

The Influences of Synchronous and Asynchronous CMC and Communication Models in Online Peer Evaluation

郭信俐、倪淑芳

E-mail: 9701078@mail.dyu.edu.tw

ABSTRACT

Applying Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) as a teaching tool in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing classrooms has become a trend. The purpose of this study is to investigate the influences of synchronous and asynchronous CMC and two communication models on EFL online peer evaluation at the college level. The independent variables are communication tools and communication models, and the dependent variables are participants' perceptions and their writing performance. The participants in this study included 140 undergraduates from two universities in Taiwan. During the peer-evaluation, all participants were divided into four groups. Each did evaluation activities and self-revisions twice. The participants were asked to answer the questionnaire after evaluation to ascertain their perceptions on the online peer-evaluation, the communication tools and the communication models. The participants' writings were also collected. The findings from this study revealed that after the evaluation activity, four groups of participants had the same perceptions toward online peer evaluation and different perceptions toward communication tools and communication models. Finally, participants' final drafts were better than second drafts, and both communication tools and communication models influenced students' writing performance. On the basis of the major findings, some pedagogical implications were provided: (1) when combining CMC tool and communication model for teaching and learning writing, teachers and students gain benefit; (2) evaluation activity really helps students in composing better essays writing.

Keywords : online peer evaluation ; computer-mediated communication ; communication model ; writing

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS PAGE COVER PAGE SIGNATURE AUTHORITY.....	iii
ABSTRACT (CHINESE).....	iv
ABSTRACT (ENGLISH).....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
Chapter I. INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background and Motivation.....	1
1.2 Purposes of the Study.....	3
1.3 Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	4
1.4 Significance of the Study.....	5
1.5 Limitations of the Study.....	6
1.6 Definition of Terms.....	6
1.7 Summary.....	8
Chapter II. LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Synchronous CMC Tool versus Asynchronous CMC Tool.....	9
2.2 Communication Models.....	11
2.3 CMC Tool and Communication Model in Learning.....	14
2.4 Peer Evaluation.....	17
2.4.1 Basic Theory of Peer Evaluation.....	18
2.4.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of Peer Evaluation.....	21
2.4.3 Peer Evaluation in the EFL Writing Classes.....	22
2.4.4 CMC Tool and Communication Model in Online Peer Evaluation.....	23
2.5 Summary.....	25
Chapter III. METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Participants.....	27
3.2 Independent and Dependent Variables.....	28
3.3 Instruments.....	29
3.4 Reliability and Validity.....	30
3.5 Data-Collection Procedures.....	31
3.6 Data Analysis.....	35
3.7 Summary.....	35
Chapter IV. RESULTS	
4.1 Demographic Data.....	36
4.2 Results of Hypothesis Testing.....	38
4.2.1 Students' Perceptions toward Online Peer-Evaluation.....	39
4.2.2 Students' Perceptions toward the Effectiveness of CMC Tool.....	40
4.2.3 Students' Perceptions toward the Effectiveness of Communication Model....	42
4.2.4 Final Writing Performance in Online Peer-Evaluation.....	44
4.2.5 Writing Improvement in Online Peer- Evaluation.....	45
4.3 Summary.....	46
Chapter V. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION	
5.1 Discussion of Results.....	48
5.1.1 Students' Perceptions toward Online Peer-Evaluation, the Effectiveness of CMC Tool, and the Effectiveness of Communication Model.....	48
5.1.2 Final Writing Performance in Online Peer-Evaluation.....	52
5.1.3 Writing Improvement in Online Peer- Evaluation.....	54
5.2 Suggestions for Further Studies.....	56
5.3 Pedagogical Implications of the Findings..	58
5.4 Conclusion.....	59
REFERENCES.....	61
Appendix A: The Evaluation Questionnaire for Class A and Class B.....	67
Appendix B: The Evaluation Questionnaire for Class C and Class D.....	69
Appendix C: The Evaluation Checklist.....	71

