

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

Talks by Invited Speakers (In English)

(1) John Peterson (Stanford University)

Title: *Reading Rhetorically to Support Writing Instruction*

Time: 09:30~10:20

Room: Auditorium

Abstract

This talk will investigate the intersection of writing instruction and reading instruction in writing courses. John Bean and others have helped us focus on the value of “reading rhetorically” in order to help students practice an academic approach to deep and critical reading. This emphasis on reading goes hand-in-hand with learning to write within a rhetorical context, that is, learning about writing as a product of its rhetorical situation, in which a specific audience is addressed for specific purposes for a specific occasion. In reading, as in writing, the choices a writer makes can be understood as determined by the goals of connecting with the audience and moving them to engage with the message of the argument. When students read in order to identify and assess rhetorical elements, in a sense they are producing a meta-cognitive response to the reading, and thus practicing a meta-cognitive approach to their own writing. They learn to think about their thinking, write about their writing, and offer their own readers sophisticated meta-guidance through the reasoning of their own texts. This talk will offer some best practices for classroom activities, reading assignments, and writing assignments that support the synthesis between reading and writing instruction.

(2) Paul Wadden (International Christian University)

Title: *10 Best Practices for Teaching Academic Writing*

Time: 10:20~11:10

Room: Auditorium

Abstract

This talk will present a series of contemporary “best practices” in the teaching of academic writing to multi-lingual language learners in general and higher-level Japanese university students in particular. In other words, what writing teachers could or should do in their courses to promote writing skill acquisition and understanding of academic writing conventions. About half of these best practices apply to academic writing in the general composition course and about half to writing-within-the-disciplines of fields such as economics or psychology. The presentation further extends and applies principles outlined by John Peterson in his preceding Invited Talk “Reading Rhetorically to Support Writing Instruction” and is based upon pedagogy and publications that the presenter and Peterson co-developed.

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

(3) Takeshi Kawamoto (Hiroshima University)

Title: *Concordance in life science corpus of Life Science Dictionary (LSD)*
Project: how to use LSD corpus

Time: 15:00~15:50

Room: Auditorium

Abstract

The Life Science Dictionary (LSD) Project provides an online dictionary service (<http://lsd-project.jp>) that contains an English-Japanese dictionary in addition to LSD corpus searches. The corpus consists of about 100,000,000 words from abstracts written by USA or UK researchers. This paper discusses the LSD corpus as a tool for non-native English speakers in writing scientific papers in English. Words used in scientific papers should have clear meaning. This is where the LSD corpus can help. For example, the word "expression" in life science usually means "gene expression". We need to understand if the word "expression" in life science papers is countable or uncountable because the word "expression" can be both countable and uncountable according to the dictionary. Using the LSD corpus, we calculated the ratio of "expression" to "expressions." The ratio was 1000:6, indicating that the word "expression" used in life science papers is an uncountable noun. However, distinguishing between countable and uncountable nouns is not so simple. For example, the ratio of "provide insight into" to "provide insights into" is 6 to 4. Yet, "provide an insight into" is seldom used. The closed ratio of 6:4 means that the word "insight" can be used as either countable or uncountable noun in similar contexts. Another finding indicated that use of "insights" or use of "insight" without an article is preferred over use of "an insight." Thus, the LSD corpus helps non-native English speakers to understand when to use appropriate English words in context, because English grammar can be confusing.

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

Talks by Mei-Writing Professors (In English)

(1) Paul Lai (Nagoya University)

Title: *The secret of building a logical argument*

Time: 13:45~14:45

Room: Auditorium

Abstract

At Mei-Writing we advocate an approach of writing a research paper that begins with a preliminary thesis statement. The entire process of research writing under the Mei-Writing approach is the development and confirmation of the thesis statement, by equipping it with a logical or convincing support. At the end of the process the thesis statement will be turned into a confirmed conclusion. In order for the logical argumentation approach of research writing to succeed and prevail, there are two important questions to be addressed; namely, (i) what are the premises that constitute the convincing support? And (ii) how are they built from scratch? In the previous symposium I gave a talk that partly answers the second question. My talk this time will focus on the first one. Specifically, I would argue that there are basically two types of premises needed in order to make a thesis statement convincing. The first is called the Premise of Proof, which functions to prove that the thesis statement is true by presenting the evidences that infer the truth. The second is called the Necessary Premise, which functions to prove that the thesis statement is not false by presenting the evidences that can defend the statement against some possible counterstatements. In my talk I shall present some practical cases to explain the reason for the two types of premises, as well as the important features that compose each of them. If time allows, I shall explain how to start building the premises.

