

The Effect of Teacher-Guided Peer Feedback on English Writing Performance of Chinese EFL High School Students

Zhang Bo, Abu Bakar Razali & Lilliati Ismail

Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia

Email: 383730287@qq.com, abmr_bakar@upm.edu.my, lilliati@upm.edu.my

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i4/23034> DOI:10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i4/23034

Published Online: 09 October 2024

Abstract

Writing is an important output skill among the five basic skills of English, and giving and receiving feedback is an important aspect in the teaching and learning of writing. In the current English writing teaching in Chinese high schools, the method used is teacher feedback, but it is time-consuming and untimely, and it is not possible to give complete feedback on the mistakes and highlights of each student's writing. This puts students in a state of passive acceptance, which is not conducive to learning autonomy, whereas peer feedback facilitates students' independent learning through collaborative exchanges. Therefore, in the practical application of teaching, combining the two teaching methods can make up for each other's deficiencies and work together to bring out better advantages. This study focuses on whether the combination of teacher feedback and peer feedback is effective in improving students' writing performance as compared to the traditional teacher feedback particularly in three aspects of writing, which are idea/content, organization, and grammar. This study takes the process writing method and cooperative learning theory as the theoretical basis and selects two classes of the second year of high school in the first high school of Jixi City, Heilongjiang Province, as the experimental subjects for the teaching experiment. The control class used traditional teacher feedback and the experimental class used teacher-guided peer feedback. A pre- and post-writing test was used in this experiment to explore whether the students' English writing improved or not, and the data were analyzed with the help of SPSS26. Finally, through data organization and analysis, this study found that compared with the traditional teacher feedback model, the combination of teacher feedback and peer feedback can effectively improve students' writing performance, and the average scores on writing idea/content, organization, and grammar are all improved to a certain extent.

Keywords: High School English Writing Instruction, Peer Feedback, Teacher Feedback

Introduction

The Chinese New English Curriculum Standards (2017 Edition) emphasize that English language proficiency is a crucial component of language usage in China. Nevertheless, Chinese high school students still find English writing to be a challenging endeavor (Yi, 2017). Feedback serves as an important intermediary stage in the process of writing where it serves the purpose of assessing students' writing process and can also be utilized to enhance teaching

methods by measuring the effectiveness of instruction (Yao & Wan, 2012). Feedback plays a crucial role in improving writing skills and has a significant impact on the teaching and learning of writing (Ji, 2018). Peer feedback has become a significant teaching practice in various fields, including native or second language writing, oral presentation of projects, physics modeling, and so on (Baker, 2016; Tsivitanidou et al., 2017). In the field of second language teaching, especially in EFL writing, more and more teachers and researchers are focusing on peer feedback. Many studies have found that peer feedback, when given effectively, can not only reduce the pressure on teachers to review all students' scripts alone (Rahimi, 2013; Tsui & Ng, 2010), it can also benefit EFL learners by improving their understanding of quality standards, improving their ability to evaluate and think critically about second language writing, enhancing their autonomy by reading peers' texts, and even helping students form English learning communities (Ghahari & Sedaghat, 2018; Schunn et al., 2016).

Peer feedback activities are favored by many writing teachers and even though this teaching approach is now widely used mainly in writing teaching around the world, its application rate in China is still relatively low. This is because in China, on the one hand, many teachers lack knowledge of peer feedback implementation processes and learner training methods (Zhao, 2018). On the other hand, Chinese EFL learners lack confidence in their own writing feedback ability due to their long-term reliance on written feedback from teachers (Han, 2017; Zhao, 2010), they also do not trust the ability of their peers to give feedback, which results in low acceptance of peer feedback (Hu, 2012; Zhao, 2018). The teaching practice of using peer feedback in teaching English writing in Chinese high school is affected by the actual situation of students where high school students tend to focus on the form of peer feedback and ignore the actual content, resulting in teachers' failure to achieve good results in the actual peer feedback (Tsivitanidou et al., 2017).

