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SUMMARY

This research explores peer review in the academic writing of ESL university students. It investigates the problem from both qualitative and quantitative perspectives. Overall findings showed no significant differences between the holistic coherence ratings given to the original and final drafts of the group of students exposed to a process approach to writing with peer review. Similarly, there were no significant differences between the holistic coherence ratings of this experimental group and control group on their final drafts. However, the findings of finer-grained comparative analyses of each experimental group student's original and final drafts revealed both positive and negative results with respect to changes made. The study also explores the changes in terms of the peer review process, so attempting to analyse in more qualitative detail how coherence is constituted in student academic writing.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to outline the research problem, the aims and hypotheses of the study and the research design employed, and then to provide an overview of the structure of the dissertation.

1.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The current study explores one kind of writing development initiative, namely the use of peer review in student academic writing. Peer review or peer response is a teaching approach in which students work in pairs or small groups to provide feedback on one another's writing (McGroarty & Zhu 1997:2). According to Zhu (1995: 492) this approach has become a common feature of writing instruction in colleges throughout the United States. The interest in peer review was largely due to two developments in the teaching of writing. Firstly, there was a greater emphasis on the writing process. Secondly, there was a sense of recognition that "social interaction is a prerequisite for learning to write" (Lockhart & Ng 1995: 606). These two developments are discussed in detail in Chapter 2 (cf 2.1 & 2.2).

South African tertiary institutions, unlike their American counterparts, have paid little attention to peer review. Boughey 1997b is, however, one South African study that reports on peer review groups.

Studies mentioned above (e.g. Lockhart & Ng 1995; McGroarty & Zhu 1997; Zhu 1995) examined peer review in the context of Freshman English composition writing whereas my study examines this approach in the context of student academic writing. Like other writers (e.g. Horowitz 1986; Shih 1986), Hubbard
(1989) maintains that there is a difference between the genres of composition writing and academic writing. He defines student academic writing as that sub-genre of expository writing that is required from students in the study of course content. It is writing that deals with specific content particular to the relevant course or discipline (Hubbard 1989: 3).

As many studies can testify, this type of writing is conceptually and cognitively demanding (Shay, Bond & Hughes 1996), and it requires students to exercise complex cognitive, researching and language skills (Shih 1986). This type of writing is discussed in detail in Chapter 2 (cf 2.3).

The kind of writing described above would present a problem to students, particularly those coming from a school background where rote learning and regurgitation bring success and where the authority of the teacher and textbook is absolute (Rule 1994:101). This kind of schooling system does not prepare students for the kind of writing tasks that would be expected of them in the academic environment. The participants in the present study come from this kind of schooling system (cf 3.3.1.1).

The problem of writing at tertiary level is much more pressing, particularly for students who are expected to acquire academic literacy in a language that is not their mother tongue. This poses a double burden on the second language writer (Murray in Mpambani 1997: 315). ESL writers then, find themselves at a disadvantage because they have to grapple with acquiring academic literacies and competency in English, which is necessary for understanding academic reading and writing. Taylor et al. (in Leibowitz, Goodman, Hannon & Parkerson 1997: 5) define academic literacy as the acquisition of the formal conventions associated with the academy, such as the manner of organising concepts and the practices and methods of enquiry pertinent to a particular discipline.
A further aggravating factor in the case of the students described in this study is that unlike their counterparts at many other tertiary institutions in South Africa and elsewhere, these students are not exposed to formal writing programmes or English for Specific Purposes courses, which facilitate the acquisition of academic literacy.

The fact that student academic writing poses a particular problem to students is evidenced by a large body of research generated by teachers and researchers at tertiary institutions in South Africa (Boughey 1997a; Dison 1997; Hubbard 1989; Israel 1992; Leibowitz & Parkerson 1994; Leibowitz et al. 1997; Moore 1994; Mpambani 1997; Parkerson 1996; Rule 1994; Shay et al. 1996; Slemming 1996; Van Tonder 1999; Watkinson 1998).

The use of peer review as conceived within a process and "socio-constructionist approach" (Lockhart & Ng 1995: 606) and within student academic writing is examined in the context of two research paradigms, namely, the qualitative case study and quasi-experimental research paradigms. In terms of the quasi-experimental quantitative approach, the study aims to determine whether the final drafts of students exposed to peer feedback were rated as more coherent than the original drafts. Furthermore, it examines whether the experimental group produced more coherent final drafts than the control group. The aim of the qualitative case study is to make a comparative analysis of the original and final drafts produced by the experimental group in terms of coherence while also exploring aspects of the writing process that the experimental group went through.

1.2 AIMS OF STUDY

The main aim of this study is to establish the effects of peer feedback on English Second Language (ESL) students' writing. This aim can be defined in terms of the general research questions, that is, Research Questions 1 and 2, which are addressed in a quantitative manner and the specific research questions (those that
appear in italics) which lend themselves to a qualitative case study approach. The two sets of questions are outlined on the next page.

1. Will the final drafts of students exposed to peer feedback be rated as more coherent than the original drafts?

   1.1 Does revision help to make the final drafts more coherent than the originals?
   1.2 What kind of cohesion-related problems were evident in the original and final drafts?
   1.3 What type of revision changes do students make as they revise their original drafts?
       1.3.1 To what extent do students make surface as opposed to meaning changes when revising?
       1.3.2 Do surface and meaning changes result in more coherent final drafts?
       1.3.3 To what extent do writers incorporate changes suggested during peer review as well as self-initiated changes?
       1.3.4 Does writers' incorporation of peer comment help to make the final drafts more coherent?
       1.3.5 Is there a relationship between incorporation of peer comment and the interaction patterns that pairs engage in during the peer review process?
   1.4 What is the students' attitude towards peer review?

2. Will the final drafts produced by the experimental group (the peer feedback group) be more highly rated than those produced by the control group?

   1.2.1 Research hypotheses
   The research questions 1 and 2 have been reformulated as hypotheses. The two
hypotheses which are referred to as Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 are reproduced below:

Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant difference in the holistic ratings between the original and final drafts of the experimental group.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant difference between the holistic ratings on the final drafts of the experimental group and the control group.

1.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

This study should be seen primarily as a case study focusing on the four students who were exposed to peer review. The research hypotheses must be seen within the larger context of the specific research questions presented in 1.2. As suggested above (cf 1.2) this research design combines a qualitative case study approach with a quantitative quasi-experimental approach such that these two designs can be seen as complementing each other.

In terms of these designs, Research Question 1, which has been formulated into Hypothesis 1, lends itself to a quasi-experimental quantitative-statistical approach and the specific research questions, which help the reader gain deeper insight into the problem being investigated, lend themselves to a qualitative case study approach.

Research Question 2, which has been formulated as Hypothesis 2, lends itself to a quasi-experimental-quantitative-statistical approach. The type of quasi-experiment used in this study is known as the pre-test-post-test, non-equivalent control group design. With this design there are usually two groups, the experimental and the control group, and a manipulated variable with two values (Wiersma 1995: 141).
The one group receives treatment while the other does not, and both groups are later compared on the dependent variable, to determine the effect of the experimental treatment (Borg 1987: 13).

1.3.1 Data collection and analysis procedures

Data for the present study was collected from the following sources:
(a) essays received from the experimental and control groups for the pre-test;
(b) original and final drafts of the essay produced by the experimental group;
(c) transcripts from students' discussion during the peer review process;
(d) written comments on the Peer Review Sheet (PRS);
(e) transcripts of the peer review interviews; and
(f) final essay drafts produced by the experimental and control groups.

The discussion that follows explains how each one of these types of data was analysed.

(a) The Pre-test

As mentioned earlier (cf 1.3) this study employs a quasi-experimental pre-test-post-test design. At the beginning of the study 13 students completed a writing assignment assigned by a Sociology 200 lecturer. This assignment was used as a pre-test for writing quality. Three independent raters were asked to rate this assignment using a holistic scale developed by Bamberg (1983) (cf Appendix A). The holistic scores on the pre-test were computed for the experimental and control groups to determine if they were initially comparable on the pre-test variable. The Mann-Whitney U test performed on these scores revealed no significant difference between the scores of the experimental and control groups.

Due to attrition, the results of the pre-test reported in Chapter 4 are just those for
the eight students who made the final sample.

(b) The assignment

The original and final drafts of the essay assignment (detailed in Chapter 4) were made available by the four students who were in the experimental group. The actual writing tasks designed by the Sociology Department were used. The two drafts were rated holistically using Bamberg's (1983) holistic rating scale. The main objective for rating these drafts was to determine whether there was a significant difference in the holistic coherence scores of the students' original and final drafts (cf Hypothesis 1). The holistic scores were subjected to a Wilcoxon-Matched Pairs Signed Ranked test and the results of this test are presented and interpreted in Chapter 4 (4.3).

Secondly, each student's original and final drafts were subjected to an in-depth comparative analysis of the changes made between drafts. The main aim of this analysis was to establish the kind of changes that students made and how these changes impacted on the coherence of the final drafts. Bamberg's (1983; 1984) holistic coherence and Wikborg's (1990) taxonomy of incoherence in student writing served as foundation for comparing the drafts in terms of the specific aspects coherence while Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy of revision changes was used as an analytical framework for examining the types of revision changes made. This taxonomy is explained in detail in Chapter 3 (cf 3.4.1.2).

Data from a variety of sources was used in this analysis, namely, original and final drafts of the essay produced by the experimental group, transcripts from students' discussion during the peer review process, written comments on the PRS and transcripts of the peer review interviews.

Finally, the final essay drafts produced by the experimental and control groups
were used for the post-test. The same three raters used previously were asked to rate these final drafts using Bamberg’s (1983) scale of holistic rating. The Mann-Whitney U test was performed to determine whether there was a significant difference in the holistic scores of the two groups. The results of this test are presented in 4.4.

1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

This chapter gave an overview of the research problem, the aims and hypotheses of the study and the research design employed. In Chapter 2 the concept of peer review is discussed in the context of student academic writing. This chapter focuses particularly on peer review and the process approach, theoretical support for peer review, the notion of student academic writing and findings of empirical studies on peer review. This is followed by a discussion of the methodology, research design, data collection and analysis procedures in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 presents the findings and their interpretations. The hypotheses and research questions are discussed in terms of the findings. Finally, Chapter 5 addresses the implications of the findings, the limitations to the study and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 2

PEER REVIEW IN STUDENT ACADEMIC WRITING

2 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter mentioned problems that ESL students experience with academic writing. This chapter begins with a brief overview of writing development initiatives undertaken by writing and language teachers at tertiary institutions in South Africa to address these problems. Furthermore, it explores another form of writing development initiative, that is, peer review.

The main aim of this chapter is to discuss peer review as conceptualised within the process approach and to give a brief overview of the theory underlying peer review. As the focus of the current study is on the use of peer review in student academic writing, it is necessary also to review literature on the nature of student writing. This is followed by a survey of relevant research done in the peer review area.

2.1 Writing development initiatives

In the light of student writing problems mentioned in the previous chapter (cf 1.1), language teachers and researchers attempted to address those problems by introducing a number of writing development initiatives such as writing centres, writing respondent programmes and writing across the curriculum projects. This is evident from a number of studies undertaken at South African universities (Boughey 1995; Jawitz & Martin 1995; Leibowitz 1994; Dison 1997; Rollnick, White & Dison 1992).
2.1.1 Writing Centres

Following models developed in the United States, a number of tertiary institutions in South Africa have established writing centres as strategies aimed at facilitating the development of students' academic writing. A writing centre is a place which offers students across the disciplines a one-on-one consultation about writing in progress. The task of the writing consultant (who is usually a postgraduate student tutor) is to respond to the writing not as a teacher, but as a skillful reader who helps the writer develop his or her writing by negotiating meaning (Boughey 1995: 202).

Although writing centres have to some extent been effective in developing students' writing, there are some weaknesses in this model. The main weakness is that the writing consultants consult with students from a variety of disciplines including those which the consultants are unfamiliar with. This could be problematic, as Leibowitz 1995a noted in her study: because the consultants are not familiar with the writing conventions of a particular discipline, they resort to paying too much attention to the formal aspects of the essay at the expense of coherence at the level of argument and understanding.

From the above discussion it appears that the writing centre approach lends itself to a Vygotskian approach to learning as well as a process approach to writing. The fact that the writing centre consultant intervenes in the students' writing process provides opportunities for the consultant (a capable peer) to guide and support the student learner in an attempt to help him or her produce coherent text.

2.1.2 Writing Respondent Programmes

The writing respondent programme described here is one of the alternatives to a writing centre. It functions by using writing respondents to provide written responses to students' essay drafts. This means that the respondent reads the
writing and responds with questions written on the actual draft. The student is then encouraged to use those questions as an aid to redrafting his or her essay. The questioning technique seeks to develop an awareness that writing can function the same way as speaking in that it is essentially a dialogue between the reader and the writer (Boughey 1995: 204).

The respondent does not comment on the surface features of the writing since the aim is to develop the understanding of meanings which underlie the use of these features (Boughey 1995: 205). The respondents in this programme usually come from teaching, publishing, and university lecturing backgrounds. All respondents are expected to respond to work from a variety of disciplines and construct appropriate background knowledge necessary for their work by reading appropriate course guides and lecturers' instructions. The consultants at some of the writing centres make use of the same procedure.

By concentrating on developing the meanings constructed in the writing, one of the aims of this programme is to make links between writing and learning so that writing becomes a means of developing learning rather than as a means of testing learning (Boughey 1995: 205). This demonstrates that this programme acknowledges the fact that writing at tertiary institutions occurs within a discipline, an issue which will be further discussed in the next section.

2.1.3 Integrating writing into the curriculum

Recent research indicates that writing in academic disciplines is inextricably linked with the studying of a specific subject matter. For instance, in order to complete writing tasks assigned, students would need to have a firm grasp of the content and they should be able to write according to specific instructions and specific writing conventions of the discipline (Shay et al. 1996: 20; Spack 1988: 40).

Academic departments at the various institutions in South Africa have sought to
integrate writing skills into their courses. Examples of the studies done in these areas are in the Chemistry Department at the University of the Witwatersrand (Rollnick, White & Dison 1992); Departments of Biochemistry and Occupational Therapy, University of the Western Cape (Boughey & Goodman 1994); Departments of Chemistry and Engineering, University of Cape Town (Davidowitz & Shay 1996; Jawitz & Martin 1995).

Despite the amount of research that has been done into the development of students' writing in South Africa, research into peer review, that is using students to provide feedback one another's writing, has received little or no attention in this country, whereas in the United States peer feedback in writing classes has become a common feature of writing instruction.

Research on the provision of feedback has focused on either tutors or lecturers as readers and providers of feedback to students' writing (e.g. Boughey 1995; Dison 1997). It is, therefore, the objective of the present study to explore peer review as an instructional approach in the development of students' writing.

2.2 PEER REVIEW AND THE PROCESS APPROACH

Peer review as an instructional approach in which students read drafts of their fellow students in order to give guidance and feedback on their writing lends itself to a process model of teaching writing. In this model writing is seen as a recursive, non-linear process in which ideas are explored, clarified and reformulated (Zamel 1983: 166). This view is also held by other researchers (for example Raimes 1985; Flower & Hayes 1984). Furthermore, in this model revision or changing of text through multiple drafts has been identified as an important factor in achieving quality in the final product (Sommers 1980; Zamel 1983).