(2) Chad Nilep (Nagoya University)

Title: *Analyzing distinct varieties of plagiarism.*

Time: 16:20~16:50

Room: C-41

Abstract

Plagiarism is widely recognized as a problem in academic writing, both for classwork and for publication. Scholars have discussed causes of plagiarism ranging from students' ignorance of rules and inexperience using sources (e.g. Erkaya 2009; Gilmore et al. 2010), to teachers' disengaged style and uninspiring assignments (e.g. Wells 1993; Comas-Forgas and Sureda-Negre 2010), to the ready availability of copy-able models and relatively mild judgement against plagiarism (e.g. Liu 1993; Park 2010). Although it is generally viewed as a form of academic dishonesty, however, not all plagiarism comes from students behaving unethically or even negligently (Lai and Nilep 2014). This is especially the case for inexperienced writers trying to use a foreign language. This

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

presentation discusses specific cases of plagiarism resulting from three distinct causes. First, dishonest or careless writers who copy out of desperation or negligence leave educators little to do beyond explaining and enforcing the rules. In contrast, however other causes show a need for attention to critical thinking and communication in writing education. A second cause arises when students attempt to combine information from texts with similar wording but unrelated information. In the third instance, a writer's attempt to "borrow standard phraseology from native speakers" as recommended in writing advice (Swale and Feaks 2012, 126) can result not only in close paraphrase plagiarism, but also loss of information important to the writer's own argument. In each case, writers miscommunicate by focusing too much on language form and not enough on the ideas being communicated.

(3) Kyle Nuske (Nagoya University)

Title: *Cartographies of criticality: measuring the outcomes of critical language teacher education through concept maps.*

Time: 11:30~12:00

Room: C-40

Abstract:

Critical language teacher education prompts apprentice instructors to interrogate how classroom practices reproduce or contest larger systematic power hierarchies, such as those demarcated along lines of nativeness, race, or gender (Hawkins & Norton, 2009). Because this process often involves an emotionally taxing reappraisal of one's most fundamental beliefs and assumptions, it is fraught with a high risk of resistance (Nuske, 2015).

Such complexities indicate the need for nuanced and varied measurement of critical teacher education outcomes. While research in this vein has made near-exclusive use of qualitative methodologies, the presenter argues that a properly contextualized quantitative approach can yield a concrete and precise measurement of the extent to which shifts toward critical understandings occurred.

More specifically, the presenter utilized concept maps—graphical representations of how individuals understand a given notion's components and their methods of interrelation (Borg, 2006)—to gauge the impact of a graduate-level TESOL course that placed considerable emphasis on critical concepts such as empowerment of multilingual practitioners and validation of localized Englishes. A linguistically and culturally diverse cohort (n=13) produced two maps for the concept of *critical language teaching* at the approximate beginning and endpoints of a fifteen-week semester. The maps were analyzed collectively to code and quantify the concepts that appeared most frequently and were defined most extensively (Hanauer, 2014). Subsequently, a pre-post comparison was conducted to quantify the cumulative degree of change in conceptual understanding that had occurred (Farrell, 2008).

Results indicate that participants came to embrace discrete critical notions such as promoting equal opportunities for non-native instructors and

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

customizing pedagogical approaches to suit local learners' needs, but they generally neglected to connect these imperatives to larger sociopolitical circumstances through which discourses of difference are constructed and inequalities are naturalized. The presentation concludes with recommendations for fostering more substantive understandings of criticality among apprentice practitioners.

