

Feedback, Feedback, Feedback: Peer Review, Self-review, and Grading Rubrics Improve Student Writing

Andrea M. Karkowski, Capital University, Columbus, OH

Presented at the Association for Psychological Science, May 2010, Boston, MA

Capital
University
Ask. Think. Lead.

This study examined how three types of feedback given to students (guided peer review, peer review using course grading rubric, self-review using course grading rubric) affect student writing. The guided peer review appears to be less effective than peer review and self-review using the detailed course grading rubric.

- **Student Writing:** Even though the current generation of college students might be doing a lot of writing in the form of email, status updates, and texting, many college professors lament the decline in students' ability to write for a professional audience.
- **Professional Writing:** The style differences associated with these different forms of writing make teaching professional writing a challenge.
- **Purpose:** This study examined how three types of feedback given to students (guided peer review, peer review using the course grading rubric, and self-review using the course grading rubric) affect student writing.
- **Participants:** Students in an upper division psychology course (n = 15).
- **Procedure:** Students completed drafts of a paper, written in APA-style, about an experiment that the class conducted.
- **Paper Drafts:** Each draft required additional content to be added to the paper.
 - 1st draft was of the introduction
 - 2nd draft added the method section
 - 3rd draft added the results and discussion
 - Final draft added the abstract
- **Internal Validity Issue:** To control for improvements in writing of the revised sections, only the grade for the content from the NEW information in each draft was analyzed, with the exception of the final paper.
- **Limitations:** All of the limitations of a repeated measures design apply to this study and future research should employ a between groups design or counterbalance the order of the types of feedback provided.
- **Quantitative Results:** A repeated measures ANOVA conducted on the percentage of points earned on each draft revealed improvement in writing across drafts, $F(3, 42) = 12.123, p = .000$.
 - LSD *post hoc* analyses indicated:
 - NO improvement in writing following the guided peer review:
 - 1st draft mean = 69.11 (SD = 12.44)
 - 2nd draft mean = 67.11 (SD = 19.18)
 - A significant improvement in writing for the draft that followed the peer review using the course grading rubric:
 - 3rd draft mean = 77.56 (SD = 13.12)
 - A significant improvement in writing for the draft that followed the self-review using the course grading rubric:
 - Final draft mean = 84.85 (SD = 10.19)
- This last finding is expected and uninteresting because the grade for the final paper included the revised material, rather than new material.
- **Qualitative Analysis:** Students also anonymously wrote about their experience on writing for this class.
 - All students felt their writing had improved.
 - Most students (N = 8) stated that the writing component of the course was one of the hardest things they had to do in college.
 - Other themes in the student comments included:
 - Developing a better understanding of APA-style
 - Building confidence in writing for a professional audience
 - Coming to appreciate the feedback that they receive about their writing and the value of re-writing
- **Conclusion:** A guided peer review appears to be less effective than peer review and self-review using the detailed course grading rubric (this rubric will be presented in the poster).

Poster available online at <http://capital2.capital.edu/faculty/akarkows/documents/APS2010StudentWriting.pdf>