Supporters of peer revision in both L1 (e.g. Bruffee 1984) and L2 contexts (Berkenkotter 1984; Boughey 1997b; Carson & Nelson 1994; Jacobs 1987;
Lockhart & Ng 1995; Nelson & Murphy 1993; Villamil & De Guerrero 1996; Zhu 1995) see this approach as a way to intervene in the writing process and "it is assumed that the guidance and feedback will result in improved text" (Carson & Nelson 1994:18). DiPardo & Freedman (1988: 123) support this view by suggesting that peer response groups provide the environment conducive for intervening in the individual’s writing process and provide opportunities for students to work collaboratively to discover ideas and to raise the writer’s awareness of the needs of the audience.

Proponents of peer review for example, Di Pardo & Freedman (1988); Beach (in Anson 1989); Nystrand & Brandt (in Anson 1989); Villamil & DeGuerrero (1996); Jacobs (1989) make the following claims about the benefits of this approach:

- Peer review gives students opportunities to recognise on their own the kinds of problems that teachers as readers experience with their texts
- It motivates and provides students with insight into writing
- It can be helpful in providing students with a real audience that can foster in them a sense of audience
- It affords learners opportunities to see the kinds of ideas other students have and how they develop them
- Writers benefit from the suggestions of their fellow students
- It gives students opportunities to explain, justify and clarify their viewpoints.

2.2.1 Theoretical support for peer review

The theoretical basis for peer review derives from Vygotsky’s theory, which stresses that learning is not an individual lonely activity, but a cognitive activity that occurs in, and is mediated by social interaction (Zhu 1995: 493). This view is supported by adherents of the peer review process (e.g. Jacobs 1987; Mendonca & Johnson 1994; McGroarty & Zhu 1997; De Guerrero & Villamil 1994; Di Pardo & Freedman 1988; Bruffee 1984; Carson & Nelson 1994).
According to this theory, during social interaction learning takes place between two people, one a more capable or experienced participant and the other a novice. The experienced individual guides or supports the less experienced in an attempt to solve a problem. In turn the novice internalizes the expert's strategies for problem solving (Donato in Lantolf & Appel 1994: 37).

This conceptualization of learning led Vygotsky to distinguish between a person's 'actual' and 'potential' levels of development. The former implies that a person is able to perform certain tasks independently of another person while the latter suggests that an individual cannot carry out certain functions or tasks without the help of an experienced person (Lantolf & Appel 1994: 10).

Closely related to these two concepts is the notion of regulation, whereby an individual's area of control of mental activity shifts from the external context, meaning, the physical environment and social relations to the internal mind. A cognitively developed individual is one who has become independent of the external context, meaning he or she is no longer dependent on concrete objects to explain something. Added to this, he or she is not dependent on an experienced person for support and guidance (Ahmed in Lantolf & Appel 1994: 158).

Underlying the notion of regulation are three regulatory functions: object-regulation, other-regulation and self-regulation. The object regulated function is the most elemental function where a child or individual is dependent on the external context to perform certain tasks. With regard to the other-regulated function, the child or the novice is able to carry out certain tasks but only with assistance from a more capable peer (Lantolf & Appel 1994: 12). The primary means of carrying out other-regulatory functions is through verbal interaction between the two. With regard to the self-regulatory function the child takes more responsibility for his or her own learning until self-regulation is achieved.
According to Lantolf and Appel (1994:12) self-regulation is not achieved at a given point in cognitive development. For example learners of the same age may require different regulatory functions to complete a given task. One individual may still be dependent on the assistance of others for guidance and support while the other may be able to complete a given task independently.

The transition from other-regulation to self-regulation takes place in the zone of proximal development, which is defined as “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (Vygotsky in Di Pardo & Freedman 1988: 129).

Given the above perspective, one needs to point out that writing, particularly academic writing, is a skill that writers acquire over a period of time. As indicated in 2.1 intervening in the individual’s writing process, either through peer feedback or teacher/tutor feedback provides opportunities for the ‘other regulated’ learners to learn how to produce coherent texts. Learning takes place when these writers are able to use this feedback to revise successfully, which means, meeting the readers’ expectations about what constitutes coherent writing. Studies on student writing (for example Watkinson 1998; Boughey 1995, 1997b) conducted at South African universities show that intervening in the student’s writing process does help students move from the ‘other regulated stage to self-regulation or in Vygotsky’s term “zone of proximal performance”(Lockhart & Ng 1995:606).

Bruffee (1984: 644), a proponent of peer review groups, supports the notion of social interaction in learning to write by pointing out that collaborative learning provides that social context in which students can “practice and master” discourse used by the academic community. He goes on to say that students can work collaboratively on a task as a group in order to help one another to master the language of the discourse community. This assertion appears to be true when one
considers how Baughey's (1997b) students worked collaboratively, pooling their knowledge of the subject content and the assignment topic plus teacher feedback to improve their essay drafts (cf 2.4.4).

In the same vein, Beach (in Anson 1989:127) points out that the immediate goal in responding to students’ drafts is to help them revise and improve a particular assignment but the long term goal is to help those students learn to critically evaluate writing on their own. The same belief is held by consultants at writing centres in South Africa (Leibowitz & Parkerson 1994; Slemming 1996; Parkerson 1996 and Leibowitz et al.1997) and also by coordinators of writing programmes (Baughey 1995; Davidowitz & Shay 1996) designed to offer feedback on writing in progress (cf 2.1.1, 2.1.2 & 2.1.3).

The practices in the writing centres are guided by philosophies that perceive writing as a process and the social constructionist theory that sees writing as a social activity (Parkerson 1996) and a means to foster learning (Leibowitz & Parkerson 1994). Furthermore, Parkerson (1996) concurs with Beach (in Anson 1989) when she points out that the aim of writing centre consultation, which is characterised by a tutor guiding students on how they should improve their drafts, is to help those students so that eventually they can produce quality writing on their own. Therefore the one-on-one consultation between a peer tutor and a tutee, typical of writing centre consultation, matches the type of relationship in which a “capable peer” assists a learner progressing through the zone of proximal development.

One other writing development programme which appears to be underpinned by Vygotsky's theory is the writing respondent programme (cf 2.1.2). This programme functions by using writing respondents who may be teachers, or people with a publishing and lecturing background, to provide written feedback to students’ essay drafts. The respondent reads the draft and responds to it through questions which seek to develop students' awareness that writing is a dialogue between the reader and the writer (Baughey 1995: 204).
Second language studies too support the claim that collaboration between the more capable and the less capable peer enhances the internalisation of cognitive skills. For example in studies by De Guerrero and Villamil (1994: 492) it was observed that in the interaction between the other-regulated (OTR) learner, that is a learner who depends on the peer for guidance in achieving the goals of the task, and the self-regulated (SER), that is a learner who is capable of identifying and solving the problems on his or her own, the SER assists the OTR to comprehend the proposed changes in the essay draft, meaning the SER guides the OTR towards the zone of proximal development.

From the above discussion it appears that on the theoretical level peer interaction may promote writing development because it encourages students to interact and negotiate meaning in a social context. However ESL writing teachers have reservations about the effectiveness of peer review in helping students improve their writing. Section 2.4 will examine, through the findings of other L2 studies involving peer review, the extent to which claims made are valid.

2.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC WRITING

The focus in the present study is on peer review as a technique of intervening in, specifically students’ academic writing. As indicated in Chapter 1, Hubbard (1989: 289) defines student academic writing as a sub-genre of expository writing that is required from students in the study of content subjects. He maintains that academic writing and general composition differ in that academic writing, which is subject-specific, “takes place against a much richer conceptual network than is the case in general composition, so that the demands of the two types of writing are not the same in every respect” (Hubbard 1989: 10). Hubbard’s (1989) observations tie in with those of Horowitz (1986), who contends that the academic writing generally expected of students in American universities differs greatly from what students are normally taught in composition courses. Horowitz (1986) examined the actual
writing assignments and essay examinations assigned in the various disciplines at Western Illinois University. He focused on 54 writing assignments from 29 courses taught in 17 departments and he found that the writing tasks differ from one department to the other and that the type of writing assigned is controlled, which means that students are expected to complete their tasks according to specific instructions. Many of the assignments had detailed content specification (Horowitz 1986: 448-449). For example in his classification of writing assignments he found that in the type 'summary or reaction to a reading', the teacher had provided a list of suggested readings and explicit instructions with regard to organisation of content (Horowitz 1986: 449).

In another study Shay et al. (1996: 10) set out to find out why students fail to answer assignment questions as required, despite the explicit instructions that teachers provide. In an attempt to answer this question they analysed a writing task given to first-year Political Science students at the University of Cape Town. The essay was designed following tutorials and lectures on the content required for this assignment. Tutorial tasks given were designed to integrate the “development of thinking and writing skills with the conceptual development of the course content” (Shay et al. 1996: 10).

When they examined this task they found that it was conceptually and cognitively demanding on the students in that they had to have a firm grasp of the basic concepts they had learnt in the early stages of the course and had to synthesize those concepts. The task required students to “build a conceptual bridge” between separately presented components of the course (Shay et al. 1996: 10-11).

Furthermore, not only did the students have to grapple with the cognitive and conceptual demands of the task, but they also had to present their assignments according to a specific format determined by the department. Shay et al. (1996) conclude that the inability of students to master the way of writing expected by their lecturers prevent them from responding appropriately to the demands of the task.
Added to this, students are confronted with new concepts which have discipline-specific meanings and to show that the students have understood these new concepts, they should be able to apply them correctly in relevant context. Shih (1986: 621) made similar observations to Shay et al. (1996) regarding the nature of writing tasks, which she describes as "requiring students to exercise complex thinking, researching and language skills". These tasks require students to recall, sort, synthesize, organise, interpret and apply information presented in lectures and course materials.

Baughey and Goodman (1994) endeavoured to introduce activities designed to develop language proficiency of second year students who were studying in the Biochemistry Department for the first time at the University of the Western Cape. As in the case of my study the students were expected to produce first drafts of an essay set by the content lecturer. Baughey and Goodman (1994: 143) point out that they asked the subject specialist to identify and set an actual essay topic in order for the task to have face validity in the eyes of the students. When they examined the first drafts of the essay they discovered that many of the students had failed to understand the requirement of the task. They had to write an essay in which they had to present an argument either for or against a given issue, but instead they wrote a descriptive essay. These findings show that students were unaccustomed to this type of writing task. Shay et al. (1996) point out that the manner in which the students are required to think about content and manipulate it, is something that the majority of students in South African universities are unable to do as they are accustomed to the straightforward nature of school writing tasks.

Demands of these tasks reflect an assumption on the part of teachers that students are adequately prepared to cope with the demands of academic reading and writing they are expected to do at university. This perception does not hold especially for English Second language students who come from previously disadvantaged academic backgrounds where regurgitation and rote learning brings success (cf Rule 1994).
There is currently a growing awareness in higher education in South Africa that a better way to teach writing is to link the teaching of writing to the learning of the subject content. This is revealed by a body of research that has been generated in this field (Leibowitz 1994; Boughey 1997b; Davidowitz & Shay 1996; Jawitz & Martin 1995; Shay et al. 1996; Parkerson 1996;).

Leibowitz (1994) collaborated with the History Department at the University of the Western Cape to experiment with two methods that could help improve students’ writing, namely extra writing tutorials and the use of dialogic journals. Her findings were that the amount of time spent on writing skills activities does not necessarily lead to improved text. This is so because writing in the disciplines is influenced by other aspects of the curriculum such as failure to grasp new concepts during lectures or failure to understand course content (Leibowitz 1994:126).

These findings demonstrate that familiarity with the course content is crucial if one wants to assist students to improve their writing. Spack (1988: 32) claims that because writing in the disciplines requires knowledge of the subject content and each discipline has its own set of conventions, therefore the teaching of writing should be left in the hands of teachers of those disciplines. Spack (1988) makes a valid claim, but in practice this would not be feasible for the following reasons: the majority of the lecturers in the teaching departments have not been trained as writing teachers and the value that lecturers place on writing will need to change because if writing is perceived as a mode of examining students and not as a process, then the main goal of teaching writing will not be attained. Furthermore, many lecturers will complain about the teaching load and say that they will not be able to complete their syllabus.

With regard to the transfer of writing skills learnt in other courses, Leibowitz (1994) found that students are either unable or unwilling to transfer skills learnt in one course to another. This finding was a concern for the university as it had hoped to make the English 105 course available to all first year students. It would seem
that the English course referred to is similar to the composition courses which have been criticised for not providing students with the "tools they need to produce the kind of academic writing required in other courses" (Spack 1988: 32).

In the same vein, Parkerson (1996: 61) quotes Starfield, a language teacher who has observed that in a language course task, students were able to use, for instance, logical connectors correctly to form a coherent argument but they were unable to use the same skills in the various disciplines, to structure and present their arguments in a logical manner. A possible reason why students are unable to do this, is because of the cognitively and conceptually demanding writing tasks that they are confronted with in courses other than the language or skills based courses.

Boughey (1997a) made a similar observation about a philosophy class at the University of Zululand. She realised that although she had taught academic skills such as listening and note-taking skills, these skills could be of little value to "someone who does not understand the rules of constructing knowledge which operate in academic discourses" (Boughey 1997a: 5). These observations have implications for programmes servicing the academic mainstream, such as Academic Skills/Support Programmes (ASP), Academic Literacy courses, English for Specific Purpose (ESP) courses and writing centres. Many of the South African universities, like their American counterparts, teach writing in these courses and programmes on the assumption that what is taught and learned in these courses will prepare ESL students to function effectively in their writing tasks across the disciplines.

One other factor to note regarding writing in the disciplines is that there is a disparity between the expectations of the teaching departments and writing teachers regarding how they evaluate an essay. Leibowitz (1994: 127) for example, found that the essays of students who participated in her research improved at the level of structure but not in terms of content. As a result the students received low marks, contrary to their expectations. Parkerson's (1996) study revealed that when students are conversant with the discourses specific to a discipline, the quality of
their writing improves and they obtain better marks.

The above discussion on student academic writing has shed some light on the nature of writing expected of students at tertiary institutions. It has also demonstrated that the teaching of writing skills outside the academic mainstream does little to assist students who are expected to respond to the cognitively and conceptually demanding writing tasks they face in their specific-subject areas. In particular, it has shown that students are unable to transfer skills learnt in courses and programmes such as the Academic Support Programme and English for Specific Purpose into their disciplines. Furthermore, Leibowitz (1994) and Parkerson's (1996) observations about the disparity between the subject-specialist and the writing specialist in the way they evaluate students' texts, suggests that content teachers value knowledge of the subject content more than the coherent and logical manner in which content should be presented.

2.3.1 Coherence in student academic writing

This section serves to lay foundation for the discussion on what constitutes coherence in student writing. This discussion is made in the light of the two methods used in the current study for assessing coherence in student writing. The assessment consisted of two parts: a holistic general impression coherence rating and a detailed descriptive analysis of specific coherence features in students' essays.

It is imperative that prior to this discussion, I define the concept 'coherence'. This concept can be broadly defined as the extent to which a text succeeds in communicating its intended meaning to the reader (Bamberg 1983: 417). This definition draws attention to the fact that coherence like meaning, is not "inscribed in the text ... but arises from readers' efforts to construct meaning from the texts" (Bamberg 1983: 419). In constructing meaning readers are guided by text-based features like the use of cohesive devices as well as reader-based features, which may involve the reader's knowledge about the subject content and their
understanding and expectations about what constitutes a coherent text (Witte & Faigley 1981: 202). According to Bamberg (1983: 420) these features, that is, reader-based and text-based, "facilitate a reader's integration of details in a text into a coherent whole".