(4) Mark Weeks (Nagoya University)

Title: *What are you talking about?! Practicing presentations across disciplines.*

Time: 16:20~16:50

Room: C-40

Abstract:

This paper discusses both the benefits and difficulties of running a course in research presentation skills across disciplines. At Nagoya University, the Academic Writing Department now runs several presentation courses, each of them open to researchers, including graduate students, from all disciplines. There are obvious benefits in this, such as allowing researchers to interact with others from outside their field. The fact remains, however, that most students (with the encouragement of their research supervisors) wish to efficiently learn and practice presentation skills readily applicable to their own research area. This is a significant issue for the teacher in a cross-disciplinary classroom: not only is much of the researchers' material unintelligible to those in far-off disciplines, but the format of presentations also varies across fields. Building on the theme of presentations as interactive communication, I want to suggest that a primary fundamental requisite is to encourage a change in the mindset of the students regarding the aims of the presentation process. The cross-disciplinary classroom can actually be seen to provide an excellent environment to support such a shift towards what might be called a "communicative" model. Nevertheless, the compromises required to ensure a useful degree of mutual intelligibility remain a significant challenge as we seek to provide courses with "real world" applicability, so one of my goals in this presentation is to invite input from others running such courses or concerned with related pedagogical issues.

(5) David Toohey (Nagoya University)

Title: *Using builds to clearly present complex information to multi-disciplinary audiences.*

Time: 16:50~17:20

Room: C-40

Abstract:

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

Asian and Western academic writing and presentation often use opposite sequences for facts and logical explanations. It is common for Asian students to start with lengthy explanations of facts to establish expertise before making a logical explanation of their ideas. Western styles start with a thesis statement and expect the facts to prove these thesis statements. In the Western style, the amount of facts may be less, yet complexity also must not be sacrificed. The act of summarizing can in fact involve “creative thinking” and “critical thinking” (Rose & Kiniry 1998: 82). Build slides help present complex information slowly to improve audience memory (Lerner 2016: CLMB 2016). Graduate students in Asian universities are expected to present in both Asian and Western contexts. What strategies may help them clearly present large amounts of complex facts in both contexts? This paper argues that builds, PowerPoint slides that slowly disperse large amounts of facts, can help present new, complex information clearly to general audiences by not letting complex information overwhelm logical argumentation.

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

Talks by Other Contributors (In English)

(1) Jennie Roloff Rothman (International Christian University)

Title: *Investigating changes in peer feedback in the second language writing classroom*

Time: 15:50~16:20

Room: C-41

Abstract:

The use of peer feedback in the second language writing classroom is controversial, as there is conflicting research regarding its impact. Despite this, its popularity in the EFL context continues to grow. While most research has centered on whether or not peer feedback results in an improved written product, there is less showing what quality peer feedback looks like or how students develop the ability to provide it. This skill is fundamental to thinking critically and becoming a better writer in one's own right. This study, conducted in a Japanese university academic writing classroom, investigates the efficacy of a specific method of peer feedback training that draws on writing center theory. Students were trained in how to use the metalanguage of writing as well as provide both constructive and positive feedback, much as a writing tutor might critically evaluate a text. Written feedback collected over one academic year showed a variety of changes, primarily positive, in the type and quality of feedback given. While it is unclear whether this particular training method was the cause of the improvement or simply the repetition of providing feedback, it supports the idea that training students to provide feedback is valuable. Results also suggest that students of varying ability levels improved differently and exhibited varying degrees of critical thinking. The speaker will conclude with suggestions for implementation of training as well as future research directions.

(2) Chih Hao Chang

Title: *Two heads are better than one head*

Time: 16:50~17:20

Room: C-41

Abstract:

Peer review, or peer feedback, is a process where peers evaluate one's work performance and products (Liu, Pysarchik, & Taylor, 2002). In peer review, evaluation is done by one's co-workers or peers who are usually at a similar language level in all related language-learning environments. Peer review is most often used in writing classes where students offer comments on each other's writing (Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, & Huang, 1998). This presentation aims to analyze peer comments via peer review activity, the taxonomy of comments invented by Faigley and Whitte (1981) was selected and adapted. The comments on peer writing were first categorized into two kinds of comments-general comments and specific comments. General comments refer to both positive feedback on the overall writing and personal reflections. Specific comments were

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

divided into two kinds of feedback: surface-level and text-based comments. Surface-level comments suggest surface changes, and text-based comments refer to global-level changes. Surface comments were further classified into two kinds of comments: formal changes (mechanics and grammar) and meaning-preserving, which “paraphrases the concepts in the text but does not alter them” (ibid.: 403). Text-based comments are divided into two similar parts: microstructure comments (do not affect the summary of a text and only have minor changes in sentences and paragraphs) and macrostructure comments (affect the overall summary of a text). In conclusion, this study found that subjects are able to not only produce useful comments but also improve their overall writing abilities. It is suggested that the combination of peer feedback and teacher feedback would meet the diverse needs of students in writing class, so that their learning performance may develop to the best of their efforts.

