

Christopher Puszkar

Professor Longhany

English 1102

24 October 2012

### Interpretive Summary Assignment

Yang, Yu-Fen. "A Reciprocal Peer Review System To Support College Students' Writing." *British Journal Of Educational Technology* 42.4 (2011): 687-700. Academic Search Premier. Web. 24 Oct. 2012.

The author, Yu-Fen Yang discusses in his article, *A Reciprocal Peer Review System to Support College Students' Writing*, the problem that college students have very few opportunities to participate collaboratively in peer review activities. He displayed a design of a reciprocal peer review system for students to observe and learn from each other when writing. Yu-Fen recruited a sample of 95 undergraduate students to construct texts with the support of web-based reciprocal peer review in the processes of modeling, coaching, scaffolding, articulation, reflection and exploration. The results of the study, he found, revealed that these six processes helped students find their internal writing processes so that they could observe and learn from peers in writing. They constructed collaborative language knowledge for text improvement as local revisions (grammatical corrections) and global revisions (corrections on the development organization or style of a text) were made in their final entries.

Yu-Fen's main point is that collaborative peer review activities are important to the writing development of college students. "Through the reciprocal process of peer review in writing, students are

able to develop new ideas and perspectives as well as improve their writing skills” (687). I already agree with his claim judging by experiences in my past leading up to my college career. At the beginning of the article I found myself saying “Well of course peer review is helpful, how could it not be?”, but his peer review process was a bit different. An underlying issue that the author saw was that college students, he observed, rarely had a willing peer to review their essay. I have noticed this at my own university, most people don’t have the time to help others because they have their own work.

An ulterior motive for the author seems to also study students’ thinking process and language knowledge during the peer review sessions. “...the diversified thinking processes and language knowledge from peers were externalized for students to examine” (698). This makes sense because of what the author specialized in during college: Applied Foreign Languages at the National Yunlin University of Science and Technology. Why would someone who studied foreign language want to do a study about the writing process and peer review? It makes sense that he was also interested in how the students communicated and not just what they communicated.