The notion of reader-based coherence is important to my study because when students are given opportunities to read and give their fellow students feedback on writing in progress, this helps students to internalise the needs of the reader (Bamberg 1983: 426). Furthermore, Bamberg (1983: 426) points out that writers do not normally consider the reader's perspective when they prepare their initial drafts but they are able to revise drafts into coherent texts if they know how to revise in such a way that a text meets the conditions of coherence. Bamberg's (1983) point is crucial in terms of the present study because peer readers can help writers produce coherent final drafts if they know what makes a text coherent. In the same vein writers can independently revise their drafts into coherent texts if they know how to accomplish this.

A revisit at what makes a text coherent, Bamberg (1984: 317-318) defines a fully coherent essay as one in which the writer:

• clearly identifies the topic
• does not shift topics
• orients the reader by creating context
• organises details according to a discernable plan that is sustained throughout the essay
• skillfully uses cohesive ties to link sentences and paragraphs together
• concludes with a statement that gives the reader a definite sense of closure
• makes few or no grammatical and or mechanical errors that interrupt the reading process

In a complementary way Wikborg (1990: 133) describes an incoherent text as one which is beset by factors that interrupt "the smooth processing of the flow of
information in a text”. Such factors are termed 'coherence breaks' by Wikborg.

Wikborg (1990: 134) provides a taxonomy of coherence breaks that distinguishes between topic-related and cohesion related coherence breaks. The following topic related coherence breaks were identified in Wikborg’s (1990) investigation of coherence breaks in Swedish university-student essays:

- Unspecified topic
- Unjustified change of/drift of topic
- Misleading paragraph division
- Misleading ordering of content
- Irrelevance of content
- Misleading headings

Bamberg's (1984) categories of coherence and Wikborg's (1990) taxonomy of coherence breaks complement each other. Therefore, for the purpose of my study a modified framework of Bamberg's (1984) holistic coherence and that of Wikborg (1990) has been discussed, incorporating elements of both frameworks.

2.3.1.1 Identifying the topic

One of the conditions of coherence in student writing is that the writer should clearly identify the topic. Bamberg (1983) studied differences in coherence in essays written by 13 and 17 year olds and she found a problem common to both age groups was that writers failed to identify the topic, that is, to inform the reader what the essay is about, even though the writing task instructed them to do so. Furthermore, she found that writers of essays with a clear topic identification regarded the topic as new information that should be presented in the introductory paragraph of the essay. These writers did not only inform the reader in the introduction about what the essay was about but they oriented the reader by placing the topic in context (Bamberg 1983: 422). Providing orientations in the introduction helps the reader identify and understand the theme - what the essay is about (Scarcella 1984: 672).
Scarcella (1984) examined how English first language (EFL) and English second language (ESL) writers orient their readers in the introductory paragraphs of expository essays. She found that generally writers orientated their readers. However, there was a difference in the way the two groups of writers accomplished this. For example ESL writers "lacked the range of attention-getting devices" used by EFL writers and they provided longer orientations than their counterparts (Scarcella 1984: 677). Orientations refer to statements that serve to explicate information which prepares the reader for the theme, and theme refers to what the essay is about (Scarcella 1984: 671-672). The term orientation appears to be similar to the idea of a thesis as defined by Watkinson, who defines a thesis as the main idea of the essay (Watkinson 1998: 88).

Theme is defined by Scarcella (1984: 672) as a statement which tells the reader what the writer has been asked to write about. The term theme is similar to Watkinson's (1998) idea of a map, which is defined as a statement made to inform the reader about the way the essay is going to be structured.

The EFL writers in Scarcella's (1984) study knew exactly what their audience expected of them and they were able to meet those expectations. For example when introducing their themes they used explicit signals like: The purpose of this paper is to discuss ..... These signals leave no question as to the identity of the theme (Scarcella 1984: 679). ESL writers on the other hand, stated their themes implicitly and they tended to underestimate their readers' knowledge of the theme by introducing information which readers would consider as given. These writers violated one of the conditions of coherence and that is, the ability to predict the reader's interest and knowledge of the world (Scarcella 1984: 679).

It would seem from the two studies mentioned above that providing brief orientations and stating the theme explicitly in the introductory paragraph of the essay is important in terms of creating impressions of coherence.
2.3.1.2 Topic development

Closely related to the notion of identifying the topic is topic development. According to Wikborg (1985: 362) if a text is to be fully coherent it must acquire topical character. A topic acquires independent topical character if a general statement or proposition is followed by a hierarchy of sentences which can be summarised into a coherent whole (Wikborg 1985: 362). Before a text can acquire topical character it must fulfill two conditions:

- If there is a series of propositions which are on the same level of generality each one must be developed
- If there is a series of statements and none is subordinate to any of the others each statement must be developed.

Added to this, Wikborg (1990: 147) points out that a single sentence cannot acquire topical character unless it is developed and supported. Furthermore, if a paragraph consists of a series of unrelated sentences, that paragraph does not have a topic and therefore cannot acquire topical character. Consequently it cannot be coherent. McCrimmon (in Bamberg 1983: 417) defines a coherent paragraph as one in which "the reader can move easily from one sentence to the next and read the paragraph as an integrated whole rather than a series of separate sentences".

Johns (1986: 249-250) asserts that topic support is one of the most important features of coherent essays. She cites Witte (1983) and Conner and Farmer's (1985) studies which revealed that coherent essays had fewer topics and more T-units per topic, meaning that writers did not present a series of sentences but they introduced and developed each topic.

The above discussion points to the importance of topic development in the effort to create coherence in essays. Watkinson's (1998) study of coherence breaks in
essays written by first-year English second language university students, revealed that one of the most frequent problems in the writing of these students was lack of elaboration: statements were made which were not related to the main idea of paragraphs. Sometimes statements were made at the end of paragraphs and the reader could not understand their functions. Such paragraphs or statements cannot acquire topical character and therefore cannot be regarded as coherent.

Watkinson (1998) found that despite tutor intervention in the writing process of students the frequency of coherence breaks in terms of lack of elaboration increased in the final essay of the semester. This finding suggests that writing teachers should pay special attention to the teaching of topic development in essay writing.

2.3.1.3 Organising text

An essay is regarded as fully coherent when writers organise information according to a discernable plan that is sustained throughout the essay (Bamberg 1984: 317). Bamberg (1983: 420) indicates that when writers use headings to show the division of topics in the essay and they maintain this structure throughout, this facilitates a reader's integration of details into a coherent whole.

Additionally, Wikborg (1990: 136) contends that paragraphing contributes significantly to the structure of an essay. In the case where there are few or no alternative structuring devices, paragraph divisions serve as the main topic-shift markers and their removal impairs the coherence of an essay. Wikborg (1990) discovered in her study that the students had no difficulty using paragraphs to indicate major topic shifts but were not sure when to move from one subtopic in the paragraph to another. This suggests that their essays displayed one type of coherence break known as misleading paragraph division. Wikborg (1990) found that misleading paragraph division was the second most frequent coherence break in her study. She identified two types of misleading paragraph:
cases where there is a need to break a long paragraph into shorter ones but this need is not met

cases where there is a need to combine short paragraphs into one but the writer is not aware of this need.

In Watkinson's (1998) study misleading paragraph division was the second least frequent category of coherence breaks. For example in the second essay of the semester, there were only four examples of this type in 32 essays, which suggests that teaching paragraphing during the writing process was of benefit to students. Besides using paragraphs to signal topic shifts writers could employ "metatextual pointers" such as these enumerators: firstly, next, finally (Wikborg 1990:136).

2.3.1.4 Irrelevance of content

This is one type of topic-related coherence break identified by Wikborg (1990). Writers may provide irrelevant content when they digress from the given topic. This would render the essay incoherent. Witte and Faigley (1981: 201) support this statement by pointing out that a text may violate a coherence condition when the writer does not provide information relevant to the topic. They add that a text lacks coherence if it does not fit to its context.

In Wikborg's (1990) study irrelevant content was not among the five most frequent categories of coherence breaks, whereas in Watkinson's (1998) this was the sixth most frequent type. Watkinson (1998) found that six examples of this coherence break occurred in the first drafts of the first essay but these decreased to two in the final draft. However, the final drafts of the second essay had 16 cases of this type of coherence break. One would have expected a further decline in the number of coherence breaks. Watkinson (1998) attributes this to the fact that the essay topic required students to engage with highly demanding source material and perhaps the students were uncertain as to what information was relevant or not relevant to the
topic. Another possible reason could be that the second essay was conceptually and cognitively demanding on the students (cf 2.3 Shay et al. 1996). Therefore because of the cognitive demands of the writing task, students could experience difficulty in selecting relevant information for the text.

2.3.1.5 Closure in conclusions

Conclusions serve to summarise the arguments presented in the essay and they usually refer to the main idea expressed in the introduction and the essay topic (Van Tonder 1999:113). In examining the cohesion of concluding paragraphs, Van Tonder (1999) found that there was a highly significant relationship between the density of cohesive ties in the closing paragraph of an essay and the essay's coherence. She points out that cohesive ties between these paragraphs and the assigned topic might have had the effect of "reminding the reader of the theme of the essay" (Van Tonder 1999: 113). Watkinson (1998) found a low negative correlation between no sense of closure in the conclusion and impressions of coherence. She found that the frequency of coherence breaks in the conclusions of the first essay was high. Nonetheless this frequency declined by the time students wrote their second essay, which suggests that students had benefitted from tutor feedback regarding the creation of a sense of closure in the conclusions.

2.3.2 Cohesion related problems in student writing

The previous discussion on coherence has highlighted features that makes a text coherent and that is, text-based features and reader-based features. Cohesion can be referred to as a text-based feature of coherence. A text is said to be coherent if the writer skillfully uses a range of cohesive ties to connect sentences and paragraphs together (Bamberg 1984: 317). Carrell (1982: 486) supports this contention when she points out that a coherent text is likely to be cohesive, though the relationship between coherence and cohesion is by no means a simple one.
Bamberg (1984), in her study of differences in coherence in essays written by 13 and 17 year-old found that coherence is a necessary, though not sufficient condition for effective writing. She sees cohesion, which she terms local coherence, as one of the factors that contribute to the creation of coherence. Witte and Faigley (1981) studied five good and five poor freshman essays and they found that cohesion is an important property of writing quality. In their analysis of these essays they found that high rated essays were more dense in cohesion than low rated essays (Witte & Faigley 1981: 317). These studies confirm that cohesive ties play a role in determining writing quality.

The present study is concerned only with errors of cohesion as they impact negatively on coherence. In this regard a discussion of Wikborg's (1990) cohesion related coherence problems becomes necessary. Wikborg (1985: 361) identified the following cohesion problems in students' essays:

- uncertain reference ties
- missing or misleading sentence connection
- malfunctioning cohesive ties
- misleading distribution of given and new information
- too great a distance between cohesive items

It is not the intention of my study to explore all five cohesion-related problems identified by Wikborg. The current study focused only on the first two because they were the only types of cohesion errors identified in the students' essays.

Uncertain reference ties refer for example to instances where a pronominal or demonstrative reference item has been used but the reader is uncertain as to which noun the item refers. Hubbard (1987: 13) points out that uncertain pronominal reference is one type of error that prevents the reader "from arriving at a plausible interpretation", and as such can have a serious effect on coherence. In his study of cohesion in the academic writing of ESL students Hubbard (1987) found that the
frequency of this type of error was, however, fairly low.

Wikborg (1990) on the other hand found that uncertain reference ties were amongst the five most frequent types of coherence breaks. This was followed by misleading sentence connection which was the third highest coherence break noted in her analysis. In Watkinson's (1998) study uncertain pronominal reference was the highest category of cohesion related breaks, accounting for 25 breaks out of a total of 39 in her study. This category was followed by incorrect reference with a total of seven cases of coherence breaks.

The category of missing or misleading sentence connection covers instances wherein a conjunctive is incorrectly expressed or used when there should be no conjunction. Such errors constitute one type of coherence break. Misleading sentence connection was amongst the five most frequent types of coherence breaks in Wikborg's (1985;1990) study. In Watkinson's (1998) study incorrect conjunction was the third highest category accounting for five coherence breaks.

2.4 QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE FINDINGS ON PEER REVIEW AND PROCESS WRITING

A number of second language studies have investigated areas of research similar to the research questions stated in 1.2 of the present study. These research areas are outlined and discussed in turn:

What types of revision changes do L2 students make as they revise their drafts? (Faigley & Witte 1981; Zamel 1983; Connor & Asenavage 1994; Raimes 1985)

Do L2 writers incorporate their peers' suggestions when revising their drafts? (Nelson & Murphy 1993; Connor & Asenavage 1994)

Does peer review result in improved text? (Chaudron 1984; Boughey 1997; Jacobs 1989)

What is the students’ attitude towards peer review? (Mangelsdorf 1992; Mendonca & Johnson 1994).

2.4.1 Revising as part of the process approach

As indicated earlier, revision forms an integral part in a process model that sees writing as a non-linear and recursive process (cf 2.2). Of importance in this section is the types of revisions - surface or meaning changes that L2 writers make as they revise their drafts.

Faigley and Witte (1981) developed a research tool to study revision, and they applied this tool in two studies of revision. In the first study they analysed revisions made on descriptive types of essays written by six inexperienced student writers, six advanced student writers and six expert adult writers. Each student writer was enrolled in some form of writing class. For example the inexperienced writers were recruited from a writing class designed for students deficient in writing skills, the advanced writers from an upper-division expository class which attracts mostly able and motivated students and the expert writers had journalistic experience and three had publications.

All three groups were given a writing task in which they had to describe a place in Austin. This task was meant to be published in a newspaper. The students were expected to complete the task over a three day period. On the first day they had to think about the topic and make notes. On the second day they had to use those
notes to formulate an essay. These essays were collected, photocopied and analysed to find out what changes the writers made while composing. On the third day those essays referred to as first drafts were returned to the students for revision. The first and second drafts were then collected and analysed.

The results of the first study showed differences in the way the three groups revised their essays. For instance the expert writers made the least number of changes as compared to the two groups. Added to this, they made largely meaning changes as opposed to surface changes. The inexperienced writers on the other hand made an overwhelming number of surface changes. The advanced and expert adults' changes were evenly distributed between the two types.

Faigley and Witte (1981) attribute the difference in the revision type to the fact that during composing expert writers often stop to review text and in the process they generate additional content. On the other hand inexperienced writers seldom stop to reread text and when they revise they limit their revision to surface features.

In the second study expert writers were asked to revise the first drafts that three inexperienced writers had written to find out what kind of changes they would make. The expert writers made major meaning changes to these drafts. They reduced what the students had written, and either elaborated or added new information to support the points the inexperienced writers had made. The fact that the expert students elaborated on statements and added new information to the writing of inexperienced writers, suggests that topic development is problematic to most inexperienced writers.

Faigley and Witte (1981: 410-411) claim that the number and type of revisions are not only dependent on the skill of the writer but also on certain situational variables. These variables include: the reason why the text is being written, the format, the medium, the writer’s familiarity with the writing task, the subject content, the audience and the length of the task.
Some of these variables might have contributed to the type of changes that inexperienced writers made. For example, these writers may have been unfamiliar with the place they were describing, unfamiliar with the language of journalism, had a limited vocabulary to use in the description or perhaps they were unfamiliar with the format required for newspaper publications and did not know the reader’s expectations. Faigley and Witte (1981:411) support the latter statement by pointing out that inadequate revision often results from misconception of the audience’s needs and this prevents writers from revising their texts in accordance with the needs of the audience. This suggests that the two authors support the idea of producing reader-based texts (cf. 2.3.1).