(3) Chad Musick (ThinkSCIENCE Inc.)

Title: *Avoiding the uncanny valley of formality*

Time: 11:30~12:00

Room: C-41

Abstract:

Many students are taught at the undergraduate level to adopt a certain tone and level of vocabulary in their writing. Typically, this is done to encourage them to move beyond the "simple" writing of elementary and (to some extent) secondary school. Unfortunately, this results in writing of low clarity for academic purposes. Such writing marks inexperienced researchers and leads to pointless complication. The problem is exacerbated for non-native writers, who cannot easily evaluate the appropriateness of level of English in general books about writing. A few specific techniques can rapidly improve academic-level writing. These techniques include shortening sentences; using simpler, more appropriate words (e.g., 'use' instead of 'utilization', 'too small' instead of 'insufficiently large'); and avoiding needless word variation.

(4) Thomas Kabara (Mie University)

Title: *Writing to Impress and Writing to Communicate: Emphasizing Clear Argumentation in Academic Writing Instruction*

Time: 12:00~12:30

Room: C-41

Abstract:

Any evaluation of academic writing is bound to include clarity in its criteria. This includes university entrance exams and English language tests for college-bound students. The numerous shortcomings of teaching to the test are well known, but one of the limitations rarely mentioned is its effects on student's expectations

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

about the goals of academic writing. While in real-world academic writing the goal is to communicate an argument clearly, the goal of test responses is to impress evaluators—using sophisticated vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, etc. This presentation will review evaluation criteria for writing portions of major language tests for college-bound students and analyze test-taking strategies applied to such tests. It will demonstrate how writing strategies that are calculated to impress evaluators actually thwart clarity. The presentation will also argue for the need to teach academic writing students to differentiate between the two divergent aims of writing in academic contexts: writing to impress and writing to communicate an argument clearly.

(5) Zeinab Shekarabi (Hiroshima University)

Title: *The impact of critical thinking on JSL academic writing*

Time: 12:00~12:30

Room: C-40

Abstract:

Academic writing courses generally aim to teach students the theory of academic writing and provide student writers opportunity to apply this theory by writing their own texts. Critical thinking plays a critical role in developing an argument, therefore coupling academic writing instruction with critical thinking instruction might be effective in preparing student writers to produce better essays. This study investigated the differential effects on quality of academic writing produced when teaching academic writing in tandem with critical thinking versus teaching academic writing alone. The effect of these instructional approaches on content, organization, and coherence was elucidated. Using an analytic academic writing rubric, two raters specializing in teaching Japanese as a second language (JSL) evaluated the quality of argumentative essays produced by advanced level JSL students. It is expected students who received both academic writing and critical thinking instruction produced higher quality texts. The presenter will discuss the impact of these instructions on the quality of JSL learners' academic writing as a whole, and on the specific components of content, organization, and coherence. Future implications concerning the instruction of academic writing for second language learners will be also discussed.

(6) Sally Jones (Nagoya University)

Title: *When a Presentation is like a Conversation: Using Conversation Analysis to Understand Academic Presentations*

Time: 15:50~16:20

Room: C-40

Abstract:

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

There is nothing simple about giving a presentation. From verbal cues to non-verbal cues to designing your presentation so that your audience can understand it, doing a presentation is an activity rich with interactional features that presenters must actively engage with. It might be, however, not something that presenters are aware that they are engaging in. The aim of this talk is to examine how presenters use interactional features in their academic presentations. Using the analytic framework of Conversation Analysis to inform this talk, I will in particular highlight how different interactional features are used for the initiation of new topics in presentations and for displaying engagement with the audience. That is, far from being a monologue, academic presentations are akin to our everyday, mundane conversation. It is hoped that this talk will inform presenters on how they can communicate better with their audience during presentations.

