Peer Assessment via electronic, synchronous, text-based chat vs. oral, face-to-face methods
Do comments in these modes differ, and do they affect student revisions of work differently?

Authors	Participants & Context	PA Activities	Research Question(s) or Topics & Data	Results (only those relevant to above concerns)	Limitations
Sullivan & Pratt (1996) See my summary & comments at: http://is.gd/LyY75u	38 undergrad students, second-year, with **English as additional language**; in first English writing course. Two sections of course: traditional & computer-mediated (see right)	Students did PA on drafts of writing assignments. In one course, all class discussions & PA were oral; in the other, all class discussions & PA used a written, synchronous, electronic chat system.	Research questions: Several, but I focus here only on whether the two modes of PA differ in terms of the nature of the communication, and whether students in the two courses experienced differential improvements in writing ability. Data: students provided writing samples at beginning & end of course; PA transcripts analyzed (audio recording of F2F PA). Writing scored holistically on 5pt scale by 2 raters.	-- There was a "small but significant (P = 0.08) increase in writing ability" for the computer-assisted class over the traditional class (computer class mean writing scores went up .07 pts from beg. to end of term; trad class mean scores went *down* 0.46 pts) (500). -- There were more conversational turns in F2F than electronic chats, but F2F discussions less focused on the essays being discussed than electronic; more personal narratives, repetitions, etc. -- Suggestions for revision in electronic discussions were often repeated, which may be effective for taking them up (in F2F students just agreed w/o repeating the suggestions) -- Electronic chats were more egalitarian: author didn't dominate there as did in F2F Conclusion: electronic PA appears effective (not enough data to conclude more effective than F2F)	Small effect size for improvement in writing quality; questionable interpretation of the "unfocused" nature of F2F discussions (see: http://is.gd/LyY75u)
Braine (2001) (not summar-ized earlier on my blog)	87 undergrads in 6 sections of academic writing course in English in Hong Kong (most 1st or 2nd year students); for all, **English was an additional language**	Students did PA on a writing assignment; both written comments and synchronous, oral. Half the sections did all class discussions & PA F2F, & other half did these on written, synchronous, electronic chat system	Research questions: Compare the quality of writing and improvement of writing in the two kinds of classes (oral and electronic chat). Data: Drafts of essays, before and after PA; transcripts of PA discussions, including audio recordings of F2F sessions. Writing quality judged by "Test of Written English" measure—scored holistically on 6 pt scale by 2 raters.	-- Mean scores for essays in traditional classes improved more after F2F PA (0.42 pts) than mean scores for essays in computer-mediated classes with electronic chat PA (0.2 pts). --Analysis of PA transcripts shows differences: * in F2F PA, there is orderly turn taking, students pay attn to time and make sure they get through all essays to be discussed; give thoughtful, careful, holistic feedback. * in electronic chat PA, the discussion is scattered as students type at same time, not knowing what others are saying; turn-taking is disorganized; threads of conversations are spread amongst the chat; comments can therefore be hard to follow. Conclusion: "student interaction and collaboration in this study were more frequent and more effective" in F2F PA (290).	Test used to score writing looked only at ability to write in English; not clear if/how this translates to PA and writing in L1 (first-language) courses. Also, small improvement size difference, and on just one essay.

Peer Assessment via electronic, synchronous, text-based chat vs. oral, face-to-face methods
Do comments in these modes differ, and do they affect student revisions of work differently?

Authors	Participants & Context	PA Activities	Research Question(s) or Topics & Data	Results (only those relevant to above concerns)	Limitations
Liu & Sadler (2003) See my summary and comments at: http://is.gd/LyY75u	8 undergrad students, 4 in each of two 1st yr composition courses; for all, **English was additional language**	One group of four students from each of two courses: in one, comments written on paper & also discussed orally, F2F; in the other, comments written digitally (MS Word) & discussed in a synchronous, text-based, electronic chat.	Research Questions: I focused only on: (1) Do comments in two modes differ re: "the area (global versus local), the type (evaluation, clarification, suggestion, alteration), and the nature of comments (i.e. revision-oriented versus non revision-oriented)" (197)? (2) Do students act on PA comments in one class more than the other? Data: transcripts of PA, drafts of essays, follow up questionnaires, interviews.	-- Higher % of "global" comments ("idea development, audience and purpose, and organization of writing" (202)) in synchronous modes (both F2F & electronic chat); higher % of "local" comments ("wording, grammar, and punctuation" (202)) in asynchronous modes (writing on paper, digital comments via MS Word) -- Higher % of "conversation maintenance" turns in electronic chats than F2F; more disorganized -- Higher % of "revision-oriented" comments in F2F oral discussion than electronic chat -- Students acted more often on revision-oriented comments in "traditional" class (paper and F2F discussion) than computer-mediated class (digital comments & electronic chat). Conclusion: **for asynchronous comments, digital most effective; for synchronous, F2F is best**	Small sample size (8 students)
Jones et al. (2006) See my summary & comments at: http://is.gd/SsyPOS	5 undergrad peer tutors in an English Writing Centre in Hong Kong; all had **English as additional language**	Peer tutors engaged in PA in two modes: (1) F2F meetings, for which clients usually emailed papers beforehand; (2) online, text-based, synchronous chats; clients did not necessarily send their essays to tutors.	Looked at interactional dynamics btwn. tutors & clients; considered "initiating moves" (e.g., statements, offers, questions, directives) vs. "responding moves" (e.g., acceptance/rejection, agreement/disagreement). Data: transcripts of 6, audio-recorded F2F mtgs.; transcripts of 18 online, electronic "chats" (giving approximately the same # of conversational turns for each mode)	Conversational control: tutors had many more initiating moves than clients in F2F; in e-chats, initiating moves about equal for tutors & clients. In F2F tutors made more requests and commands than clients; in e-chats, clients made more requests than tutors and about the same # of commands as tutors Topics of conversation: in F2F, more conversational turns focused on "textual" issues (such as grammar & word choice) than in e-chats; in e-chats, more focused on "higher order goals" (e.g., content, writing process) than F2F Conclusions: F2F interactions between tutors & clients tend to be more hierarchical; e-chats tend to be more egalitarian. -- F2F conversations seem better for local, textual issues; e-chats better for broader issues. -- **Different modes serve diff. purposes, & "the ideal situation is to use them together"** (18).	Small sample size (5 tutors); many of the differences between F2F and e-chats could be traced to students giving essays to tutors beforehand in F2F but not in e-chats. See: http://is.gd/SsyPOS