Moreover, most areas of China still use the traditional large classroom system where teachers need to correct a large number of essays, and their workload is understandably heavy (Zeng & Liang, 2017). After teachers spend a lot of time reading and marking students' essays, students get their own essays and do not pay much attention to them (Ji, 2018). Few students edit their writings in response to the teacher's comments, and the majority of students focus more on their grades before quickly skimming through the teacher's comments (Liu et al., 2017). Many students feel that after spending a lot of time writing essays in the process of learning English that their English writing has not improved much and they still make similar mistakes in the process of writing in the future (Li & Xue, 2018). Therefore, from this student's point of view, traditional teacher feedback is not fully utilized and its role is not played out (C. Li, 2019).

Due to the long-established teacher-led teaching model and the examination-based education system in China, English writing teaching is only centered on teacher feedback, although the new curriculum reform encourages the use of cooperative learning and contextual learning, peer feedback in English writing is also uncommon (Wang, 2022). Under this kind of feedback, students are generally not motivated to write. Therefore, how to provide students with more effective feedback on their writing and help them improve their writing skills is an important issue facing the research on English writing teaching in high schools (Wang, 2022). Furthermore, existing studies have evaluated the effectiveness of peer feedback activities by analyzing the quality of the manuscript and/or the quality of revision, neglecting to explore

learners' feedback skills. Moreover, it is undeniable that, in addition to skills on the task itself, the development of learners' feedback skills is an important factor in reflecting the effectiveness of peer feedback activities (Deiglmayr, 2017). Therefore, when judging the effectiveness of peer feedback, it is important to focus not only on whether learners' second language writing skills have improved, but also on what specific aspects of learners have improved, such as content, organization, and grammar have improved and what the specific manifestations are. Chang (2021) found that most of the students perceived that peer feedback helped them in their English writing, with the more obvious aspects that helped being: idea / content aspects, such as reviewing the topic, argumentation clear points of view, etc., the correctness and richness of vocabulary and sentence grammar use and logical contextualization are the main three main aspects.

Therefore, in this study the researchers conducted an experimental study of peer feedback on more students to explore whether this feedback mode is suitable for more senior high school students to improve the current Chinese senior high school students' writing performance and alleviate students' writing difficulties. This study aims to investigate the effect of combining teacher feedback and peer feedback in high school English writing teaching performance (i.e., idea/ content, organization and grammar).

Literature Review

Peer Feedback

In English teaching, peer assessment is often used by teachers as a teaching tool. This type of assessment is aimed at developing learners' knowledge and skills (Patchan & Schunn, 2016). In general, peer-to-peer assessment consists of two components: quantitative evaluation, i.e., scores, and qualitative feedback (Adachi et al., 2017; Berndt et al., 2017). In 2016, Patchan and Schunn believe that peer feedback is a way for learners to actively participate in the evaluation process, to think about their peers' performance or the quality of their outcomes, and to discuss improvement strategies with their peers in light of their goals or quality standards (Patchan & Schunn, 2016).

Peer Feedback in EFL Writing

Many scholars acknowledge the role of peer feedback. Cho and MacArthur's (2010) have found that peer feedback corrects more detail errors than student self-feedback, in part replacing teacher feedback (Cho & MacArthur, 2010). Peer feedback can help students have a better understanding of writing requirements, thus deepening the depth of their composition content, peer feedback activities can promote the improvement of students' writing ability (Hu & Lam, 2010). Compared with teacher's feedback, peer feedback can help students examine the writing content from the readers' perspective (Baker, 2016). There has been quite a notable benefit of peer feedback. For one, in a study by Qiu and Ma (2017) they found that most college students think that peer feedback can make up for the deficiencies of teacher feedback (Qiu & Ma, 2017). Meanwhile, Yu and Lee (2016) found that both high- and low-proficiency second or foreign language learners are able to provide effective peer feedback through a study of the effectiveness of peer feedback among learners of different language levels (Yu & Lee, 2016a).