Faigley and Witte’s (1981) findings regarding the types of revision changes made by student writers concur with Zamel’s (1983), who sought to investigate the composing processes of skilled and least skilled ESL writers. She found that while all writers attended to surface feature changes, the skilled writers seemed to be less concerned with these features as they revised their first drafts. They appeared to have understood that writing is a recursive process of generating, clarifying previously stated ideas and exploring the form in which to express these ideas (Zamel 1983:172). Zamel (1983) observed that during this process sentences were deleted or rewritten until they expressed the writer’s intention, new paragraphs were formed as thoughts developed and paragraphs were shifted around when writers realised that they related to ideas presented elsewhere in the text. The types of changes that these students made fell into the category of changes which Faigley and Witte (1981) refers to as macrostructure and microstructure meaning changes. These types of revision changes will be explained in detail in Chapter 3 as I explore Faigley and Witte’s (1981) framework of revision changes.

The least skilled writers on the other hand, viewed revision as a process of changing words and phrases in sentences rather than that of creating meaning. They made the types of changes that Faigley and Witte (1981) call meaning-preserving surface changes (cf 3.4.1.2).
Raimes' (1985) and Connor and Asenavage's (1994) studies present results different from those of the studies discussed above. Raimes (1985) examined the composing processes of eight unskilled ESL writers.

With reference to revising, Raimes' (1985) subjects were more concerned with generating ideas and seemed not to be preoccupied with linguistic errors. These writers reread their texts in order to generate new ideas. However, they were not concerned with generating ideas in order to communicate their intended meaning with the reader (Raimes 1985: 250).

The fact that the students were only interested in exploring ideas without taking into cognisance the reader's expectations, violates conditions of coherence, in that the writers may be concerned with generating ideas not relevant to the topic and the reader might have difficulty trying to figure out what the writer is trying to communicate (cf 2.3.1). Furthermore, it would be inappropriate to classify the types of revision made by these writers as meaning changes, as defined by Faigley and Witte (1981) because although new ideas are brought into the text, they may not impact on the different parts of the text or the text as a whole.

In another study, Connor and Asenavage (1994) sought to investigate the types of revision changes in essays of two groups of freshman ESL students. The students were placed in Groups 1 and 2 based on a holistically rated writing task, cultural background and gender. Each group consisted of four students. The students were recruited from different study fields. Both groups were introduced to peer collaborative methods and they practiced giving feedback on each other's drafts. During this process they were encouraged to be helpful and supportive to each other and to overlook surface errors.

The students in both groups were expected to write a descriptive essay which required reading two outside sources. They participated in three consecutive peer review sessions. In the first session, the students discussed the articles they had
read. Following this, each student had to write a first draft. In the second session each student read his or her draft aloud to the group soliciting oral peer comments. After revisions to the first drafts, students participated in the third session of peer review discussion. They shared and received peer input before handing in their drafts to their teacher for comment. After the third session input and teacher's comments on the second draft, the students wrote the third draft, which could be regarded as their final draft.

The students’ first drafts were compared with the second drafts in terms of revision. Revisions were also analysed between the second and third drafts. The source of each revision was noted as either group, teacher or self/other.

Connor and Asenavage (1994) used Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy of analysing revisions to categorise the revisions made by the two groups. Their findings were that Group 1 made predominantly surface changes (68%) rather than meaning changes (32%), while Group 2 made more meaning changes (62%) than surface changes (38%). The reason for the difference in the number of revision types between the two groups could be attributed to the number of surface and meaning changes that individuals in the groups made. For example when one compares members of Group 1 with those of Group 2, one finds that two students in Group 1 made predominantly surface changes (93% and 98%), whereas one student made largely meaning changes (78%).

With reference to Group 2, of the four students who participated in this group, three made a similar number of surface changes (64%) and meaning changes (35% and 36%) while the fourth one made 28% surface changes and 72% meaning changes (Connor & Asenavage 1994: 267). Furthermore, the two students in each group who had made largely meaning changes had previous experience in process-based collaborative writing activities. This suggests that exposure to strategies of collaboration over a long period of time may impact on the type of revision that students make (Connor & Asenavage 1994: 267). This point could be valid when
one considers the results of Zhu's (1995) study.

Zhu (1995) examined the effects of training for peer response and the results revealed that training students for peer response had a significant impact on the quality and quantity of feedback students provide on peer writing. He attributes his results to the emphasis put on global concerns of writing such as topic development, relevant content, creating a sense of closure in conclusions, during training and on the teaching of strategies for giving specific feedback (Zhu 1995: 516).

Another factor that contributes to the students' making fewer meaning changes than surface changes could be that when revising, most students fail to note that change in one section of an essay often necessitates revision to the structure of the entire essay (Boughey & Goodman 1994). This means students fail to make what Faigley and Witte (1981) refers to as macrostructure revision changes. A macrostructure change is a major revision change that affects the reading or understanding of other parts of the text (Faigley & Witte 1981: 404).

Faigley and Witte (1981: 411) also make the point that a large number of revisions does not necessarily mean the text will read better but successful revision depends on the "degree to which revision changes bring a text closer to fitting the demands of the situation". This implies for example that if a writing task is misinterpreted or the writer is not conversant with the course content or is unable to converse in the language of the discourse community, the text will not be successfully revised in that the writer will pay more attention to the local features of the text rather than make changes that affect meaning.

Conclusion

The empirical studies discussed in this section have demonstrated that when revising drafts 'inexperienced' or 'unskilled' ESL writers may pay more attention to surface
changes or meaning changes. For example studies conducted by Faigley and Witte (1981) and Zamel (1983) have shown that the revision of these student writers manifest in surface changes while Raimes' (1985) study has shown that inexperienced writers appeared not to be concerned with monitoring linguistic errors but were preoccupied with generating ideas as they revised. Similarly, Connor and Asenavage (1994)'s study has shown that certain individuals in a group may choose to focus more on meaning changes than surface changes and vice-versa.

Based on the findings of these studies it would therefore be inappropriate to conclude that inexperienced ESL writers make predominantly surface changes while rarely making meaning changes as Faigley and Witte (1981) suggest, because there may be some variables contributing to the type of changes writers make. For instance when students have been trained to focus on meaning changes when they revise drafts, they are more likely to make changes that affect meaning.

Finally, it is important to note that a common feature in all the above mentioned studies is that data comprised composition writing, which is the kind of writing typical of freshman composition courses. The nature of writing tasks described in these studies is different from student academic writing which has been discussed in 2.3. It is therefore crucial that the current study examine the types of revision changes that inexperienced ESL writers make when confronted with academic writing. In addition to this, the study should establish whether those revision changes lead to more coherent final drafts.

2.4.2 Do L2 writers incorporate peer comments in revising their drafts?

Studies on the use of peer feedback in the revision of second language drafts have revealed that students rarely incorporate their peers' comments when they revise their original drafts. Connor and Asenavage (1994) compared students' incorporation of peer feedback with teacher feedback and feedback from self/other among two groups of ESL writers. The results revealed that the effect of peer
comments in both groups was small (Connor & Asenavage 1994: 266). For example of the total number of changes that Group 1 students made, 6% resulted from peer review, 37% from teacher feedback and 57% from self or other feedback. On the other hand in Group 2, of the total number of revisions made, 1% resulted from peer review, 35% from teacher feedback while 64% was either self-initiated or came from other sources. The overall results show that approximately 5% of the revisions resulted from peer comments, 35% resulted from teacher comments and about 60% occurred as a result of self/other feedback.

In another study Nelson and Murphy (1993) examined whether L2 students incorporate suggestions made by their peers when they revise their drafts. Four students enrolled in a 10-week intermediate writing course participated in the study. The investigators read the original drafts and the corresponding video transcripts of individual students and they listed all the suggestions made by the group. These researchers used a 5-point scale to indicate the extent to which the four participants implemented their peers' comments. A score of 1 indicated that students had used none of their peers' comments while a score of 5 indicated that students had included all or nearly all of their peers' suggestions in revising their drafts (Nelson & Murphy 1993: 137).

The results show that some students were more receptive to peer feedback than others and they were inconsistent in the way they incorporated their peers' feedback over a period of six weeks. For instance one student received a score of 1 in the first week and a score of 5 in the fifth week while another received a score of 4 in the first week and a score of 2 in weeks 4 to 6.

These results necessitated an investigation into the factors that contribute to students' incorporation or non-incorporation of peer comments. The results revealed that the extent to which L2 writers incorporated their peers' suggestions in their revised drafts was dependent on the type of interaction the writers had in the group. These results are discussed in detail in the next section (cf 2.4.3).
2.4.3 Peer review interaction patterns

As indicated in 2.2 in the past, writing was often seen as a lonely activity but currently many researchers are raising the importance of the social dimensions of writing. Some of these researchers have begun to explore the kinds of interaction patterns occurring between dyads and among groups of students as they come together to discuss a piece of writing (De Guerrero & Villamil 1994; Lockhart & Ng 1995; Mendonca & Johnson 1994; Villamil & De Guerrero 1996; Zhu 1995; Nelson & Murphy 1993; Berkenkotter 1984).

De Guerrero and Villamil (1994) sought to determine the kinds of interaction occurring between dyads. They identified three interaction patterns amongst dyads: the self regulated, other regulated and object regulated. With regard to the self-regulated (SER) pattern, the "learner is able to identify trouble sources, initiate revisions" and provide suggestions for improvement in the text (De Guerrero & Villamil 1994: 487). The other regulated (OTR) pattern is characterised by the learner being dependent on the peer to an extent that she or he is unable to take any initiative to revise the text. He or she "may recognize trouble sources when pointed out by the peer" (De Guerrero & Villamil 1994: 487). On the other hand, object regulated learners are unable to change problem areas identified in their texts and do not contribute to a discussion which may result in the improvement of text. The reason for this is that they lack the "language and rhetorical knowledge necessary to carry out the task" (De Guerrero & Villamil 1994: 487).

The results with respect to these interactions were that the dominant mode of interaction was self-regulation. De Guerrero and Villamil (1994: 492) noted that the interaction between the OTR and SER were collaborative in that the SER assisted the OTR to comprehend the proposed changes. They attribute these results to the training the students received prior to peer response sessions and to the use of the L1 throughout the sessions.
Furthermore, when the interaction was between OTRs, such interaction did not result in improved text because when the two had identified trouble sources they would provide inappropriate or incorrect solutions. In some instances they would resort to outside help. However they rarely “abandoned the task”, a behaviour which according to these authors is common among L2 learners (De Guerrero & Villamil 1994: 492). One would describe an interaction such as this as one of the blind leading the blind, which is a concern where novice L2 writers have to help each other improve their text.

In another study, Lockhart and Ng (1995) sought to examine the different roles that readers assume in peer review. They identified four roles, namely: authoritative, interpretive, probing and collaborative roles. They found that the authoritative readers were mainly concerned with pointing out problem areas in their peers’ drafts and imposing their ideas on the text without allowing the writer a chance to respond to the comments. These readers saw their role as that of transmitting knowledge to the writer, who is seldom expected or invited to respond (Lockhart & Ng 1995: 616). Writers interacting with these type of readers relinquish their rights as authors by assuming a passive role. Villamil and De Guerrero (1996: 63) point out that these writers feel compelled to comply with the reader’s comments. As Berkenkotter (1984) indicates, these writers lose their authority as writers and become the most receptive to peer comments (cf 2.4.2).

The interpretive readers appear to be similar to the authoritative ones. The difference between the two is that although these readers tend to control the discussion, they allow writers to express their opinions. Secondly, unlike the authoritative readers, they focus on specific areas of text that they find personally appealing and they would give evaluative comments about those areas. Writers working with these types of readers withdraw from active participation and they limit their input to eliciting the reader’s thoughts or reacting to comments (Lockhart & Ng 1995: 622).

In direct contrast to the aforementioned readers are the probing and collaborative
readers. Probing readers focus their discussion around areas of text they find confusing and they use questions to elicit further clarification from the writer (Lockhart & Ng 1995: 626). The collaborative reader works together with the writer to discover the idea that the writer wants to convey. The reader and writer work collaboratively to solve problems. For example when these readers suggest improvement in a text they brainstorm the suggested change with the writer. In this kind of interaction the writer is more likely to incorporate the suggestions and comments because they have been mutually created.

In another study Zhu (1995) set out to determine the effects of training for peer response on students' comments and interaction. This study employed a quasi-experimental design with two groups. The experimental group received training on the techniques of providing feedback over a period of 15 weeks while the control group were only exposed to a demonstration video on peer response which was followed by a discussion of the demonstration. The latter did not receive further training on peer response. However, both groups were compared with regard to the quantity and quality of feedback given as well as their interaction patterns during peer review sessions. In comparing the interaction patterns between the two groups, the results revealed that the interaction patterns of the experimental group were primarily "reader-writer sharing" whereas the control group demonstrated a predominantly "reader-reporting pattern" (Zhu 1995: 510).

The reader-writer sharing pattern, which is characterised by both parties negotiating meaning through requesting and offering clarification to one another, is reminiscent of Lockhart and Ng's (1995) definition of probing stance. On the other hand, the reader-reporting pattern which is characterised by the absence of any real negotiation because the writer would not ask any clarification even though he or she does not understand the reader's comment is similar to Lockhart and Ng's authoritative stance (Zhu 1995: 510).

Nelson and Murphy (1993) examined video transcripts of a group of four students
enrolled in a writing course to determine the nature of interaction patterns amongst this group (Nelson & Murphy 1993: 138). The researchers observed that in some discussions where the writers interacted with members of the group in a cooperative manner, meaning that they listened to and asked for clarification if they did not understand certain comments made on their drafts, they were more likely to incorporate their peers' suggestions. When, on the other hand, writers were defensive and were concerned with justifying their writing they were most unlikely to make use of the group's comments (Nelson & Murphy 1993:140).

Nelson and Murphy's observations regarding the reasons why some writers are more likely to incorporate their peer's suggestions than others, ties in with the findings in Berkenkotter's (1984) study, which sought to investigate whether obtaining feedback from multiple peer audiences can help students improve their text. She found that the writers' responses to their readers' comments were to a great extent affected by "the writer's personality, level of maturity and the ability to handle writing problems" (Berkenkotter 1984: 313). She discovered three types of writers, namely the resisting reviser, who deliberately disregarded his or her peer's comments; the authority crisis reviser, who loses his or her authority as a writer and becomes the most receptive to peer comments; and the 'inner-directed reviser' who is too egocentric to allow peers to help (Berkenkotter 1984:313-316). She observed the following about the three types of writers:

The first type of writer, namely the resisting reviser, was less concerned with peer input and he deliberately disregarded his peers' comments. The second type of writer, namely the authority crisis reviser was more receptive to peer comments and she spent most of her time drafting to incorporate her group's comments. She was aware of her readers' needs and felt compelled to accommodate her readers' expectations even though they made her give more detail in places where it was inappropriate or unnecessary. However this writer realised later that her group's suggestions were unwarranted and she used her own judgement to assess which of the suggestions to include (Berkenkotter 1984: 317).
The third type of writer, the inner-directed revisor had a strong sense of authority and responsibility towards his text. This strong feeling of authority made him make decisions on how he would like to present his text, independent of his readers' expectations (Berkenkotter 1984: 316). This is demonstrated in the two quotes below:

*If that is what a person wants to write about that's great because my paper is on reflections too, on my memories. If people don't like it, they don't have to read it, you know......*

He also said this:

*I have decided to change my whole story around. The focus of my other story was very weak. It was not me. There was one other main problem. It did not seem very good to me.*

Furthermore, the remark made by the inner directed writer suggests that in composition writing classes where students write about topics close to their hearts, they are more likely to change their topics and they may disregard the views of their audience because they feel that no-one in the group shares those personal experiences they are relating. This is less likely to happen if the writing task is of an academic nature (cf 2.3).