REFERENCES

1. Baron, R. A. (1986). *Behavior in organizations—Understanding and managing the human side of work* (2nd ed.). Taipei: Allyn & Bacon.
2. Bavelas, A. (1950). Communication patterns in task-oriented groups. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 22(6), 725-730.
3. Belisle, R. (1996). E-mail activities in the ESL writing class. *The Internet TESL Journal*. Retrieved May 7, 2006, from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Belisle-Email.html>
4. Bell, J. H. (1991). Using peer response groups in ESL writing classes. *TESL Canada Journal*, 8(2), 65-71.
5. Berge, Z. L., & Collins, M. (1993). Computer conferencing and online education. *The Arachnet Electronic Journal on Virtual Culture*, 1(3). Retrieved May 7, 2006, from <http://www.emoderators.com/papers/berge1n3.html>
6. Bloch, J. (2002). Student/teacher interaction via email: The social context of Internet discourse. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11(2), 117-134.
7. Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1994). Writing groups: Cross-cultural issues. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(1), 17-30.
8. Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
9. Chen, J. H. (2002). The impacts of communication model and web communication tools on learning effects. Master thesis. Department of Computer Science and Information Management Providence University.
10. Chen, P. J. (2000). A prototype of online intermediate English writing for Chinese speakers of learners: A six-week intensive course. *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China*. Taipei: Crane.
11. Cohen, J. (1973). Eta-squared and partial eta-squared statistics in fixed factor ANOVA designs. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 33, 107-112.
12. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.
13. Daft, R. L., & Noe, R. A. (2001). *Organizational behavior*. NY: Harcourt College.
14. Derry, S. J. (1999). A Fish called peer learning: Searching for common themes. In A. M. O'Donnell & A. King (Eds.), *Cognitive perspectives on peer learning* (pp. 197-211). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
15. DiGiovanni, E., & Nagaswami, G. (2001). Online peer review: An alternative to face-to-face? *ELT Journal*, 55(3), 263-272.
16. Ei-Tigi, M., & Branch, R. M. (1997). Designing for interaction, learner controlled feedback during web-based learning. *Educational Technology*, 37(3), 23-29.
17. Green, S. B., Salkind, N. J., & Akey, T. M. (1999) *Using SPSS for Windows: Analyzing and understanding data* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ.: Prentice Hall.
18. Hafernik, J. J. (1983). The how and why of peer edition in the ESL writing class. Paper presented at the State Meeting of the California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Los Angeles. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED253064)
19. Huang, A. H. (2003). The effects of on-line peer-evaluation on English writing for students in senior high school. Master thesis. Department of English National Kaohsiung Normal University.
20. Huang, S. Y. (1995). The efficacy of using writing groups to help students generate ideas for writing and revise drafts in an EFL university writing class. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on English Teaching*. Taipei: Crane.
21. Husen, T., & Postlethwaite, T. N. (1994). *The international encyclopedia of education* (2nd ed.). NY: Pergamon Press.
22. Jacobs, G. M., Curtis, A., Braine, G., & Huang, S. Y. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 307-317.
23. Kearsley, G. (2000). Learning and teaching in cyberspace. Retrieved May 7, 2006, from <http://home.sprynet.com/~gkearsley/chapts.htm>
24. Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294-304.
25. Kuo, C. H., Wible, D., & Chou, C. L. (2001). A synchronous EFL writing environment for the Internet. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, 7(3), 240-253.
26. LeBaron, J. F. (2001). Online learning in schools and higher education: An overview of thought and action. Retrieved May 7, 2006, from <http://gse.uml.edu/lebaron/OFL-SOF.htm>
27. Lee, K.C. (2004). Computer mediated communication (CMC) discussion tools in the second language classroom. (STETS Vol.3). Singapore: National University of Singapore. Retrieved November 20, 2006, from http://www.stets.org.sg/vol3N1_2004KCLee.pdf
28. Lehr, F. (1995). *Revision in the writing process*. Bloomington. IN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED379664)
29. Lewes, U. E. (1981). Peer-evaluation in a writing seminar. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED226355)
30. Li, L., & Steckelberg, A. L. (2006). Perceptions of Web-mediated peer assessment. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 10(2), 265-269.
31. Li, Y. L. (2000). Linguistic characteristics of ESL writing in task-based email activities. *System*, 28(2), 229-245.
32. Liaw, M. L. (1998). Using electronic mail for English as a foreign language instruction. *System*, 26(3), 335-351.
33. Lin, H. C. (2003). Online Chatting for EFL Writing. Paper presented at the 13th International Symposium and Book Fair on English Teaching. Taipei: Crane.
34. Lin, S. S. J., Liu, E. Z. F., & Yuan, S. M. (2002). Student attitudes toward networked peer assessment: Case studies of undergraduate students and senior high school students. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 29(2), 241-254.
35. Liu, C. F., Chou, Y. H., Lin, S. J., & Yuan, H. M. (2001). NetPeas implemented in technical English copy-editing: A case study about student attitudes. *Proceedings of the GCCCE*. Jhongli: National Central University.
- [劉旨峰, 周宜興, 林珊如, 袁賢銘 (2001)。科技英文編修課程推行網路同儕互評的實例: 學生態度實例分析。發表於全球華人學習科技研討會。中壢: 中央大學。]
36. Liu, J., Pysarchik, D. T., & Taylor, W. W. (2002). Peer review in the classroom. *Bioscience*, 52(9), 824-929.
37. Liu, J., & Sadler, R. W. (2000). The effect and affect of peer review in electronic versus traditional modes on L2 writing. Retrieved August 16, 2006, from http://www.eslweb.org/effect_and_affect.htm
38. Mason, R. (1994). Using communications media in open and flexible learning. London: Kogan Page.
39. Mangelsdorf, K., & Schlumberger, A. (1992). ESL student response stances in a peer review task. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1, 235-254.
40. Mendonca, C. O. & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 745-769.
41. Nelson, G. L., & Murphy, J. M. (1992). An L2 writing group: Task and social dimensions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(3), 171-193.
42. Palme, J. (1995). *Electronic mail*. Norwood: Artech House.
43. Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265-289.
44. Piaget, J. (1926). *Judgment and reasoning in the child*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
45. Quinn, C. N., Mehan, H., Levin, J. A., & Black, S. D. (1983). Real education in non-real time: The use of electronic message systems for instruction. *Instructional Science*, 11, 313-327.
46. Reid, J. M. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing*. NY: Prentice Hall Regents.
47. Richard, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman: Dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics*. NY: Longman.