At the same time, some researchers also disapprove of the role of peer feedback. In theory, peer feedback is an effective way of feedback, but in practice, it is difficult to carry out in

junior and senior high school (Bai, 2013). This is because the operability and accuracy of peer feedback remains to be verified (Zhou, 2013). Zeng Yonghong and Liang Yue (2017) found in their research that peer feedback is not widely accepted because of a lack of trust among students (Zeng & Liang, 2017).

More importantly, scholars have found that the training before peer feedback is really important. Altstaedter (2016) conducted an in-depth study of peer feedback training and found that trained students often give macro-level advice on the type of feedback, such as organization and content. Untrained students often provide detailed comments, such as vocabulary, grammar and punctuation (Levi Altstaedter, 2016).

Peer Feedback in Chinese High School English Writing

In terms of research direction, Chen (2020) conducted a comparative study of teacher feedback and peer feedback and concluded that while high school students generally rely on teacher feedback, at the same time they also hope that their peers can put forward the revision of their own compositions. A single form of feedback cannot fully correct errors in students' compositions. Professor Li Yan (2017), discusses strategies to improve the effectiveness of peer feedback systems in high school students and she claims that teacher feedback and peer feedback both have their own advantages and disadvantages, just a single way to take one of them, it is difficult to give good play to the role of feedback in the teaching of writing, and it is difficult to achieve the desired teaching results. In addition, Ni Libing (2013), also made a review on the application of peer feedback in senior high school English writing teaching, and she found that peer feedback is theoretically feasible and effective, and students' attitudes toward peer feedback are positive, but in practice it can be limited due to students' English language proficiency. Pei and Jiang (2021), try to arouse people's attention to peer feedback by summarizing the application of peer feedback in English learning and they found that the model of group peer feedback guided by teacher was more effective than the single-peer-feedback model, and that it helped to increase motivation and class identity, in addition to improving the level of writing. A number of studies have reached this conclusion by examining only a single peer feedback activity (e.g. Miao Yang, et al., 2006) and claim that in the Chinese foreign language context, students tend to be more supportive and recognize teacher feedback, but teacher feedback has its shortcomings. In a comparative study of teacher feedback and peer feedback, Liu (2015), found that combining the two modalities was more effective than either of the feedback modalities alone. Hui (2017), conducted a comparative study between teacher-guided peer feedback and teacher feedback on two classes in the second year of high school, and the study showed that with the teacher's guidance, the students' composition scores improved significantly after peer feedback.

In fact, the improvement of writing ability is not an overnight success, it must be after a period of hard work to be able to improve. Therefore, in this study the researchers conducted an experimental study of peer feedback on more students to explore whether this feedback mode is suitable for more senior high school students to improve the current Chinese senior high school students' writing performance and alleviate students' writing difficulties. Through literature review, we can see that our research on peer feedback applied to English writing teaching has achieved fruitful results, peer feedback also has a positive impact on the teaching of English writing. In fact, due to the limitation of class size and grading task, teachers in Chinese high school English writing class mainly pay attention to the accuracy of students'

language but pay less attention to the structure of the articles. In the previous research on peer feedback, many scholars tend to compare the overall writing performance before and after the experiment to judge whether peer feedback is effective or not (Wang, 2022).