The three cases suggest that peer feedback will not always benefit students, and that there are a number of variables which determine whether the writer will or will not benefit from peer review, for example the writer's attitude towards the suggestions of the group.

As indicated earlier the proponents of peer review perceive language as a tool for mediating and directing discussions among peers (cf 2.2). Second language studies have shown that students use their mother tongue in verbal interaction with their
peers. For example in Jacobs' (1987) study of third year ESL students' reaction to working in peer feedback groups in a composition class at Chiang Mai University in Thailand, students reported that they used their first language, Thai, more than English while interacting in groups even though they were encouraged to use English. The students felt that if they were to use English throughout the peer review session they would not have said much because they would have been concerned with not making grammatical mistakes (Jacobs 1987: 329). A similar observation was made by Villamil and De Guerrero (1996: 67) where students used their L1, Spanish, “for conducting interactions and solving revision problems”.

This shows that the claim that groups offer students opportunities to speak the target language does not hold because it would seem that the L2 students perceive their L1 as a “practical and effective tool to achieve task goals, that is revising an English text” (De Guerrero & Villamil 1994: 492).

Conclusion

Studies discussed above seem to suggest that the incorporation of peer comments and suggestions in the writer’s draft depends on the type of interaction the writer had with the reader and vice-versa and that certain interaction patterns such as the reader-writer sharing and the self-regulated patterns are more likely to lead to the improvement of text. However most of these studies have not examined whether specific interaction patterns do in fact lead to the improvement of text.

Nelson and Murphy (1993: 140) emphasise the point that the success of peer review interaction does not solely depend on incorporation of comments but on whether these comments succeeded in creating an impression of coherence in a text. They point out that writers’ incorporation of peer comments may weaken the text (Nelson & Murphy 1993: 140). My study too does not only address the type of interaction patterns occurring between reader and writer but it is also concerned with whether the manner in which reader and writer interact lead to the production of more
2.4.4 Does peer review result in improved text?

Peer feedback has been a common feature in writing development at universities in the United States. However, in South Africa peer feedback in writing has received little or no attention at all. This could be because teachers fear that peer feedback, particularly with L2 writers, might impact negatively on the students’ drafts.

Studies with ESL students show mixed results regarding the effect of peer intervention on students’ writing. Chaudron (1984) sought to investigate the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the revised text. The teacher gave grammatical and rhetorical feedback on the students’ draft while peers had a set of guiding questions to use during feedback.

The original and revised drafts were scored by two independent raters. Although there was a significant correlation between the raters, interrater reliability was low. A t-test was employed to determine whether the change in scores from the original draft to the revised draft was significant and no significant difference between the amount of improvement resulting from either teacher or peer feedback was found (Chaudron 1984: 7).

It seems that the texts might not have improved because of ineffective training on the procedures for providing peer feedback. Chaudron (1984: 5) pointed out that students practiced peer feedback procedures in a single session on a class assignment. Secondly, perhaps teachers focused more on grammatical features which could have had little effect on the text as a whole. (Chaudron 1984: 5).

Boughhey (1997b) had different results regarding teacher intervention on the improvement of students’ essays. Her participants were 30 first-year occupational therapy students at the University of the Western Cape. She divided these students
into five groups and they had to compose as a group and submit a group assignment. The lecturer in the department gave students feedback on the essays using a questioning technique aimed at “prompting them to reflect on their writing” (Baughey 1997b: 131).

The lecturer produced a descriptive marking scale which ranged from 0-10 to rate students’ assignments. The results revealed that all five groups showed a significant improvement between the original and final drafts. For example Group 2 had a mark of 4 on the first drafts and the mark was improved to 8.5 following teacher intervention (Baughey 1997b: 132).

Baughey (1997b) attributes the improvement to the detailed and constructive feedback the students received. One other reason could be that the students took the feedback seriously as it came from their lecturer. Another reason could be that because the students worked collaboratively as a group to revise, they were able to share ideas on how the text could be improved. DiPardo and Freedman (1988: 120) support group collaboration by pointing out that groups function collaboratively when members work together on a “single cooperatively owned product”.

Jacobs (1989) investigated miscorrection in group writing activities. The subjects were 18 third-year ESL students enrolled in a composition writing class. The normal procedure for writing compositions in this course was to get students to first write a sentence outline and this outline was transformed into a three-paragraph composition (Jacobs 1989: 69.)

Jacobs (1989) asked students to read their partner’s drafts and make suggestions regarding grammar only. The students had to draw a line through incorrect items and correct the same items. He classified these corrections as category A. Added to this, they had to indicate with a circle those items which they thought might be wrong but which they were uncertain about (Category B) (Jacobs 1989: 70). He compared the changes between the first draft and the revised drafts after peer intervention.
The results show that the highest percentage (55%) of changes fell under the category "wrong in the original draft but correct in the final draft", meaning that most of the local features of the students' texts improved after intervention. In cases where a correct form was replaced with another correct form, or an incorrect form substituted for another incorrect form the quality of the draft was not affected (Jacobs 1989: 73).

A plausible reason why the highest percentage of changes fell in the category of "wrong in the original but correct in the revised draft" could be that in the composition type writing it may be easier for students to handle local features of writing than in academic writing. In addition to this, the students had to focus only on grammar which is one aspect of their writing that they are more prone to make changes in, and as Bamberg (1984) has pointed out, this has usually little effect on the coherence of a text.

2.4.5 Students’ attitudes towards peer review

Second language studies have investigated students' views on the value of peer review and the results reveal that students find the peer review exercise valuable.

Mendonca and Johnson (1994) interviewed 12 students to determine their perception of peer reviews. All 12 students said they found peer review activities useful. The students reported that having someone read their essay helped them see what was clear and what needed revision (Mendonca & Johnson 1994: 764). However two students said peer review was not helpful when the reader came from a totally different discipline from the writer, which suggests that knowledge of the course content is important when providing feedback. The results of the interviews also revealed that students perceive both teacher and peer feedback as important (Mendonca & Johnson 1994: 765).

In a similar study, Mangelsdorf (1992) investigated the value of peer review from
the perspective of 40 advanced ESL writing students. Out of the 40, 22 (55%) felt that peer review was beneficial while 12 (30%) had mixed feelings about this approach and 6 (15%) were negative. The students who were positive about this approach reported that peer reviews helped them see their topics from different perspectives and to "generate, clarify and develop ideas" (Mangelsdorf 1992: 281). Of the negative comments expressed, the largest number concerned the students’ lack of trust in their peers’ responses to their text (Mangelsdorf 1992: 280). This kind of comment has been expressed in other L2 studies, for example Connor and Asenavage (1994) Jacobs (1987) Mendonca and Johnson (1994) and Nelson and Murphy (1993). Lack of trust has been reported as one of the reasons why students choose not to incorporate their peers’ suggestions.

Summary

The results of the above studies have demonstrated that generally students find peer review useful. For example in Mendonca and Johnson (1994) study all students were in favour of this approach and in Mangelsdorf’s (1992) study, the majority of the students found this activity beneficial. The reasons students give for supporting this type of feedback concurs with some of the claims made by the proponents of this approach (cf 2.1).

These studies have also shown that although students find peer feedback valuable, they still perceive teacher feedback as important. This suggests that peer feedback should not be used as the only type of feedback.

2.5 CONCLUSION

The aim of this chapter was to discuss key issues that are central to this study, namely, peer review and the process approach, student academic writing, coherence in student academic writing, the kinds of revision changes made by ESL student writers, the extent to which writers incorporate comments when revising their
drafts, peer interaction patterns, whether revision results in improved text and students' perception of the peer review process.

Most of the quantitative and qualitative findings discussed in this chapter were based on composition writing. The current study examines the above mentioned research areas in the context of student academic writing. Secondly, the question of the type of revision changes that inexperienced writers make were largely based on studies in which student writers did not receive any form of feedback, meaning teacher feedback or peer feedback. The students initiated changes themselves. Connor and Asenavage's study (1995) is an exception because it examined types of revision changes in the peer review context. Thirdly, these studies examined process writing, which is one of the areas central to my study.

Finally, although these studies have looked at peer review from different perspectives, little research has been done in investigating whether the revision of ESL writers in the context of student academic writing results in more coherent final drafts. This is the main question which is addressed in my study and the results are reported in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

As indicated in Chapter 1 (cf 1.2), the main focus of this study is to determine the effect of peer feedback on ESL students' academic writing. In particular the study attempts to address the general as well as the specific research questions set out in Chapter 1 (cf 1.2). This chapter also reports on the research design and the research procedures employed in responding to these research questions.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

In terms of the research design this study can be classified as operating within quantitative and qualitative research paradigms. Chaudron (1986: 710) supports this combination of research paradigms when he asserts that research in and about second language classrooms shows that qualitative and quantitative designs are virtually inseparable.

The research is quantitative in respect of the quasi-experimental part of the design. This design is used rather than a full experimental design because in educational settings, it is often difficult to control the large number of variables present and it is also not possible to assign subjects randomly for the purpose of research.

The type of quasi-experiment used is known as the pre-test post-test, non-equivalent control group design. This design usually uses two groups, the experimental and the control group, and a manipulated variable with two values (Wiersma 1995: 141). The one group receives treatment while the other does not, and both groups are later compared on the dependent variable (Borg 1987: 13).
According to Cook and Campbell (1979: 104), when one makes use of this design one needs to take cognisance of the threats to internal validity. One of the threats is that of selection-maturation, which arises when the respondents in one group outperform the participants of the other at the pre-test, simply because of uncontrolled variables. For instance if the treatment group is motivated, and have gained writing experience through other writing development programmes they will outperform their counterparts because of their abilities before intervention.

The other problem concerns local history, that is events other than the treatment which affect the experimental group but not the control group or vice-versa. Cook and Campbell (1979) contend that the plausibility of a local history explanation has to be examined within the particular context of specific research settings when the non-equivalent control group design is used (Cook & Campbell 1979: 106). For example the control group may be exposed to writing development programmes presented in other courses. As a result they may outperform the experimental group in the post-test. The two threats were taken into consideration in the present study (cf 3.3.1.1 & 3.3.1).

In the present study the experimental group received intervention in the form of peer feedback during the writing process while the control group received no intervention at all. This means that the experimental group had to produce two essay drafts. They produced the original draft and received peer feedback and then wrote the final draft while the control group had to produce single drafts, which I refer to as final drafts. The final drafts of both groups were holistically rated and the Mann-Whitney U test was performed to compare the distribution of scores between the two groups.

Secondly, the original and final drafts of the experimental group were holistically rated and the Wilcoxon-Matched Pairs Signed Ranked test was performed to determine whether the holistic scores on these drafts differed significantly. The results of the Mann-Whitney and the Wilcoxon tests are presented in Chapter
The design is qualitative in the sense that it uses a qualitative case study approach. This approach applied only to the experimental group. The aim of this case study was to compare the original and final drafts of this group in terms of the different aspects of coherence.

3.2.1 Research questions
In order to help the reader understand how the qualitative and quantitative methodologies were applied in the current study, it becomes necessary to reproduce the research questions and hypotheses formulated in Chapter 1 (cf 1.2)

1. Will the final drafts of students exposed to peer feedback be rated as more coherent than the original drafts?

1.1 Does revision help to make the final drafts more coherent than the originals?

1.2 What kind of cohesion-related problems were evident in the original and final drafts?

1.3 What type of revision changes do students make as they revise their original drafts?

1.3.1 To what extent do students make surface as opposed to meaning changes when revising?

1.3.2 Do surface and meaning changes result in more coherent final drafts?

1.3.3 To what extent do writers incorporate changes suggested during peer review as well as self-initiated changes?

1.3.4 Do writers' incorporation of peer comment help to make the final drafts more coherent?

1.3.5 Is there a relationship between incorporation of peer comment
and the interaction patterns that pairs engage in during the peer review process?

1.4 What is the students' attitude toward peer review?

2. Will the final drafts produced by the experimental group be more highly rated than those produced by the control group?

3.2.2 Research hypothesis

Research Questions 1 and 2 (cf. 3.2.1), which will be tested statistically, have been reformulated as hypotheses. The two hypotheses which are referred to as Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 are reproduced below:

Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant difference in the holistic ratings between the original and final drafts of the experimental group.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant difference between the holistic ratings on the final drafts of the experimental group and the control group.

Hypotheses may be formulated directionally or non-directionally, depending on whether a prediction is made regarding the direction of the possible outcome of the research (Seliger & Shohamy 1989: 62). The two hypotheses mentioned above have been formulated non-directionally in that they merely hypothesize that there will be a difference in the holistic scores. They make no prediction regarding the direction of the outcome of the research. These hypotheses have been formulated in this manner because of relatively inconclusive findings in the literature regarding the effect of peer review on the quality of the revised draft.
3.3 RESEARCH PROCEDURES

In order to answer the research questions posited in 3.2.1 it becomes necessary to outline the procedures followed in this study.

3.3.1 The sample

The selection of the sample from the population was done using purposive sampling, while the assignment of subjects to the experimental and control groups was done through random sampling. Purposive sampling means that the subjects are selected with the intention that they will best meet the needs of the study. Whereas random sampling implies that every person in the population has an equal chance of being selected for inclusion in the study (Maykut & Morehouse 1994: 56).

In the present study a class of second year Sociology students were asked to volunteer to take part in the study. When this class was approached there were 35 students in class. I explained that when they volunteer they should consider: their interest in participating in the study, workload and willingness to commit themselves to the study, since data collection would be done over a longer period of time. Lastly they had to be students who would continue with the course until the end of the year. Vista University semester system allows students to repeat only part of the course if they fail. For example, if a student passes the end of year but fails the middle of the year examinations, in the following year that student is permitted to repeat only the mid-year exams.

A total of 17 students volunteered but only 13 turned up for our first meeting and this constituted the sample. In this study a random sampling procedure was used only after the sample had been drawn from the larger population. The sampling procedure is explained on the next page.
Sampling procedure

The 13 were then randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups using this procedure: I had pieces of green paper and white paper in a container. I asked the students to close their eyes and pick one paper. They had to write their names on the papers. I had already decided that the green papers would be for the experimental group and the white ones for the control group. Six students picked the green papers and seven the white papers. Therefore the experimental group consisted of six students while the control group had seven students.

3.3.1.1 Background to the sample

The two threats to internal validity mentioned earlier (cf 3.2) were addressed by gathering information about the sample on characteristics critical to the study and testing the sample prior to intervention. Borg (1987: 244) contends that because of the difficulty with the non-random assignment of groups, the two groups may differ in some characteristics, which may affect the interpretation of results.

To alleviate this problem, Borg and Gall (1989: 217) suggest that the researcher report as much descriptive data as possible about both the experimental and control groups because there could be extraneous variables that could affect the results. Considering this factor, pre-study interviews were conducted with the two groups to establish their biographical information, writing experiences at school and at university and the forms of writing development they are exposed to at university.

Thirteen students participated in the pre-test but before information about the sample was obtained, one student from the experimental and three from the control group dropped out. Consequently nine students made the final sample and the names by which they would be referred to in the study are given in Table 1 on the next page.
Table 1: Participants in my study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP</th>
<th>CONTROL GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student O</td>
<td>Student RN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>Student MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student T</td>
<td>Student MK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student N</td>
<td>Student GW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants

The nine ESL students were enrolled in a second year Sociology course at the University of Vista, Mamelodi Campus (Pretoria). Each student speaks an African language as a mother-tongue, for example Tsonga (1), North Sotho (4), South Sotho (2), Tswana (1) and Swazi (1). Their age is between 22 and 34. Out of this nine, eight attended government schools (former DET) in the urban and rural areas. One completed her matric at a private school. Four of them studied at other institutions before coming to Vista. For example three spent between two and six years at the University of South Africa (UNISA) while the other did a one year diploma at a secretarial school. All of them had completed the English course in their first or second year.