48. Robbins, S. P. (1984). *Management: Concepts & practices*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. 49. Rothschild, D., & Klingenberg, F. (1990). Self and peer evaluation of writing in the interactive ESL classroom: An exploratory study. *TESL Canada Journal*, 8(1), 52-65. 50. Shaw, M. E. (1976). *Group dynamics: The psychology of small group behavior* (2nd ed.). NY: McGraw-Hill. 51. Shiao, C. K. (2004). Synchronous electronic discussions in an EFL reading class. *ELT Journal*, 58(2), 164-173. 52. Sullivan, D., Brown, C. E., & Nielson, N. L. (1998). Computer-mediated peer review of student papers. *Journal of Education for Business*, 74(2), 117-121. 53. Sullivan, N., & Pratt, E. (1996). A comparative study of two ESL writing environments: A computer-assisted classroom and a traditional oral classroom. *System*, 24(4), 491-501. 54. Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 239-276. 55. Tsai, W. W. (2005). *The king of English error finding : 100 common grammar errors*. Taipei: Shou-Hsueh Culture. [宰薇薇 (2005)。英文挑錯王:常見文法錯誤100則。台北: 首學文化。] 56. Tso, W. W. (2001). The effectiveness of peer evaluation on EFL writing. Master thesis, Department of English National Kaohsiung Normal University. 57. Villamil, O. S., & Guerrero, M. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Social-cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5(1), 51-75. 58. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 59. Wagner, J. A., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (1995). *Management of organizational behavior*. (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall Englewood Cliffs. 60. Walters, R. (1995). *Computer-mediated communication: Multimedia applications*. Boston: Artech House. 61. Warschauer, M. (1996). Comparing face-to-face and electronic discussion in the second language classroom. *CALTCO Journal*, 13(2), 7-26. 62. Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem-solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17, 89-100. 63. Wu, W. S. (2006). The effect of blog peer review and teacher feedback on the revisions of EFL writers. *Journal of Education and Foreign Language and Literature*, 3(1), 125-138.