participants in the study appeared to accept more peer feedback for revision than the previous studies revealed (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Moon, 2000; Nelson & Murphy, 1993).

(2) Incorporation of Peer Feedback into Revision for Final Drafts

After receiving offline feedback from both peers and the teacher, the participants made revisions to the second drafts. The participants were found to incorporate less peer feedback into revisions to second drafts than they did to the first drafts. Compared to online feedback, more teacher feedback was given to the participants. With the participants giving peer feedback each other, the teacher addressed the important points that the participants did not notice in both online and offline feedback, and provided the content and grammar knowledge which the participants lacked. Also, the teacher tended to resolve the conflict they had by providing a variety of alternatives.

Eun made 113 revisions to the second drafts. Among these revisions, peer-influenced revisions were 44 (38.94%), and teacher/other-influenced revisions were 69 (61.06%). In offline feedback sessions, he was provided with the greatest number of peer comments (92), and the teacher also gave a number of comments as well. Eun had problems dealing with surface issues such as capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and format while writing using word processor programs. Hyun and Jin kept providing feedback on mechanics to Eun in both online and offline sessions, but he seemed to think of the issues as trivial ones. As he made mistakes on mechanics constantly despite peer feedback, the teacher provided very explicit feedback on mechanics, and accentuated the importance of the correct usage of mechanics. After he had the teacher feedback, he seemed to be more careful of mechanics. Hyun made 80 revisions to his second drafts. Among the revisions, 19 (23.75%)
were affected by peers and 61 (76.25%) were the results of the teacher’s or others’ input. On Jin’s second drafts, 35 (35.71%) revisions were made based on peer feedback and 63 (64.29%) revisions were influenced by the teacher or others.

The participants incorporated less peer feedback into revisions to the second drafts than the first drafts. When they revised the first drafts, peer feedback was the main resource for the revision. However, in offline sessions, the participants were provided with teacher feedback as well as peer feedback, so they had more resources to refer to for their revisions to the second drafts.

3) Types of Revisions in Blended Learning in L2 Writing

The revisions in 18 drafts were analyzed into mechanics, structure, organization and content changes, using the rubric for academic writing. The participants made a total of 418 revisions to their drafts as seen in Table 8. Of these revisions, structure changes accounted for 238 (56.94%), which was the greatest proportion of revisions made by the participants to the first and second drafts. 104 (24.88%) were mechanics changes and 62 (14.83%) were content changes. Only 14 (3.35%) changes were categorized as organization changes.

| TABLE 8 |
| Types of Revisions from First Drafts to Final Drafts |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st drafts to 2nd drafts</th>
<th>2nd drafts to Final drafts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64.57</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants were found to revise mostly formal features of writing, structure and mechanics (81.82% of total revisions). This finding is congruous with previous studies that found students focused on formal features while revising (Cho, 2005; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Moon, 2000; Paulus, 1999). It can be attributed to the fact that the participants provided more feedback on mechanics and structure than content and organization, both in online and offline sessions. Also, the participants seemed to keep their content of their writings and to be able to decide independently whether they revised or not (Cho, 2005).
After receiving online peer feedback, the participants made 127 revisions. Of these revisions to their first drafts, structure revisions accounted for 82, followed by mechanics (38), content (6), and organization (1). The participants appeared to focus on grammar usage and sentence structure while revising the first drafts. A number of peer comments in online sessions were given on structure (115), so the participants tended to revise their incorrect usages of grammar and sentence structures. In addition, mechanic changes accounted for 29.92% of total revisions to the first drafts. The participants seemed to consider revisions to the first drafts as a copy-editing and tidying-up activity focusing on elimination of grammar, punctuation and spelling errors (Faigley & Witte, 1981). Consequently, the participants made a few content and organization revisions.

While revising their second drafts, after receiving offline teacher feedback as well as peer feedback, the participants made 291 revisions. Although the participants received the greatest amount of peer feedback on content in offline feedback sessions, and the teacher provided quality feedback on content, the participants still revised mostly structure problems on their second drafts (156). However, the participants made more content and organization revisions to the second drafts in comparison to the first drafts. Of the 291 revisions, 56 (19.24% of total revisions) were content revisions and 13 (4.46% of total revisions) were organization revisions on the second drafts, whereas only six (4.72% of total revisions) were content revisions and one (0.79% of total revisions) was an organization revision on the first drafts. It can be seen that the participants had more opportunities to revise content and organization on the second drafts compared to the first drafts because they had more substantial discussions on content and the teacher gave ample feedback to the participants in offline feedback sessions.

(1) Types of Revision in Eun’s Drafts

Eun made 42 revisions to the first drafts and 113 revisions to the second drafts, totaling 155 revisions in all. Of these 155 revisions, the highest number were structure revisions (63), followed by mechanics (49), content (34), and organization (9) revisions. Eun tended to make more substantial revisions to the second drafts than the first drafts. He made 22 structure revisions and 19 mechanic revisions to his first drafts. As he received 60 and 18 comments on structure and mechanics respectively, he seemed to focus on revising structure and mechanics errors.