Participants’ schooling

Studies conducted by Leibowitz (1994) and Boughey (1997) have shown that prior schooling has an influence on the skills and learning styles students bring to university. The impact of prior schooling in terms of both reading and writing skills was reinforced in the interviews with these students. For example, Student C mentioned that she found studying at university difficult because she had to do work on her own and she was expected to write long essays whereas in high school she used to write a one-page essay. This student said this about her experiences at school:
At high school they spoonfed us they write us notes but at university there is nothing like that. At high school you can spend the whole year without a textbook and still pass but here it is not possible.

Student N said:

*Here we have to read different books for one assignment but in high school we used just one textbook*

The one student, Student RN, who did her matric at a private school said that the school was not different from a government school in that she was not taught writing or reading skills or note-taking skills.

*We were not taught how to write essays because although it was a private school it was meant for black pupils and our teachers were also black. We were told to write an introduction, body and conclusion which is something we learnt from Std 6.*

When students were asked about their previous writing experiences, they pointed out that they wrote essays in English classes and were only told that an essay must have an introduction, body and conclusion but they were never taught for example, about how ideas are developed in the body of the essay. Those students who studied at other institutions prior to coming to Vista said that those institutions did not prepare them for the type of writing expected at university. For example Student N said:

*In Sociology 100 at UNISA we used to write multiple choice questions and in Public Administration we had only one assignment for the whole year and it involved short questions.*

**Students' writing development**

The students reported that they benefitted from being taught writing in specific
courses. The English Department at Vista University features prominently here as students said that they learnt to write by writing especially in the English 100 course, where students receive feedback on writing in progress. The English 100 course teaches aspects like topic analysis, argumentation, identifying the main ideas and supporting ideas, and logic (English 100 Study Manual). Student O said the following about how the English course helped in the development of her writing:

*In English they taught us that when you write you must not use the past tense, and in the conclusion you must summarise what you have been writing about and each paragraph must have one idea and you have to explain that idea.*

The Sociology Department was mentioned as one other department in which one lecturer shows students what she expects from an assignment. In addition there is an Academic Skills Co-ordinator based in the department who assists students with assignment writing.

Student MN indicated that she benefitted from the teaching of writing skills in Sociology. She said:

*With assignment writing I had problems especially in the first and second year. I did not know how to make my introduction understandable. I used to write my introduction like this: In this assignment I'm going to discuss about .... But since Mr Mahlangu [the Academic Skills Co-ordinator] helped us last year and Ms Fynn [Sociology lecturer] by showing us what is expected and told us not to cut and paste there is a huge difference in my writing.*

It would seem that although students were taught about writing an introduction, paragraphing and conclusion in the English course they could not transfer those skills into writing in other courses.
Difficulties experienced with writing expository text

The students mentioned the following as problems they experience with writing expository texts:

- They tend to write jumbled sentences and mix tenses
- They find it difficult to understand assignment topics
- They experience problems with organizing ideas in a logical way when confronted with ideas from various textbooks. For example Student T said that he would copy information from different textbooks and paste it on his paper without any understanding of content. As a result he found that there was no relationship between the introduction and the body of his essay.
- They are unable to make the intended meaning accessible to the reader. For instance Student N said:

  The English you speak is different from the one you write. You tell yourself you wrote something that you wanted to write but you find that your sentence construction is wrong. Like when you write this is what you are thinking and when somebody reads your essay he finds that there are lot of mistakes. The way we speak is the way we write and you find that your ideas do not follow.

Conclusion

The background information given above might help to contextualise the results of the pre-test and the statistical results of Hypothesis 2 reported in the next chapter (cf 4.4). Firstly, the participants were similar in that they came from the same educational background in terms of their high school education. They had all done the English course at Vista University, which teaches aspects of academic essay writing like writing an introduction, identifying main ideas and supporting ideas in paragraphs.
However, there may be other factors that could put the control group at an advantage in terms of prior knowledge of writing acquired at other institutions. For example the following students in the control group had studied at other institutions of higher learning: Students MN, GW, and MK and Student RN did her matric at a private school. In the experimental group, only two students had studied at other institutions, that is, Student T and Student N. These were some of the variables that could not be controlled in the present study.

3.3.2 Data and Procedures

3.3.2.1 The Pre-test
As indicated earlier (cf 3.2) this study employs a pre-test post-test design. At the beginning of the study 13 students completed a writing assignment assigned by a Sociology 200 lecturer. This assignment was used as a pre-test for writing quality. However, due to attrition reported earlier the results reported in Chapter 4 were supposed to be for the nine students. This was not the case because of further attrition. Student M of the experimental group did not take part in the peer review exercise of the main study. Consequently, the results of the pre-test reported in 4.2 are of the eight students who made the final sample.

Three independent raters were asked to rate these assignments using a holistic scale developed by Bamberg (1983) (cf Appendix A). The holistic scores on the pre-test were computed for each group to determine if they were initially comparable on the pretest variable. The Mann-Whitney U test performed on these scores revealed no significant difference between the scores of the experimental and control groups. That means their writing abilities were similar, which therefore implies that the selection-maturation threat to validity is ruled out.

3.3.2.2 The assignments
The assignments reported here were made available by the four students in the experimental group. The actual writing tasks designed by the Sociology Department
were used. The issue of face validity was perceived to be important as previous experience had revealed that students are often reluctant to engage with work which is considered irrelevant to what they are learning or has no immediate benefit, such as obtaining a higher mark on an assignment.

Initially written data consisted of two assignments reproduced below:

**ASSIGNMENT 1:**

*Topic:* Write a summary on any three (3) textbooks dealing with any one theoretical perspective on education.

**OR**

Write a summary on any one textbook dealing with each of the three theoretical perspectives on education.

**Purpose of the task:**

The aim of this task is to train you in information gathering techniques as well as in academic understanding.

*N.B* You may not therefore make use of the prescribed or recommended books listed in your study guide. If you do make use of these for the purpose of this task you will not be awarded any marks.

The length of each summary is entirely your decision.

**ASSIGNMENT 2**

Write an essay on **OUTCOMES BASED EDUCATION** using the following headings:

(a) Principles

(b) Methods
(c) The role of the teacher
(d) The role of the learner

Your essay should not be less than 8 pages in length
You may use any publication for the purpose of writing this essay- books, booklets, pamphlets, brochures, newspapers, speeches, white papers, conference notes, workshop notes etc.
These sources must be correctly acknowledged

The five students who made the experimental group at the beginning of the study, participated in the peer review process in which two drafts were produced on the first assignment. However certain variables affected the process of writing this assignment.

As the topic of the first assignment indicates, students were expected to write a summary. All the students in the Sociology class wrote an essay instead of a summary. When their lecturer realised this mistake she decided not to mark the assignments and returned them to the class. She explained in class what she expected from them and they had to rewrite the assignment. This affected the peer review process in the sense that the five students participated in peer review after they had been told to rewrite the assignment. As a result when they wrote what was supposed to be the second drafts they changed the structure of the assignment completely. As such it would have been inappropriate to suggest that the changes the students made as they wrote the second drafts were as a result of peer review. Therefore, because of these variables I decided not to include data of the first assignment in the main study. When I report about the assignment in Chapter 4 I therefore refer to Assignment 2, which is an essay.

As mentioned earlier Student M did not participate in the peer review process of Assignment 2. As such the essay drafts reported on in the next Chapter apply to four students only.
The essay drafts produced before peer intervention were referred to as original drafts and were indicated by the capital letters OD and the ones written after the peer review exercise were known as final drafts and were indicated by the letters FD. Throughout the study the ODs were compared with the FDs to find out whether there were any changes and whether the changes resulted in more coherent final drafts.

### 3.3.2.2.1 The assessment of students' essays

A holistic method for ranking writing samples was used in rating the essays for the pre-test, final essay drafts of the experimental and control groups, and the original and final drafts of the experimental group. In this regard Bamberg's (1984) holistic rating scale was used because it is a "quick impressionistic qualitative procedure for sorting or ranking samples of writing .... by assigning a value to a writing sample according to previously established criteria" (Charney 1984: 67). Even though criticism has been leveled against the use of holistic rating scales, Charney (1984: 67-68) points out that raters trained in this method produced reliable results.

Bamberg’s (1984) holistic rating scale was tested in a pilot study of essays written by 13- and 17-year olds and the overall interrater reliability obtained was .84, which according to Mulder (1982), signifies a very high correlation. Furthermore, this scale has been used by other researchers such as Hubbard (1989), Wessels (1993), Maringa (1995) Watkinson (1998) and Van Tonder (1999) to assess writing quality.

### 3.3.2.3 The raters

Three independent raters were asked to rate the essays referred to in the previous section for holistic coherence. One rater was an experienced English lecturer, the second, an applied linguist and a lecturer of English Didactics and language proficiency. The third was a visiting English second language teacher from the
United States. The same raters who rated essays for the pre-test were available to rate the original and final drafts produced by the experimental group and the post-test essays of both the experimental and control groups.

One of the conditions for valid and reliable holistic rating is that the raters should come from similar academic backgrounds (Cooper in Charney 1984: 72). The three raters came from a common academic background in that they were all experienced second language teachers and it was expected that such background would create a good chance for agreement when using the rating scale. An important point regarding the raters is whether they were consistent in assigning scores to the students' essays, showing good interrater reliability. Seliger and Shohamy (1989: 186) define interrater reliability as the extent to which judgements based on the evaluation of one rater will also be arrived at and agreed upon by another rater examining the same data. Reliability is expressed as a correlation coefficient ranging from 1.00 to 0.00. Mulder (1982: 73) evaluates correlation coefficients as follows:

- 1.00 - perfect correlation
- 0.80 - 0.99 very high correlation
- 0.60 - 0.79 high correlation
- 0.40 - 0.59 moderate correlation
- 0.20 - 0.39 low correlation
- 0.01 - 0.19 very low correlation
- 0.00 no correlation

In order to determine whether there was any interrater reliability between the three raters a pairwise correlation coefficient was calculated and low to moderate correlations were found. More specifically, the correlation coefficient between raters one and two was 0.3583, between two and three was 0.4741 and between one and three it was 0.2099.

A possible reason for the low to moderate correlations could be that the raters were
not given training to help them respond in a consistent way. This may be a limitation on my study but it was felt that too much priming would not be appropriate to this attempt to elicit an impressionistic response. The raters were only supplied with the following guidelines: that they rate the essays by concentrating on the coherence of the text, that they rate them according to Bamberg's 4-3-2-1 scale but allowing for half-mark intervals on the scale, and that they make a relatively quick assessment of the coherence of each text without too much deliberation on each text read.

3.3.2.4 Instruction in peer review

The experimental group was exposed to a one-off two hour training session in peer review while the control group received no training. This session was tape recorded and transcribed. The duration of training was a shortcoming, as Lockhart and Ng (1995) claim in their study that learning to engage in peer response is a process which needs to be developed over time. Also relevant here is Zhu's (1995: 516) study on the effect of training for peer response which revealed that training students for peer response has a significant impact on the quality and quantity of feedback students provide on peer writing.

Due to the fact that writing is not integrated into courses and the students could not be set aside for the purpose of my study, I had to model peer response within a short space of time. During training, process writing was demonstrated, the rationale for using peer review was explained and response strategies were modelled.

Response strategies were modelled using an essay written by one of the students in the control group. This was the same essay used for the pre-test prior to the study. The essay was chosen because it had a lot of problem areas.

Each student was given a copy of this essay. They were asked to read the essay
silently and using the Peer Response Sheet (PRS) make comments on the text itself as well as on this sheet. The PRS contained questions which guided students in the kind of feedback they should provide (cf Appendix B). The same PRS was used in the peer review sessions.

3.3.2.5 Peer review sessions

Two peer review sessions were held on separate days. Initially six students were expected to participate in peer review in pairs. However, in the first peer review session, five students took part in this process for Assignment 1 because the sixth student had dropped out before the commencement of the empirical study. For the reasons mentioned earlier (cf 3.3.2.2) data which emanated from this session was excluded from the main study. Therefore, the first session served to give students further practice in peer review.

Data collected during the second peer review session, in which students discussed Assignment 2 is reported in Chapter 4. The procedure followed in peer review sessions appear as follows:

Before the sessions students had to bring along copies of their original drafts which they had prepared at home. I had arranged with the students to choose partners and to come to the sessions in pairs. The use of pairs instead of groups was considered because it would not have been feasible to have fixed times for the group to meet as the students are enrolled in different courses. Therefore students had to choose their partners based on the free time they both had.

Elbow and Belanoff (1989) point out that it is better to obtain feedback from different readers, suggesting group feedback, however this is time consuming. They also claim that with pairs it is much easier to establish rapport and trust between two people, a point which I strongly support.
During these sessions students were given Peer Review Sheets (PRS) and were asked to read their partner's drafts silently using the guiding questions on the sheet. The students were expected to make written comments on the draft as well as on the PRS.

Following this activity, the pair exchanged their drafts to check what comments or suggestions their partners had made on their drafts and on the PRS. This was followed by the writers initiating a discussion by asking the readers to explain the comments or suggestions they had made. The pair switched roles of reader and writer. This whole activity was tape recorded and the recordings transcribed. The students took their written drafts and PRS home for revision. They were encouraged to consider their partner's comments as they revised their drafts.

The idea of take-home assignments is consistent with Villamil and De Guerrero's (1996) study where students worked on their final drafts at home and submitted them a week later. The students in the current study had only two days to work on the drafts.

3.4 DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Data analysis was carried out in response to the hypotheses and research questions stated in 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

3.4.1 Hypothesis 1

With reference to Hypothesis 1, in order to determine whether there was a significant difference in the holistic coherence scores of the students' original and final drafts, the scores were subjected to a Wilcoxon-Matched Pairs Signed ranked test and the results of this test are presented and interpreted in Chapter 4 (4.3).

As indicated earlier, in addition to the statistical testing of the holistic scores, (cf 3.2) a case study approach was used in order to gain deeper insights into the
differences occurring between original drafts and final drafts. Case studies often require incorporation of a variety of data in order to produce an in-depth understanding of the problem being studied (Borg & Gall 1989: 402). In this regard data was collected from the following sources:

(a) extracts from students' original and final drafts
(b) transcripts from students' interaction during peer review
(c) written comments on the Peer Review Sheet
(d) transcripts of the post-review interviews

The above data helped to provide answers to the specific research questions (cf 3.2.1).

With regard to research question 1.1, a modified framework of Bamberg's (1983; 1984) holistic coherence parameters and Wikborg's (1990) taxonomy of incoherence in student writing served as foundation for the comparative analysis of essay drafts. Bamberg's (1983; 1984) categories of coherence and Wikborg's (1990) categories of coherence breaks were used in comparing the original and final drafts in terms of certain features that constitute coherence in student academic writing. Their categories or taxonomies were discussed in detail in 2.3.1. In the current study this analysis focused on the following categories listed in Table 2 below:

3.4.1.1 Table 2: Coherence-related categories

| Identifying topic in the introductions |
| Organising text |
| Topic development |
| Closure in the conclusion |
| Uncertain pronominal reference |
| Incorrect use of conjunction |
| Incorrect use of definite reference items |
The categories above served as a framework for the comparative analysis of students' essay drafts. This framework was used to help provide answers to research questions 1.1 and 1.2.

