

**Peer Assessment via asynchronous, written methods or oral, face to face methods**  
Do the comments differ in each mode, and do they differentially affect later drafts of work?

Authors	Participants & Context	PA Activities	Research Question(s) or Topics & Data	Results (only those relevant to above concerns)	Limitations
<p>van den Berg, Admiraal &amp; Pilot (2006)</p> <p>See my summary &amp; comments at: <a href="http://is.gd/u3Ix8V">http://is.gd/u3Ix8V</a></p>	<p>131 undergraduate students in 7 courses in History (1<sup>st</sup> year through 4<sup>th</sup> year)</p>	<p>Students engaged in peer feedback on written work (essays, outlines of essays, analysis of an exhibition, &amp;more). 6 out of 7 classes had both written peer feedback (feedback forms) &amp; oral peer feedback. One class had just written peer feedback.</p>	<p>An analysis of the nature of peer feedback in seven types of courses, according to: (1) feedback “functions” -- product-oriented: analysis, evaluation, explanation and revision; -- process-oriented: orientation and method (2) feedback “aspects” -- the subject of feedback: content, structure and style</p> <p><u>Data:</u> oral, F2F sessions recorded; written feedback gathered through standardized feedback sheets.</p>	<p><u>Written feedback:</u> more focused on product than process function; more evaluation comments and fewer explanation or revision comments. Re: aspect, more on content and style than structure.</p> <p><u>Oral feedback:</u> more comments on process than written feedback; more balanced between evaluation, explanation and revision; also mostly focused on content &amp; style rather than structure.</p> <p>More feedback on structure given when PA done earlier in writing process.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> "A combination of written and oral feedback is more profitable than written or oral feedback only" (146).</p>	<p>Oral feedback was given by students who <i>also</i> gave written feedback; this may have affected the kind of both oral and written feedback they gave (b/c doing both).</p>
<p>Hewett (2000)</p> <p>See my summary &amp; comments at: <a href="http://is.gd/eOmVOt">http://is.gd/eOmVOt</a></p>	<p>Eight undergraduate students (four in each of two peer groups) in two upper-level writing courses</p>	<p>One course used oral, F2F peer assessment &amp; other used written, online discussion board, both synchronously (during class) and asynchronously (outside of class)</p>	<p><u>Research Question</u> (related to above concerns): “How is peer talk that occurs in the traditional oral and in the CMC classroom alike and different? Where differences exist, are they revealed in the writing that is developed subsequent to the peer-response group sessions? If so, how?” (267)</p> <p><u>Data:</u> peer comments on one essay assignment for both groups; earlier and later drafts of the assignment; student journals re: PA experiences</p>	<p><u>Differences in types of feedback:</u> -- oral discussion more interactive; students worked together to generate new ideas; talk ranged from discussion re: essay content to wider issues about it and its context -- in online, written comments students responded to essays but not much to each other; talk focused mostly on content of the essay</p> <p><u>Impact of feedback on revisions:</u> -- more “intertextual” idea exchanges in oral group (both comments made by students on <i>other</i> students' papers, as well as ideas or methods used in essays that a student had read <i>by others</i> in her group) -- more “self-generated” idea exchanges in oral group (comments made by a student in the group, that she goes on to use later in her own work)</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> use combination of feedback types</p>	<p>Small sample size (4 students per group)</p>