Methodology

This research used a quantitative method, i.e., quasi experimental research, to explore the effectiveness of peer feedback on Chinese EFL high school students' writing performance. In this study, a total of 100 students, 50 in each intact class, were selected as experimental subjects from the first high school in Jixi City, Heilongjiang Province. The sampling procedure for selecting participants is purposive sampling due to the classes being intact classes at the research setting. Both of the two classes adopted the traditional teacher feedback method before the experiment, and the teaching progress as well as the teaching materials used in the two classes are the same. The quasi-experimental research method was used to determine students' idea/content, organization and grammar changes after experiment. This study was conducted over a period of almost 4 months, or 16 weeks, from the beginning of the first semester of the sophomore year in September 2023 to the end of the semester in December 2023, with writing completed every two weeks for a total of 8 sessions of 45 minutes each. The experimental class was given a combination of peer feedback that was guided by the teacher, while the control class was given teacher feedback only. The writing test used in this study was designed to compare the changes in writing scores of students in the experimental and control classes. The pre-test and the post-test of the experiment respectively use the former Chinese College Entrance Examination writing theme to ensure the accuracy of students' scores. The pre and post-test writing scores were both 25 points. In the post-test, after the students finished writing in the classroom, the essays in the control class were given feedback by the teacher only, while in the experimental class, the essays were first given feedback by the students in small groups but guided by the teacher. Afterwards, the writing scores of students in the two classes were recorded, which was used to compare the changes in the writing scores of the two classes and to reflect the impact and effect of the peer feedback practice on writing. In the process of peer feedback, many students did not know in what ways to evaluate others' essays. Therefore, the researcher made reference to the feedback criteria designed by Yang (2006) and combined them with the Heilongjiang Provincial College Entrance Examination Essay Scoring Criteria and the opinion of a teacher in the experimental school who had enough teaching experience to prepare a peer feedback form, which consisted of three parts, i.e., idea/ content, organization, and grammar. The researcher used the method of determining the high and low subgroups as mentioned by Qin (2003) in *Quantitative Data Analysis in Foreign Language Teaching Research*, i.e., choosing the top 25% and the bottom 25% of the total number of students as the criteria for high and low levels and the rest as medium levels. Because students have not had much exposure to peer feedback on writing, training on how to conduct more effective peer feedback was given to the students in the experimental group to standardize students' practices after preparing peer feedback forms and forming peer feedback groups.

During the experiment, the control group followed the traditional teacher feedback model, in which students completed their first drafts and were revised by the teacher, and the corrected students' first drafts were sent back to the students, and the teacher was required to explain to the class the common problems that appeared in the students' first drafts, and to help the students understand how they should be revised. In the experimental group, on the other

hand, after the students finished the first draft, the students followed the process in the previous peer feedback training to give feedback to each other for correction, in which the teacher had to ensure that each group of students was observed. Teachers not only supervised some feedback activities were not active or less serious students into it, but also to students in the feedback process of some of the problems arising from the guidance. After the students' peer feedback, students are instructed to revise according to their peers' feedback, where they do not know how to revise, they can also ask their classmates or the teacher who suggested the revision, so as to revise more accurately and in time.

After the experiment, SPSS software was used to test the difference between the mean scores of the pre- and post-tests of the experimental and control classes to analyze the significant effect of peer feedback on the aspects of writing brought to the students in the experimental class. The mean scores of the students in the experimental class and the control class on the three aspects of writing, i.e., idea/content, organization, and grammar were also collected and compared to analyze which aspects of writing the peer feedback brought significant differences. After that, the mean scores of students of different writing levels in the experimental class were compared to analyze the significant effects of peer feedback on students of different writing levels.

Results

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of CG and EG1 Students' Scores in Pre-test

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
CG	50	14.940	3.401	0.481
EG1	50	14.580	4.427	0.626

Table 1 shows that there are 50 students in both classes, and the mean of the pre-test scores of the experimental class is 14.940, with a standard deviation of 3.401. The mean of the pre-test scores of the control class is 14.580, with a standard deviation of 4.427. From the mean of the pre-test scores of the two classes, the difference of the scores of the two classes is 0.36, which is almost similar, and an independent samples t-test is conducted.