On the other hand, he made much more revisions to his second drafts than the first drafts, focusing on not only mechanics and structure, but also content and organization revisions. Among 113 revisions made to the second drafts, 41 revisions were made to structure and grammar and 30 revisions were made to mechanics. In addition to revisions of structure and mechanics issues, he made changes in content (33) and organization (9).
In offline feedback sessions, he was given more feedback on content as well as mechanics and structure from peers. Also, the teacher provided quality feedback for him, giving instruction on writing conventions and explaining content issues. Peer feedback as well as teacher feedback in offline sessions seemed to have a more significant impact on Eun’s revisions because he considered offline feedback more serious and substantial.

(2) Types of Revision in Hyun’s Drafts

Hyun made a total of 116 changes: 36 changes on the first drafts and 80 changes on the second drafts. He focused mostly on structure (80), followed by mechanics (20), content (13), and organization (3).

Among the three participants Hyun received the lowest number of online comments, so this may have led him to make less revisions compared to Eun and Jin. He revised sentence structures and grammar usages the most (21) and then mechanics (10); however, he made only one revision in organization and four revisions in content. For the final drafts, he made the greatest number of revisions on structure (59), followed by mechanics (10), content (9), and organization (2). It seemed that Hyun accepted feedback on mechanics and structure. However, he did not change content, preferring to keep his own voice.

(3) Types of Revision in Jin’s Drafts

Jin made 49 revisions to the first drafts and 98 revisions to the second drafts, totaling 147 revisions. Among the 147 revisions, she made 95 structure changes and 35 mechanics changes, while making only 15 content and two organization changes. As she tended to focus on structure and mechanics when providing feedback, she seemed to be concerned with structure and mechanics in revision.

After receiving online peer feedback, Jin made 39 revisions of structure and nine revisions of mechanics to her first drafts. She made one revision of content and did not make any revision of organization. Jin appeared to be concerned with structure and mechanics when she revised her first drafts after receiving online peer feedback. For the final drafts, she still made the most number of revisions on structure (56), followed by mechanics (26), content (14), and organization (2). While working on her first and second drafts, she mostly made revisions in structure and mechanics. Because she was quite aware of the organization of academic English writing and applied it to her drafts, there seemed to be few problems in organization. Also, although she was provided offline feedback on content, she did not incorporate feedback on content in revisions.
V. CONCLUSION

The main findings of the study are as follows. First, the participants produced more online peer feedback than offline peer feedback. In online sessions, there were no time and space restrictions, so they were able to provide as much feedback as they wanted. On the other hand, they provided less offline feedback than they did online because they were limited in time.

Second, the participants provided the most online peer feedback on structures, whereas they provided more peer feedback on content in offline sessions. In both online and offline sessions, the participants provided the smallest amount of peer feedback on organization. In online sessions, they seemed not to be able to discuss content and organization substantially in their writings since they gave feedback through the tag-line function provided in BBS. Instead, they gave a number of comments on mechanics and structure. On the other hand, they were able to give feedback on content and organization in offline sessions, discussing what each individual student thought. With reference to the findings, peer feedback by the students in L2 writing using the Optimal BLW model appeared to address both structure and content. Blended learning in L2 writing was found to be effective in motivating L2 writers to provide feedback on content as well as structure.

Third, the participants made more revisions to their second drafts than their first drafts; however, more peer feedback was incorporated into revisions to the first drafts than the second drafts. Among the four writing components, structures were revised the most, followed by mechanics, content, and organization. In terms of content and organization, they seemed not to revise these compared to structures and mechanics.

In order to more effectively implement peer feedback in blended learning in L2 writing, the following suggestions are provided. First, peer-training is suggested to improve the quality of peer feedback and writing quality. A number of students are not accustomed to blended learning in L2 writing, so more suitable peer training for blended learning in L2 writing needs to be carried out. Peer training for blended learning in L2 writing needs to include not only modeling the process, providing students with linguistic strategies, and setting up mock peer feedback activity (Berg, 1999; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Liu & Hansen, 2002; Min, 2006; Mittan, 1989) but also the ways of using multimedia tools and web content which can be used for giving online feedback. Second, in order to help students to give more quality feedback, appropriate peer response sheets can be given to students before the online and offline peer feedback sessions. By using peer response sheets, students can prepare offline feedback and provide more comprehensive feedback on four writing components. Third, in offline peer feedback sessions, students should have enough time for giving and receiving peer feedback, and each should be given an equal amount of time so that they can get equal opportunities to receive peer feedback. Therefore,
the number of students in one group should be limited, and an equal amount of time should be given to each student. It is recommended that three or four students in a group is a suitable number for reading peers’ drafts and giving feedback, and 15 to 20 minutes needs to be given to each student. Finally, it is suggested that students give peer feedback on mechanics and structure in online sessions, and feedback on content and organization in offline sessions. In online sessions, the students appeared to have difficulties discussing the content and organization of writing; however, they discussed more content and organization in offline sessions. Because of the different features of online and offline, it would be more effective for students to focus on mechanics and structure in online sessions, and on content and organization in offline sessions, where they can interact with each other more actively. Based on peer feedback on mechanics and structure, they are able to make revisions and produce more accurate drafts. With the drafts, they can discuss more comprehensive components of writing, such as content and organization, in offline sessions.