Talks by Other Contributors (In German)

(1) Miho Isobe (Universität Shinshu)

Title: *Wie tolerant muss das Korrekturlesen sein? Zur systematischen Korrektur im deutschen Sprachunterricht*

Time: 15:50~16:20

Room: C-42

Abstract:

Die Korrektur ist für die wissenschaftliche Arbeit ein zentrales Thema. Besonders bei der Textverfassung in einer Fremdsprache rechnet man das Korrekturlesen zu den erforderlichen Vorgängen. Der Leser ist aber ausnahmslos mit Schwierigkeiten konfrontiert: Der verfasste Text soll möglichst korrekt fertig gebracht werden, wobei die Eigenart des Originaltextes gewissermaßen verbleiben soll. Vor allem im Fremdsprachenunterricht für Mittel- und Oberstufen findet man häufig eigene Stilarten im Text, die nicht völlig falsch, sondern nur komisch klingen. Sie dürfen nicht nur aus subjektiver Ansicht des Lesers (des Lehrers in diesem Fall), sondern sollten auch nach objektiven Maßstäben korrigiert werden, damit sich der Verfasser (der Lerner) von dem Korrekturvorgang überzeugen lässt. Der Lehrer ist aber nicht immer in der Lage, jeden Text systematisch gleich zu korrigieren. So geraten der Lehrer und der Lerner bei der Schreibaufgabe oft in ein Dilemma. Um dieses Dilemma zu lösen, beschäftigt sich der vorliegende Beitrag mit der Frage: Wie tolerant muss das Korrekturlesen sein? Bei der Korrektur muss der Lehrer eine Entscheidung treffen, ob nämlich die Stilarten akzeptabel sind oder nicht. Die Schwierigkeiten mit dieser Entscheidung sind auf die Wortauswahl des Lerners zurückzuführen. Denn der Lerner wählt aus seinem mentalen Lexikon (aber meistens aus dem Wörterbuch) ein Wort oder eine Phrase aus, wobei oft die Kollokation nicht berücksichtigt wird. Solche Wörter in den Text einzubetten sollte jedoch als Fehler nicht nur korrigiert werden: Idealerweise könnten einige bessere Stilarten systematisch vorgeschlagen werden, damit die Eigenart des Originals beibehalten wird. Zu dieser systematischen Korrektur im deutschen

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

Sprachunterricht findet diese Arbeit Tendenzen bei der Wortauswahl der japanischen Deutschlernenden heraus, indem Übersetzungstexte vom Japanischen ins Deutsche analysiert werden.

(2) Maria Gabriela Schmidt (Universität Tsukuba)

Title: *Kreatives Schreiben auf den Niveaustufen A1 und A2 als Vorbereitung auf das akademische Schreiben*

Time: 16:20~16:50

Room: C-42

Abstract:

Um die Studierenden zu einem selbständigen Sprachgebrauch mit einer kritischen Auseinandersetzung in einer akademischen Abhandlung hinzuführen, sind mehrere Phasen im Fremdspracherwerb zu durchlaufen. Die Studierenden können in einem ersten Schritt durch den kreativen Umgang mit der Zielsprache, hier Deutsch, an eine eigenständige schriftliche Sprachproduktion, z. B. einen Text oder ein Gedicht anzufertigen, herangeführt werden. Dieser Beitrag stellt eine spontan entstandene Unterrichtseinheit vor, die in der Reflektionsphase dann eine große didaktische Chance für die Fertigkeit Schreiben auf der Anfängerstufe zeigte. Das Lehrwerk *Studio 21* bietet nach Lektion 3 in einer Zwischeneinheit *Station 1* moderne Gedichte wie „empfindungswörter“ von Rudolf Otto Wiemer sowie „Konjugation“ von Rudolf Steinmetz (Band 1 (A1) Seite 70-71)) an. Diese wurden im Unterricht in zwei Parallelklassen behandelt. Im Anschluss bekamen die Studierenden ein unbeschriebenes Blatt mit der Anweisung, „Mein erstes Gedicht auf Deutsch“ zu schreiben. Alles andere wurde ihnen überlassen. Nach dem Unterricht schrieb ich die Gedichte der Studierenden ab, nur mit sehr geringen Korrekturen. Anschließend legte ich sie anonymisiert den Studierenden der jeweiligen Klasse zur Wahl des besten Gedichts wieder vor. Das Wahlergebnis zeigte unerwartete Gewinner. Die Reaktionen der Studierenden zu der Unterrichtseinheit sind in ihrem jeweiligen Unterrichtstagebuch festgehalten und sollen in die Diskussion einbezogen werden. Einige Studierende waren sofort begeistert, einige waren schockiert, einige zunächst zögernd. Die Einträge zeigen jedoch deutlich den Gewinn an Selbstvertrauen, einer für sie ungewöhnlichen Aufgabe, die sie trotz ihrer Zweifel geschafft haben. Was auf diesem Niveau durch das kreative Element gelungen ist, gilt in ähnlicher Weise auch für ein höheres Niveau wie dem akademischen Schreiben.