Table 2

Independent Samples T-test of CG and EG Students' Scores in Pre-test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances					
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Equal variances assumed	3.749	0.056	0.456	98	0.649	0.360
Equal variances not assumed			0.456	91.901	0.649	0.360

As can be seen from Table 2, in the analysis of the difference between the English writing scores of the Control group class and the Experimental group, the test of chi-squaredness was

conducted first, and the F value of the test corresponds to a Sig. value of $0.056 > 0.05$, the null hypothesis of the test should not be rejected, and it can be assumed that the analyzed data have chi-squaredness. The t-test of independent samples shows that there is no significant difference between the means of "writing performance" of the control group class and the experimental group before the experiment, and the probability of significance test corresponds to Sig. value (0.649) greater than 0.05. In other words, there is no significant difference between the writing performance of control group class and experimental group students before the experiment.

Table 3

One-way Analysis of Variance of CG and EG Students' Scores in Post-test

	CG	EG	F	Sig.
Writing performance	15.180±3.231	18.520±3.770	12.796	0.000

As can be seen in Table 3, after the experiment, the average score of students' writing achievement in the control class was 15.180 and the writing achievement in the experimental class was 18.520. Through one-way ANOVA, it can be obtained that the F value of the test is 12.796, and the probability Sig. value corresponding to the test is 0.000, which is smaller than the significance level of 0.05, and the null hypothesis of the test should be rejected, i.e., the English writing scores of the students in the experimental class after the experiment have been significantly improved.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Pre-test and Post-test Scores in CG

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pre-test	50	14.940	3.401	0.481
Post-test	50	15.180	3.231	0.457

Table 4 shows the statistics of the paired samples of the pre-test and post-test scores of the control class students' writing. It can be seen that the mean of the pre-test scores of the control class students is 14.940, and the mean of the post-test scores is 15.180, and the mean of the post-test scores is 0.24 points higher than the mean of the pre-test scores. The standard deviation between the pre-test and post-test scores for the control class was 0.17, indicating that the overall achievement gap for the control class was also narrowing.

Table 5

Paired Sample T-test of Pre-test and Post-test Scores in CG

		Paired Differences			t	df	Sig.
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Mean			
Pre-test	Post-test	-0.240	4.596	0.650	-0.369	49	0.714

In order to accurately understand the differences in writing achievement between the pre- and post-tests of the control class, the researcher conducted a paired-sample t-test on the

pre- and post-test scores of the control class, which is shown in Table 5. The t-value of the test can be obtained through the paired-sample t-test, and the probability of the test corresponds to a Sig. value of 0.714, which is greater than the level of significance of 0.05 and should not be rejected as the null hypothesis of the test. That is, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the English writing scores of students in the control class before and after the experiment, which indicates that the traditional teacher's feedback has a slight, but not significant, improvement in improving students' English writing scores.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Pre-test and Post-test Scores in CG

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pre-test	50	14.580	4.427	0.626
Post-test	50	18.520	3.770	0.533

According to the statistical data of the paired samples in Table 6, the mean of the pre-test scores of the students in the experimental class is 14.580 and the mean of the post-test scores is 18.520, and the mean of the post-test scores is 3.94 points higher than the mean of the pre-test scores. Moreover, the standard deviation of the pre-test scores was 4.427, and the post-test scores decreased to 3.770, indicating that the overall difference in the scores of the students in the experimental class is narrowing. From the mean, it was found there is a difference between the pre and post-test scores, so the paired samples t-test was conducted.

Table 7

Paired Sample T-test of Pre-test and Post-test Scores in EG

		Paired Differences			t	df	Sig.
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Mean			
Pre-test	Post-test	-3.940	5.449	0.771	-5.113	49	0.000

Table 7 shows the results of the paired-sample t-test of the pre- and post-test scores of the experimental class. It can be seen that the t-value of the test is -5.113, and the probability of the test corresponds to a Sig. value of 0.000, which is smaller than the significance level of 0.05, and the null hypothesis of the test should be rejected, which can be regarded as the existence of significant differences between the performance of the experimental class' English writing performance before and after the experiment. In other words, the English writing performance of the experimental class after the experiment is significantly higher than that before the experiment, which indicates that the use of peer feedback guided by the teacher is very effective in improving the writing performance of Chinese high school students.