3.4.1.2 The taxonomy of revision changes

Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy of revision changes was used in order to determine types of revisions as well as the extent to which each student made surface and meaning changes.

These two authors distinguish between two types of revision changes, namely meaning changes and surface changes. The meaning changes involve the adding of new content or the deletion of existing content. On the other hand, surface changes involved changes that do not bring new information or remove old information in a text (Faigley & Witte 1981: 403).

Surface changes are divided into two categories, formal changes and meaning preserving changes. Formal changes include: spelling, tense, number, and modality; abbreviations; punctuation and format. The category of meaning-preserving surface changes include additions, deletions substitutions, permutations, distributions and consolidation. These types of changes involve for example addition of a word or phrase or substitution of a word in a sentence.

Under the category of meaning changes, Faigley and Witte (1981) distinguish between two types of changes, the macrostructure and microstructure changes. A macrostructure change is a major change that would affect the reading of other parts of a text, that is a change that would influence a reader's understanding of the entire essay. A microstructure change, on the other hand, is a meaning change that does not affect the reading of other parts of a text. An example of a microstructure addition quoted from Faigley and Witte (1981: 405) reads as follows:
Barton Springs does not fit an outsider’s image of Texas. It is an eighth-mile long unchlorinated pool in a natural limestone creek bed, fed by 27 million gallons of 68-degree water from the Edwards’ Acquire each day.

In the example above the type of addition made gives more information about the pool. Although new information is added it does not impact on the reading of other parts.

[Note that the same categories listed under surface meaning-preserving changes apply to the macrostructure and microstructure meaning changes].

These categories are defined and exemplified below. The examples were copied from the Assignment 1 essay drafts.

**Meaning preserving surface changes**
These include changes where words or phrases may be added or deleted in a sentence without any change in meaning. Examples appear in italics and the changes have been underlined where applicable.

(a) Additions [adding a word or phrase without changing the overall meaning of the sentence]

*they would learn to exercise self-discipline just because they would come to see that misbehaviour damage society as a whole* = > *through punishment they would learn to exercise self-discipline just because they would come to see that misbehaviour damage society as a whole*
(b) Deletions [a word or phrase is omitted without changing the meaning of the sentence].

they are increasingly based on achievement rather than ascription, on universalistic rather than particularistic standards on meritocratic principle which apply to all its members = > they are increasingly based on achievement rather than ascription, on universalistic rather than particularistic standards

(c) Substitutions [the exchange of words or longer units that represent the same concept]

If the children being taught how to obey laws and values they can produce good results = > If the pupils being taught how to obey laws and values they can produce good results

(d) Permutations [the rearrangement of words or phrases].

Society must define social meanings for individuals to act reflectively on the social system = > social means for individual to act meaningful and reflectively on the social system by society

(e) Distributions [occurred when one segment is divided into more than one segment].

It focus on the functionalist view on education i.e Talcott and Emil Durkheim = > It focus on the functionalist's view on education. The protagonists of functional function are Talcott Parsons and Emile Durkheim
Consolidations [occurred when two or more segments are combined into one].

*Durkheim perceived education's major function as the transmission of values and norms. There is a teaching of history providing ties between the individual and society.*

This taxonomy was tested for reliability using two independent researchers and they both reached an agreement of over 90% on the types of revisions (Faigley & Witte 1981: 405). Secondly the taxonomy has been used in other studies, for example Connor and Asenavage (1994).

### 3.4.1.2.1 Procedure for counting the number of revision changes

The current study did not only examine the different types of revision changes. It looked at the extent to which the student made surface and meaning changes.

The procedure followed in counting types of revision changes in the current study was similar to that followed by Faigley and Witte (1981). For instance, according to Faigley and Witte (1981: 405) when a macrostructure addition contains seven sentences, that change would be counted as seven macrostructure revision changes.

In the current study the procedure followed for counting revision changes was as follows: the original and final drafts were read side by side and sentence by sentence. Each sentence was analyzed separately. For example when there was a substitution of a word in a sentence that change would be counted as one revision change. To illustrate this procedure an example of how a microstructure *meaning deletion change* would be counted is given on the next page.
Outcomes Based Education is a new system of learning that is interested in the outcomes of the learning content or rather of the learners. It is interested in the role of the teachers, the role of the learner, and the basic principles and the new methods which will be used to replace the style of teaching that was used in schools.

Outcomes based Education is initiated by the South African Qualifications Authorities (SAQA). They established structures and processes to develop standards and qualification criteria on the National Qualifications framework (NQF) It monitors the quality of education and training by continually assessing both education and training providers and learner continually.

The Minister of Education Sibusiso Bengu announced in 1997 to be the year of orientation and start training for curriculum 2005 [1]. The curriculum was started in 1998 which is the year with Grade 1 and Grade 7 and in the year 2005 the scale must be fully implemented [2].
In the case above the writer deleted the third paragraph which consisted of two sentences. This type of revision change would therefore be counted as two microstructure deletion meaning changes.

Following the counting and classification of changes into two broad categories of surface changes and meaning changes, the frequencies of each type were worked out for each of the four students. The results are presented in figure A (cf 4.3.2).

A limitation in my study with regard to this procedure is that no second person was involved to check for accuracy in counting the number of surface changes and meaning changes. As a result the reliability regarding the counting of revision changes could not be established.

The current study was not only interested in the frequencies of surface versus meaning changes, it looked into which types of changes were self-initiated and which ones resulted from peer review.

3.4.1.3 Revision changes by source

In determining whether the revision changes made in the subsequent drafts came as a result of PR or were self-initiated (SI) or came from other sources, the following sources of data were examined: transcripts of what was discussed in peer review sessions, comments made on the Peer Response Sheet (PRS) and written comments on the essay drafts.

To make it easier to identify changes by source, each student's original and final drafts were compared and all the changes made from the original draft to the final draft were typed. All comments which emanated from student discussions were put under each student's revisions. Comments on the PRS were also typed in. The changes were examined once again to determine whether they were self-initiated (SI) or came as a result of Peer Review (PR). They were marked SI or PR.
accordingly. This was followed by counting instances of PR and SI/Other revisions for each student. The frequencies of these revisions are presented in Figure B of Chapter 4 (cf 4.3.3).

3.4.1.4 Post-review interviews

Post-review interviews were conducted after the experimental group had completed the peer review process. The purpose of the interviews was to explore students' attitude towards peer review (cf Appendix F for post-review questions). Data emanating from these interviews provided answers to research question 1.4.

3.4.2 Hypothesis 2

With regard to Hypothesis 2 the final drafts of the experimental and control groups referred to previously (cf 3.3.2) were the post-test. The same three raters used previously were asked to rate these final drafts using Bamberg's (1983) scale of holistic rating. The Mann-Whitney U test was performed to determine whether there was a significant difference in the holistic scores of the two groups. The results of this test are presented in 4.4.

3.5 Testing of hypotheses

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested using non-parametric tests. An explanation of these tests is given below:

3.5.1 Non-parametric tests
The fact that the sample size in this study was small necessitated the use of non-parametric tests (Siegel & Castellan 1988: 35). An advantage of these tests in the context of my study is that they can be used to analyse data which appears in ranks. The Mann–Whitney U test is regarded as one of the most powerful non-parametric tests and it is an alternative to the parametric t-test (Siegel & Castellan
1988: 131). The design requirements are the same as for the t-test in that there are two independent groups and there is one continuous variable on which the two groups are compared (Pretorius 1993: 159).

3.6 Problems encountered during data collection

It was mentioned in the previous sections that in courses other than the English course, students do not receive feedback on writing in progress. This made it difficult to get started with peer review sessions because each time the student had to bring their original drafts, they were not ready to do so. In an attempt to address this problem, I allowed students to use the drafts they had submitted to their lecturer for marking as original drafts. I had to negotiate with the lecturer to get those assignments back so that the students could participate in the peer review. The students had two days after the peer review session to complete the final draft and this draft was submitted to the lecturer for marking.

3.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter has mainly presented the research approaches and procedures used in this study and demonstrated how triangulation through multiple methods, measures and data sources was employed in data analysis and procedures. In an attempt to answer Research Question 1 which corresponds with Hypothesis 1, data from holistic coherence rating was used in the quantitative analysis of the essay drafts of the group exposed to peer feedback. In addition to this, data triangulation was used in the comparative analysis of essay drafts belonging to the same group. This data helped to provide answers to the qualitative research questions which connect with the general Research Question 1 (cf 3.2.1). The qualitative questions explore the differences between the original and final drafts from different angles, as illustrated by the specific research questions. Finally, data relating to Research Question 2, which corresponds with Hypothesis 2, will be analysed and interpreted quantitatively.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the findings of the study. It presents the statistical results of the pre-test, the statistical results and the descriptive analysis of essay drafts and findings relating to Hypothesis 1 as well as the statistical results for Hypothesis 2. The results are then interpreted both statistically and descriptively where applicable and related to the aims of the study with the intention of determining whether the aims have been realised.

4.2 Results of the pre-test

As indicated in Chapter 3 (cf 3.3.2.1) the results reported here apply to the eight students who made the final sample. The total holistic scores on the final drafts and the means for each group are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Holistic scores for the pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student O</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Student RN</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Student MK</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student GW</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student MN</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Mann-Whitney U test was performed on the scores and the results as presented in the table below revealed no significant difference between the scores of the experimental and control groups (p > .05). Despite some difference in the standard deviations (and given the high reading for p of .8024), the two randomly selected groups were indeed initially comparable in terms of their writing abilities.

### Mann-Whitney results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Mann Whitney Statistics</th>
<th>p = 0.8024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U = 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Results for Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant difference in the holistic ratings between the original and final drafts of the experimental group

As indicated in Chapter 3 (3.4.1) the results for this hypothesis are first presented and interpreted statistically. This is followed by a presentation of qualitative findings in the form of case studies for each writer. The results presented here apply only to the four students who made the final sample of the experimental group.

The total holistic ratings of the original and final drafts and means for each student's draft are presented in Table 4. The students have been arranged in merit order, with respect to the final drafts.
Table 4: Total holistic scores of each student’s original and final draft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Original draft Total score</th>
<th>Final draft Total score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student O</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Wilcoxon test was carried out to determine whether the holistic scores on the original and final drafts of the peer review group differed significantly. The results showed that there was no significant difference in the scores between the two drafts (Z = -0.3682; p = 0.7127). This means that for the group as a whole the students’ writing did not improve between the original and the revised drafts. Therefore there was no support for this hypothesis.

4.3.1 Interpretation of the results

This hypothesis was stated as a non-directional hypothesis because of the uncertain status of peer feedback or self-feedback as an aid in second language writing development. Although the statistical results show no significant difference between the original and final drafts, each of the final drafts was rated differently to its original (cf Table 4). The aim of the comparative analysis of each student’s drafts which now follows was, then, to add depth to the quantitative finding by trying to determine what contributed to the changes in the holistic rating of the final drafts.
4.3.2 A comparative analysis of student drafts

This analysis involved comparing the original and final drafts of each of the four writers *firstly*, in terms of certain key features of coherence in student writing identified by Bamberg (1983; 1984) and incoherence by Wikborg (1990). As demonstrated in 2.3.1, Bamberg’s (1984) categories of coherence and Wikborg’s (1990) taxonomy of coherence breaks complement each other. Therefore for the purpose of this study a modified framework of Bamberg’s (1984) holistic coherence and Wikborg’s (1990) categories of cohesion-related coherence breaks served as foundation for the comparative analysis of student drafts. The analysis focused on the categories listed in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Coherence categories

| (a) Identifying topic in the introductions |
| (b) Organising text |
| (c) Topic development |
| (d) Closure in the conclusion |
| (e) Cohesion: Uncertain pronominal reference |
| Incorrect use of conjunction |
| Incorrect use of definite reference item |

The analyses of students’ drafts according to the above mentioned categories attempted to provide answers to the following research questions posited in Chapter 1 (cf 1.2):

1.1 Does revision help to make the final drafts more coherent than the originals?
1.2 What kind of cohesion related problems were evident in the original and final drafts?
As case studies often require the incorporation of a variety of data in order to produce an in-depth understanding of the problem being studied (Borg and Gall 1989: 402). To answer the above research questions required incorporation of data from the following sources:

- extracts from students' original and final drafts
- transcripts from students' interaction during the peer review
- written comments on the Peer Review Sheet and on the actual essay drafts
- transcripts of the post-review interviews

Secondly, the analysis addressed the following research questions:

1.3 What type of revision changes do students make as they revise their original drafts?
   1.3.1 To what extent do students make surface as opposed to meaning changes when revising?
   1.3.2 Do surface and meaning changes result in more coherent final drafts?
   1.3.3 To what extent do writers incorporate changes suggested during peer review as well as self-initiated changes?
   1.3.4 Do writers' incorporation of peer comment help to make the final drafts more coherent?
   1.3.5 Is there a relationship between incorporation of peer comment and the interaction patterns that pairs engage in during the peer review process?

Finally, the analysis section reports on the benefits of peer review from the four students' perspective. It answers the question, *What is the students' attitude towards peer review?* posited in Chapter 1.

In order to help the reader understand which data was incorporated in the discussion
of the categories mentioned in Table 5 and which research questions were answered in each category, Table 6 summarises this.

Table 6: Coherence categories, research questions and data sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COHESION-RELATED CATEGORIES</th>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Identifying the topic in the introductions</td>
<td>Does revision help to make the final drafts more coherent than the originals? Do writers’ incorporation of peer comment help to make the final drafts more coherent?</td>
<td>extracts from ODs and FDs quotes from students discussion comments made on the PRS quotes from post-review interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Organising text</td>
<td>Does revision help to make the final drafts more coherent than the originals?</td>
<td>extracts from ODs and FDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Topic development</td>
<td>Does revision help to make the final drafts more coherent than the originals?</td>
<td>extracts from ODs and FDs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparative analysis of each of the aforementioned categories in terms of individual students now follows. Throughout this analysis extracts from students’ essays and PRS as well as quotations from students’ discussions during peer review and post-review interviews appear in italics.

4.3.2.1 (a) Identifying the topic in the introductions

As Bamberg (1983) pointed out in Chapter 2 (cf 2.3.1.1), writers of essays with a clear topic identification explicated their topic in the introductory paragraph of the text. These writers used the introduction to inform the reader about what the essay was about and oriented the reader by placing the topic in context. Similarly Scarcella (1984: 672) pointed out that orientations (lead-in statements) help the reader identify and understand the theme (thesis) i.e. what the essay is about. In other words orientations help the reader understand the thesis as defined by Watkinson (1998).
Watkinson (1998) adds a third element to the introduction and that is a map or statement of direction, which serves to inform the reader about the structure of the essay. In terms of the current study, the assignment topic required students to write about Outcomes Based Education (OBE), with reference to specific topics. Therefore in order to demonstrate that the final draft was more coherent than the original, the students had to briefly define or explain the concept OBE (thesis) and to inform the reader about the structure of the essay (map statement).