(3) Manshu Ide (Rikkyo University)

Title: *Übersetzung japanischer Aufsätze ins Deutsche: Der deutsche Relativsatz und das japanische adnominale Attribut*

Time: 16:50~17:20

Room: C-42

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

Abstract:

Ausgehend von der Beobachtung, dass japanische Deutschlernende beim Schreiben auf Deutsch wegen des Mangels an deutschen Formulierungsmustern japanische Muster zugrunde legen, kommt hier als ein Beispiel für unterschiedliche Muster zwischen den beiden Sprachen nominale Attribution in Betracht. In Frage kommen der deutsche Relativsatz und das japanische adnominale Attribut (Renntai Shuushoku). Beide Attributsarten haben gemeinsam, dass sie ein Verb enthalten, im Deutschen das Finitum in der Verbendstellung und im Japanischen das Verb mit adnominaler Endung (rentai-kei) unmittelbar vor dem Nomen. Vermutlich wegen dieser Verbhaltigkeit neigen die japanischen Deutschlernenden dazu, die Attribute mit adnominaler Verbendung in den Relativsatz im Deutschen zu ‚übersetzen‘. So verdient der folgende studentische Satz *„Der Dialekt gilt als eine mit Menschen verbindende Brücke, die unterschiedlichen Wurzeln haben“* (zugrunde liegt: *kotonaru ruutsu wo motsu ningen to musubu hashi*) zweierlei Aufmerksamkeit: Erstens wird bei *eine mit Menschen verbindende Brücke* Wort für Wort in eine Attributsphrase übersetzt, zweitens wird ebenfalls die Attributsphrase mit adnominaler Verbendung im Japanischen in den Relativsatz umgewandelt statt einer Präpositionalphrase wie etwa: *Der Dialekt gilt als eine Brücke, die Menschen mit unterschiedlichen Wurzeln verbindet*. Angesichts der Vielfalt der Attributstypen im Deutschen soll darüber nachgedacht werden, wann der Relativsatz im Deutschen als Attribut angemessen ist. Aufmerksam verfolgt wird dabei das „semantische Gewicht“ des Verbs im Relativsatz, das beim Kopulaverb als das leichteste einzustufen ist. Eine unkritische bzw. automatische Übertragung der japanischen Attributsstruktur in Attributsphrase oder Relativsatz im Deutschen ist auf jeden Fall zu vermeiden. Vielfältige Attributionsarten - Relativsatz, Attributsphrase, Apposition, Kompositum und postnominale Präpositionalattribut - sollten im Rahmen der stilistischen Variierung, des kardinalsten Stilgebots im Deutschen, geübt werden, indem äquivalente Varianten gegenseitig ausgetauscht werden.

AWCT 2017 Talks - Titles and Abstracts

Talks by Other Contributors (In Chinese)

(1) 張志豪 (名古屋商科大學)

Title: 同儕互評對寫作教學成效之影響

Time: 11:30~12:00

Room: C-42

Abstract:

同儕互評、同儕回饋是同儕之間互相評估寫作過程與寫作作品的一項重要的活動(Liu et al., 2002)。簡言之，就是由相同語言程度背景環境的同儕，所做的一種評量方法。除此之外，這樣的活動最常出現在寫作的課程。在此項課程，同儕之間可以互相對對方提出評論以及建議(Jacobs et al., 1998)。這個報告主要針對同儕互評活動概述其優缺點，並且在同儕互評實行前、實行期間、實行後提供相對的建議。此研究發現，學生在同儕互評活動上，學習到如何對同儕提出反饋與接受反饋。參與此項活動的研究對象也相當滿意所接受到的反饋，進而提升了對參與寫作的興趣、動機和自信心。對於提出反饋的時候，大部分的研究對象都盡可能去解決他們所面臨的困難，以便能夠提供到正確的評論，因此展現負責的學習態度。同儕互評也促使研究對象察覺到語言學習的不同角度，更加成功地提升其寫作的表現。