Table 8

Independent Sample T-test of CG Students' Pre- and Post-test Scores in Each Sub-item

	Pre-test	Post-test	t	Sig.
Idea & Content	3.020±1.584	2.960±1.577	0.188	0.851
Organization	3.040±1.498	3.080±1.510	-0.121	0.904
Grammar	2.940±1.544	3.060±1.544	-0.454	0.652
Writing performance	14.940±3.401	15.180±3.231	-0.369	0.714

As can be seen from Table 8, the average score of students' writing performance in the control class before the experiment is 14.940, while the average score after the experiment is 15.180, with a difference of about 0.24 points. Through the paired-sample t-test can be obtained, the t-value of the test is -0.369, the test corresponds to the probability of Sig. value of 0.714, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05, and should not be rejected the null hypothesis of the test, it can be considered that before and after the experiment, the writing performance of the control class is almost the same, there is no significant difference. From the indicators of each dimension before and after the experiment, the paired-sample t-test shows that there is no significant difference in the writing performance of the control class in terms of idea/content, organization and grammar before and after the experiment, and there is no significant difference in the writing performance of the control class before and after the experiment.

In order to investigate the effects of the peer feedback guided by teacher on students' writing idea/content, organization, and grammar, the researcher conducted a paired-sample t-test on each sub-score of students' writing in the experimental group to compare the changes in students' writing performance before and after the experiment.

Table 9

Independent Sample T-test of EG Students' Pre- and Post-test Scores in Each Sub-item

	Pre-test	Post-test	t	Sig.
Idea & Content	2.920±1.736	3.860±1.443	-3.145	0.003
Organization	2.960±1.525	3.760±1.506	-2.578	0.013
Grammar	2.980±1.545	3.880±1.394	-3.298	0.002
Writing performance	14.580±4.427	18.520±3.770	-5.113	0.000

Table 9 shows the paired sample statistics of the students' writing scores in each subsection of the experimental class. According to the data in the table, it can be seen that after the experiment, the students' average scores in the three aspects of writing idea/content, organization, and grammar have increased. The average score of writing idea/content increased from 2.920 before the experiment to 3.860, an increase of 0.94 points. Before the experiment, the average score of students in the experimental class in the aspect of organization was 2.960, and after the experiment, the average score was 3.760, an increase of 0.8 points. In grammar, the average score increased from 2.980 before the experiment to 3.880 after the experiment, an increase of 0.9 points. The significance (two-tailed) for content is $0.003 < 0.05$, which proves that there is a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores in the idea/content of writing. The significance (two-tailed) of organization and grammar is 0.013 and 0.002 respectively, which are both less than 0.05, proving that there

are significant differences in the writing performance of the experimental class in terms of organization and grammar before and after the experiment. From the various data in the table above, it is clear that the feedback model combining teacher feedback and peer feedback had a greater impact on the idea/content, organization, and grammar aspects of students' writing. Among them, the greatest improvement is in the idea/content aspect.

Discussion

The purpose of this study is to investigate whether there is any change in students' English writing performance under the model of combining teacher feedback and peer feedback. From the study, it was found that the model of peer feedback guided by teacher showed a significant improvement in the students' writing performance, in all three aspects of writing, i.e., idea/content, organization and grammar. By comparing and analyzing the pre-test scores of the two groups, there is no significant difference in the level of the students in the two groups. After two months of experimentation, the grades of both groups improved, but the average scores of the students' pre and post-test scores in the control group showed that the control class's grades improved by a small amount. By analyzing the pre- and post-test scores of the experimental group, there is a significant difference between the pre- and post-test scores of the experimental group. There is also a significant difference between the mean scores of the post-tests of the experimental and control groups, which indicates that there is a significant improvement in the writing scores of the students in the experimental group under the model of peer feedback guided by teacher. Moreover, the standard deviation of performance on the pre-test of the experimental group was 4.427, and decreased to 3.770 on the post-test, indicating that the overall difference in performance of students in the experimental group was decreasing, while the change in the standard deviation of performance of students in the control group was not significant.