This study was conducted as a case study, so a small number of participants were involved in the study. Thus, further studies need to be conducted with a larger number of participants as a true experiment to obtain more valid and reliable findings. Furthermore, the patterns of peer feedback and its impact on revisions in general English writing courses in university need to be investigated.
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APPENDIX
Sample Drafts and Peer Feedback

1. Eun’s first draft on topic five

Paradime Of English In TETE

Teaching english through english is similar way to learn our mother tongue. students are exposure to much english-spoken environment. we need to appreciate of language acquiring process. when we look behind how we have learned mother tongue, details are surfacing that we are exposed much of listening, speaking, reading. we must adopt this method to reach our english proficiency to join the rank of communicative speaker. If we take TETE method, how our class will change?

First, speaking english is not a special work instead it will become another day at the office. That phenomenon move into our educational institution. students naturally learn english without that section as separated. we turn loose our tension and nervous of listening and speaking. we can become recognize that language is not just as subject but communicative tool. So, we get confidence as we use english as we speak more.

1) Online peer feedback from Jin

(1) First paragraph

In the first line You need to write “English.”
Instead of exposure, exposed will be better.
Overall, capital letters are not used.

(2) Second paragraph

You need to put comma in front of instead “in expression and words as on dialogue and lecture”
instead of as on, need to write “in”.
You wrote well to understand!

2) Online peer feedback from Hyun

(1) First paragraph

1st line: article in front of way
1st paragraph: Who is ‘our’?
2nd line: much for what?
Is it possible to write “appreciate of”?
5th line in 1st paragraph: Need to change word order for interrogative sentence.
(2) Second paragraph

1st line: instead is used as conjunction?
It seems that there are some problems in capitalization and subject-verb agreement.
By the way, is the title, ‘paradime’ correct?

2. Eun’s second draft on topic five

Paradime Of English In TETE

Teaching English through English is similar a way to learn mother tongue. students are exposed to English-spoken environment. we need to appreciate of language acquiring process. when we look behind how we have learned mother tongue, details are surfacing that we are exposed much of listening, speaking, reading, we must adopt this method to reach our English proficiency to join the rank of communicative speaker. If we take TETE method, how our class will change?

First, speaking English is not a special work, instead it will become another day at the office. That phenomenon move into our educational institution. students naturally learn English without that section as separated. we turn loose our tension and nervous of listening and speaking. we can become recognize that language is not just as subject but communicative tool. So, we get confidence as we use English as we speak more.

(*Italicized parts indicate revised expressions.)

1) Offline peer feedback from Jin

Why did you only make one revision on capitalization? You need to revise all.
In the first sentence, you need to write as ‘a similar way.’ The position of the article is not correct.
To me, it is hard to understand the first sentence. What is the meaning of ‘to join the rank of communicative speaker’? You need to change the word, ‘rank.’
Here in ‘instead it will become’ this sentence needs complement. You miss it.
Instead of ‘institution’ how about just educational environment?
What does ‘without that section as separated’ mean?
What is the meaning of ‘we turn loose our tension’? It means that we feel relaxed? In my opinion, turn loose is an incorrect expression.
You need to write article in this sentence ‘language is not just as a subject but a communicative tool.’

2) Offline peer feedback from Hyun

How is the first sentence in the first paragraph related to ‘to’? What does that mean exactly?
In the second sentence, ‘need to appreciate’ is correct
In the fifth line, this method means the same way we learn mother tongue, Korean. So, ‘to reach’ is used for purpose.

What does ‘rank’ mean here?

The first part in the second paragraph, you wrote that speaking English is not a ‘special work’. How is this connected to the next sentence and content?

What does ‘as’ mean here? Language is not a subject but a tool for communication. What is the topic sentence in the second paragraph? I don’t think the first sentence is not. Is the final sentence the topic sentence?

3. Eun’s Final draft on topic five

The Best Way to Learn English as Language

Teaching English through English is a similar way to learn our mother tongue. Students are exposed to much English-spoken environment. We need to think it first how we learned our mother tongue. When we find out its secret, we can induce how we should set up our second language education policy. When we look behind that how we have learned our first language, we can find out that much of listening environment enhances our language acquiring. So, we must adopt this method to reach our English proficiency to join the rank of communicative speaker. So, Ministry of Education has launched new English teaching method which is called TETE (Teaching English through English)

First, when we are using TETE, both teachers and students are accustomed to listening and speaking in English. This let students treat English as a language. Not only we treated English as a subject, but also we treated English as a language. It has changed our concept of English. So, students can access English more easily than before.

(* Underlined parts indicate revised expressions.)

Applicable levels: tertiary
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