In addition, the author analyzed the paired samples of students' writing pre and post-test scores in each subsection of the experimental group, and the data showed that there were significant differences in students' pre and post-test scores in the aspects of idea/content, organization and grammar. Peer feedback guided by teacher provided students with rich vocabulary and sentence patterns, refined grammar, reduced the rate of grammatical errors, improved the accuracy of language expression, and standardized writing details. It also makes the writing structure gradually clearer, with sentence-to-sentence transitions as well as natural articulation between paragraphs, meanwhile, in terms of content, students are gradually able to accurately grasp the theme of the writing, express their opinions clearly, and understand the theme of the writing in depth. In summary, it can be concluded that the combination of teacher feedback and peer feedback is effective in improving students' writing performance and in terms of idea/content, organization and grammar compared to just using the traditional teacher feedback.

Recommendations for Practice

The use of peer feedback guided by teacher can effectively improve students' writing performance. Meanwhile, after this experimental study, the researcher also summarized some research insights.

First of all, teachers should give full play to their roles as organizers, managers and guides in the feedback process. In the peer feedback session, without the effective organization and

guidance of the teacher, some students may not participate in the feedback seriously, which will make the peer feedback session meaningless. Therefore, teachers should give full play to their roles in this process, guide students to participate in peer feedback seriously, and guide each group leader to play his or her role well. At the same time, teachers can organize group and inter-group feedback, so that students of different groups at high levels can exchange their compositions for feedback to ensure that every student can receive feedback. In addition, teachers should provide some help to students when necessary, especially many students with good level of writing proficiency may not get a lot of effective feedback, and teachers should also give them guidance from time to time. Second, teachers should use incentives to guide students to actively participate in peer assessment. Teachers can use internal or external rewards to motivate students and mobilize their enthusiasm for participation. It is also possible to carry out a points competition system between groups, to indicate and acknowledge which group is excellent in performance and giving feedback is good; and this group will be given extra points, and the teacher will give the group with the most points to redeem the points at regular intervals. This form not only allows the group to have a sense of competition, but it can also stimulate and improve the students' sense of group cooperation. Finally, teachers should guide students to accumulate knowledge useful for writing in the process of feedback. Students with low or middle levels of proficiency should be guided to actively learn from the good learners in the group, and to accumulate useful knowledge from the feedback in a special notebook and recite it in class. In the final summarizing and presenting session, students should also record the merits of other students' compositions so as to turn the merits of others into their own knowledge in the future.

Recommendations for Future Research

Through the experimental study, the researcher verified the positive effects of the use of peer feedback guided by teacher on Chinese high school English writing performance, but there are still some shortcomings in this study. First, the research time is short. The training of writing feedback needs a long time, and the writing class was only once a week, so the time for feedback training to students was quite short. Therefore, future research can extend the investigation time, so that students have more opportunities to participate in feedback, so that the experimental data are more scientific and representative. Secondly, there are few research subjects in this current study. The students who participated in this study were only 100 students from two classes in the same school, so future research can increase the number of subjects to make the experimental results more representative.

References

- Adachi, C., Tai, J., & Dawson, P. (2017). A framework for designing, implementing, communicating and researching peer assessment. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1405913>
- Baker, K. (2016). Peer review as a strategy for improving students writing process. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787416654794>
- Bai, L. (2013). The Feasibility and Effectiveness of Peer Feedback Model in Basic English Writing. *Journal of PLA College of Foreign Languages*, 36(01), 51-56+127-128.
- Cao, L. (2019). A Comparative Study of Peer Feedback and Teacher Feedback in College English Writing. *Modernization of Education*, 6(12), 60-61+67. <https://doi.org/10.16541/j.cnki.2095-8420.2019.12.022>

- Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2010). Student revision with peer and expert reviewing. *Learning and Instruction, 20*, 328-338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.006>
- Deiglmayr, A. (2017). Instructional scaffolds for learning from formative peer assessment: effects of core task, peer feedback, and dialogue. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 1-13*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-017-0355-8>
- Ghahari, S., & Sedaghat, M. (2018). Optimal feedback structure and interactional pattern in formative peer practices: Students' beliefs. *System, 74*, 9-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.02.003>
- Han, Y. (2017). Mediating and being mediated: Learner beliefs and learner engagement with written corrective feedback. *System, 69*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.07.003>
- Hu, G., & Lam, S. (2010). Issues of cultural appropriateness and pedagogical efficacy: Exploring peer review in a second language writing class. *Instructional Science, 38*, 371-394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9086-1>
- Hu, G. (2012). Peer review and Chinese EFL/ESL student writers. *English Australia Journal, 27*, 3-16.
- Ji, P. (2018). *A Study of Peer Feedback in Senior High School English Writing Class* [Master, Nanjing Normal University].
- Levi Altstaedter, L. (2016). Investigating the impact of peer feedback in foreign language writing. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 1-15*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2015.1115052>
- Liu, X., Ji, X., & Yu, J. (2017). Promoting Learning Through Assessment—An Effective Peer Feedback Model of College English Writing and its Effect on Promoting Learning. *The Study of Contemporary Foreign Languages(05)*, 9-15+109.
- Patchan, M., & Schunn, C. (2016). Understanding the benefits of receiving peer feedback: A case of matching ability in peer-review. *Journal of Writing Research, 8*, 227-265. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2016.08.02.03>
- Qiu, Y., & Ma, G. (2017). A Review of Peer Feedback in Second Language Writing. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University (Social Science Edition), 18(04)*, 52-58.
- Rahimi, M. (2013). Is training student reviewers worth its while? A study of how training influences the quality of students' feedback and writing. *Language Teaching Research, 17*, 67-89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168812459151>
- Schunn, C., Godley, A., & Demartino, S. (2016). The Reliability and Validity of Peer Review of Writing in High School AP English Classes. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 60*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.525>
- Tsivitanidou, O., Constantinou, C., Labudde, P., Rönnebeck, S., & Ropohl, M. (2017). Reciprocal peer assessment as a learning tool for secondary school students in modeling-based learning. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 1-23*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-017-0341-1>
- Tsui, A., & Ng, M. (2010). Cultural Contexts and Situated Possibilities in the Teaching of Second Language Writing. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*, 364-375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487110364855>
- Wang, R. (2022). *A Study on the Application of Peer Feedback in Improving Senior High School Students' English Writing* [Master Thesis, Harbin Normal University].
- Yifen, Z. (2017). A Comparative Study of Peer Feedback and Teacher Feedback in English Writing. *Foreign Language Teaching in Shandong Province, 38(03)*, 52-61. <https://doi.org/10.16482/j.sdwy37-1026.2017-03-006>

- Yao, X., & Wan, J. (2012). A Study on the Feedback of Multiple Assessment of College English Writing. *Foreign Language Studies*(02), 63-66. <https://doi.org/10.13978/j.cnki.wyyj.2012.02.020>
- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016a). Exploring Chinese students' strategy use in a cooperative peer feedback writing group. *System*, 58, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.02.005>
- Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. *Assessing Writing*, 15, 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.01.002>
- Zhao, H. (2018). Exploring tertiary English as a Foreign Language writing tutors' perceptions of the appropriateness of peer assessment for writing. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1434610>
- Zeng, Y., & Liang, Y. (2017). An Empirical Study of the Effects of Peer Review on College Students' English Writing. *Foreign Language Studies*, 34(04),53-57. <https://doi.org/10.13978/j.cnki.wyyj.2017.04.011>
- Zhou, Y. (2013). A Comparative Study of Feedback Patterns in College English Writing. *The foreign language community*(03), 87-96.