**Student O**

Original draft

*Introduction*

*I, hereunder, in this essay will debate on Outcome Based Education (OBE) by using the following headings, namely- definition of the key terms, principles, methods, the role of the teacher and lastly the role of the learner.*

Final draft

*Introduction*

*For this essay on Outcome Based Education, following headings will be used, namely- definition of the key terms, principles, methods, the role of the teacher and finally the role of the learner.*

The two drafts show that the final draft did not improve because the writer only informs the reader about the structure of the essay (map statement) but does not tell the reader what the essay is about (thesis). Although this student’s *introduction* was discussed at length during peer-review, she did not incorporate her partner’s suggestion about defining the concept OBE. Perhaps this is because of the manner in which she interacted with her partner during peer review discussions. For example when her partner pointed out the problem areas in her *introduction*, she became angry and defensive. An excerpt for this interaction is illustrated on the next page.
Writer: .... you [emphasis] you say I in this essay, I was supposed to define the term OBE
Reader: They say write an essay and here define the abbreviation OBE
Writer: So how can you define..... [reader interrupts]
Reader: OBE is an abbreviation
Writer: It is an abbreviation?
Reader: So when you define it you say the Outcomes based education .... you say what it is
Writer: You say the writer should not start by saying ‘I’ [reading the comment on the PRSJ what do you mean?
Reader: [reads the sentence] I hereunder
Writer: What wrong with that?
Reader: That’s a grammatical error
Writer: Grammatical error how?
Reader: You can’t start a sentence with I hereby say.. NO
Writer: But that’s an introduction even when you say in this essay we will discuss outcomes based education that does not make sense[ says this angrily]

Reader: Okay listen here "I hereunder" what does that mean?
Writer: I hereunder, in this essay will discuss.. will debate. Listen let me give you an example: It is the same as in this essay I will discuss
Reader: It is not the same
Writer: Is it not the same? Oh so you have a problem with that ‘I’
Reader: I hereunder, it does not make sense it is grammatically incorrect and you say in this essay will debate.. What are you debating ? In a debate it is either you agree or disagree but you here there is no debate
Writer: Let me tell you this issue is still under debate. I have debated because I don’t agree
Reader: You did not debate
Writer: Who me? Okay I will remove that debate

The above interaction demonstrates that the writer was made aware of the need to orientate the reader by defining the concept OBE but she ignored the comment. This confirms Berkenkotter’s (1984) claim that if writers interact with their partners in the manner demonstrated above, that is in a defensive or resisting manner they are more likely to deliberately disregard their peers’ comments.
Furthermore, Student O, according to Berkenkotter (1984: 316), can be described as an 'inner directed reviser'. Such writers have a strong sense of authority and responsibility towards their texts and they will tend to decide how they would like to present their texts regardless of readers’ comments (Berkenkotter 1984: 316).

When this student was asked in the post-review interviews (cf Appendix F) why she did not incorporate some of her partners’ comments she said that she felt it was not necessary to make all the changes suggested. She only chose to correct language errors and the omission of words. For example she said the following about revising her introduction:

"The first thing I did was to look at my introduction ... fix it ... avoid some of the words I was told to avoid like using 'I' after that I tried to correct my sentence construction and spelling......"

The above utterance shows that although Student O rejected some of her partner’s comments she noted some as shown in the final draft. The underlined expressions in the original draft were deleted as they were identified as problematic during peer review. This is illustrated in the discussion above and a comment on the Peer Response Sheet (PRS) which read as follows:

The writer should have not started by saying I hereunder as is grammatically incorrect. She should have started by saying: In this essay we will discuss the outcomes based education.

Student O’s final draft would have been more coherent if she had incorporated the two suggestions her partner made.

Student C
Like the previous student the changes that Student C made did not help to improve the final draft in that she only informed the reader about the structure of the essay
(map statement) without supplying the reader with information regarding what the essay is about (thesis). Furthermore the revision change involved combination of the two sentences from the original draft into one sentence. Such a change does not impact on the meaning of the text.

Example 1

Original draft

Introduction
These essay discuss the Outcomes Based Education. The following headings are going to be used, principles, methods, the role of the teacher and the role of the learner

Final draft

Introduction
These essay discusses the outcomes based education and the following headings are going to be used, principles, methods, the role of the teacher and the role of the learner

Student C's introduction was discussed during peer review discussions and remarks were also made on the PRS. The discussion between Student C (writer) and her partner Student N (reader) was as follows:

Reader: You say these essay discusses the Outcomes Based Education and the following headings are going to be used
Writer: What was I supposed to say?
Reader: You must say you are going to discuss principles, methods, etcetera but here you say you are going to use these headings
Writer: You mean I did not write what was required?
Reader: Your essay does not prepare me for what you are going to write about it just talks about what you are going to use.

The discussion regarding the 'introduction' took 24 turns and I had to intervene because the two were simply disagreeing about the word 'use'. When I intervened to ask the reader to make suggestions for improvement she said this:
Reader: Make it one sentence and remove this full stop
Writer: So must I put a comma?
Reader: Ja
Writer: Must I say These essay discusses the outcomes based education using the following ... pause
Reader: or say by referring to the following headings
Writer: Oh you don’t like the word ‘using’
Reader: Yes when you say ‘using’ the two sentences will not relate

Remarks made on the PRS read as follows:

The writer say she is going to use the heading but not preparing us that she will explain them or discuss the in the following essay

Student C’s final draft reveals that she has revised her draft based on her partner’s suggestions. Nevertheless, she chose not to consider the suggestion about the use of the word ‘use’, which they were disagreeing about. Considering that all four participants in this study have completed the English 100 course, the exclusion of the orientation statement in the introduction may be attributed to the transference of the rules and norms of writing an introduction in the English course. For example reading through the English 100 study guide (1994: 83-85), one sees that the students are taught to write an introduction this way:

Read the topic several times to make sure you understand it. Which words tell you what to do in the essay? Underline them.

Rephrase the topic in your own words. Then write an appropriate thesis statement for your essay. The thesis statement summarises the theme that the writer intends to develop throughout the essay.

The above quotation shows that in the English course the focus in the introduction is on what the writer has been asked to write about that is, the theme. However it would be wrong to suggest that no orientations are required in the English course
under any circumstances.

Another possible reason why the revised draft did not improve much is because the reader concentrated on surface changes, such as reworking of a sentence, rather than make suggestions that impacted on meaning. Despite the reader’s focus on surface changes, she failed to question the use of the plural form of the pronominal reference these, neither did the writer change this on her own. It would seem that neither were aware of this error.

Examining the interaction pattern between Student C and her partner Student N, in terms of their discussion of the introduction, I would say that this pair has adopted what Lockhart and Ng (1995: 625) refer to as the ‘probing stance’ which means interaction is centred around unclear or confusing areas in the text and questions are used to elicit clarification. Student C asked for advice: What must I say? So must I put a comma? and she asked for clarification where she did not comprehend her partner as in, You mean I did not write what was required. Her partner too offered advice, meaning that she made suggestions for changes. According to Nelson and Murphy (1993: 140), when peers interact in this manner the writers are more likely to incorporate their peers’ suggestions.

One other issue that impacts on coherence is that of identifying the topic by creating a context whereby the reader is able to understand what the writer is communicating. In the first statement of both drafts the writer assumes that her lecturer as reader shares the same information she has about ‘Spady’s workshop’, which indicates failure to provide context necessary for the production of meaning. According to Cooper (1988: 358-359), confusion arises if students assume that their lecturers as audience know what they are writing about or they can infer information from the writing situation as illustrated in the extract on the next page.
Example 2

Original & Final draft

Principles of Outcomes Based Education
According to Philippa Garson (March 1998:5) much of Spady's workshop focused on four main principles. The first one is expanding the conditions of success that is taking the mystery out of what you want learners to achieve. One views that the teacher makes things easy by guiding the learner what she or he should do in order to achieve.

The issue of the sentence about 'Spady's workshop' was raised in the peer review discussion between this student and her partner, Student N. Student N said this:

Reader: Who is this?
Writer: Oh that's the name of a person. Philippa Garson talks about Spady.
Reader: But you didn't say that this is a person's name you just said "according to Philippa Garson, much of Spady's workshop ......... So I don't know whether Spady's workshop is the name of a person or group.

Although the reader recognised a problem with beginning a new paragraph of a new section with the statement: According to Philippa Garson (1998:5) much of Spady's workshop ....... she was unable to offer suggestion that would enable the writer to understand the problem. Perhaps this is the reason why the writer ignored the comment.

Student T

In both drafts this writer does not tell the reader what he has been asked to write about, that is, the thesis. Nonetheless the final draft reads better than the original in that the writer gives background on the topic, that is, he orientates the reader whereas in the original draft he defines the topic but does not elaborate on the definition. This improvement may be attributed to the process approach to writing instruction, because when writing is perceived as a recursive, non-linear process, ideas are explored, clarified and reformulated and this may be what happened when student T revisited
his introduction.

Original draft

Introduction
The abbreviation OBE can be defined the outcome based education which is a design that is result oriented, learner centred and based on the belief that all individuals can learn.

Final draft

Introduction
The department of education in South Africa embarked on a curriculum review in 1995 with key stakeholders involved in the process. The new curriculum is based on lifelong learning which was ideal for South Africans. The new curriculum will be shift from the one which has been content based to the which is outcome based. OBE is the outcomes based education designed on oriented results, learner-centred and based on the belief that all individual can learn. OBE is going to help the South African education by equipping learners with competencies, knowledge they need when they complete their training or leave school.

The improvement in the writer's final draft could also be attributed to peer comment in that the partner wrote the following comment on the PRS:

Introduction need detail because it is an important part of an essay. I can't get a clear picture of what is all about

Although the reader did not specify the kind of detail needed, the writer was able to work out the necessary detail on his own and this might have contributed to the improvement in his holistic score (from 7-9: the highest percentage improvement of the group).

Student N
In both drafts the writer places the topic in context by giving a brief overview of the assignment topic. The final draft is more coherent than the original because the writer gives the reader some background about the topic and she explicitly states how she
will structure her essay: *The following essay will discuss..... .*

Original Draft

*Introduction*

Outcomes Based Education is a new system of learning that is interested in the outcomes of the learning content or rather of the learners. It is interested in the role of the teacher, the role of the learner and the basic principles and the new methods which will be used to replace the style of teaching that was used in schools.

Outcomes Based education is initiated by the South African Qualifications Authorities (SAQA). They established structures and processes to develop standards and qualification criteria on the National Qualifications framework (NQF). It monitors the quality of education and training by continually assessing both education training providers and learner continually.

The Minister of Education Sibusiso Bengu announced in 1997 to be the year of orientation and start training for curriculum 2005. The curriculum was started in 1998 which is this year with Grade 1 and Grade 7 and in the year 2005 the scale must be fully implemented.

Final Draft

*Introduction*

Outcomes Based Education is a new system of learning that is interested in the outcomes of the learning content or rather of the learners. The following essay will discuss the methods, the role of the learner, the basic principles and the role of the teacher which will replace the old style of teaching.

Outcomes Based education is initiated by the South African Qualifications Authorities (SAQA). They established structures and processes to develop the standards and qualifications framework (NQF). It monitors the quality of education and training by continually assessing both education training providers and learner continually.

Furthermore, in the final draft she deleted the third paragraph. This paragraph was not necessary as it contained information that was not relevant to the assignment. Although there was improvement in the final draft, her final introduction would have read even better if she had consolidated the first two paragraphs and then mentioned what she had been asked to write about.
The improvement in the final draft may be ascribed to the opportunity given to this writer to think about her introduction before producing the final draft. To substantiate this, it should be noted that when this student was asked about the benefits of the peer review process she said the following:

"A lot 'cause like in the introduction you have to prepare the reader say what you want to write about. But in my first assignment I explained Structuralism in detail in about half a page in the introduction I did not explain what I will be discussing in the essay I just started to explain Structural Functionalism, So I had to change and say in my introduction what the essay will entail".

Although the problem with her original draft was not discussed during the peer review process, she managed to discover the problem area on her own. This observation supports the belief held by some writing consultants in South Africa (e.g. Leibowitz and Parkerson 1994; Slemming 1996) that the long term goal in responding to students' drafts is to help them learn to critically evaluate writing on their own.

**Conclusion**

This section summarises and concludes the main findings relating to *identifying topic in the introductions*, as one of the conditions of coherence (cf Table 5). Firstly, the final drafts of Students T and N's introductions met this condition. These students managed to identify the topic by placing the assignment topic in context. For example Student T created impressions of coherence by supplying sufficient background on the topic to help the reader understand the theme and this might have contributed to the improvement in his total holistic score. Similarly, Student N enhanced the coherence of her final draft by deleting the third paragraph of her original draft. This deletion helped to improve this draft because this paragraph was not relevant to what the students had been asked to write about. As Witte and Faigley (1981) pointed out earlier, (cf 2.3.1.4) a text violates a coherence condition when the writer does not
provide information relevant to the topic. Similarly, irrelevant content had been identified by Wikborg (1990) as one form of coherence break.

On the other hand, there was no improvement in the introduction of Student O and C’s final drafts in that they made changes that did not help make the final draft more coherent. They failed to put the topic in context by informing the reader about what the essay was about. Failure to identify the topic according to Bamberg (1983) is a violation of the conditions of coherence. This failure constitutes the coherence break of unspecified topic (cf Wikborg 1990 in 2.3.1).

Although the four students managed to link their introductory paragraphs to the assignment topic by repeating the lexical items, used in the topic, this according to Van Tonder’s (1999) results, does not appear to have a significant effect on the coherence rating of texts.

With regard to students’ incorporation of peer review comments, as illustrated in the discussion between Student O and her partner Student T, Student O did not incorporate the suggestion that would have helped improve the coherence of her final draft. In the interaction between Student C and her partner Student N, the partner did not comment on issues that would create coherence in Student C’s introduction. She only commented on surface changes which according to Bamberg (1983) have little impact on the coherence of a text.

Students T and N’s introductions were not discussed during peer review, which suggests that they used their own knowledge about writing to make the changes that improved their final drafts.
4.3.2.2 (b) Organising text

This section focuses on what Wikborg (1990) and Bamberg (1984) perceive as coherently organised text. According to Wikborg (1990) a text is coherently structured when writers use paragraphs to signal topic shifts or employ alternative structuring devices, known as metatextual pointers. In the same vein, Bamberg (1984) points out that a text is coherent if the writer organizes information according to a discernable plan and he or she sustains this throughout the essay. The original drafts and final drafts of the four participants were compared in order to find out if the final or revised drafts met to a greater degree any of the conditions stated by the two authors.

**Student 0**

In both the original and final drafts this student did not use paragraphs to structure her essay, but used topic shift markers like *firstly, secondly* and *finally*. However this structure is not sustained throughout the essay in that she uses these markers in one part of the essay and in other parts she simply lists details as illustrated in the example below:

Original & Final draft

*The role of the learner*

*The learner as the secondary receiver of education has to play a vital role in his /her search for knowledge. The learner has to be actively involved in each and every step aimed at achieving the desired goal. The role the learner plays requires discipline, respect, obedience, patience and co-operation as well as the will to succeed. The learner being the one in need of help from education, has a very important role in order to have a round connection with the teacher.*

Although this student’s final draft was rated *fully coherent*, the digressions in her organisational plan make it partially coherent, according to Bamberg’s (1984) coherence scale. There was no difference between the structure of the original essay,
which was rated partially coherent, and the final text, rated fully coherent, which suggests that there may be factors other than text organisation that have contributed to the improvement in the holistic score.

**Student C**

This student announces her organisational plan in the original and final draft, but she shifts from this plan in the final draft. In the initial paragraphs of the original and the final draft she explicitly states that four principles will be discussed. This prepares the reader for a four-part structure. In the original draft she mentions all four principles and briefly explains them except the second principle.

In the final draft, she digresses from the structure she has announced in P1. She writes about two principles only. Reading through the two drafts I discovered that the information in P2FD, is the same as the one given in the second sentence of P2OD, that is, information about the third principle. Furthermore P2FD is confusing in that the writer has left out a signal that clearly marks a topic shift, that is the second principle is .... In the light of this analysis, the improvement in the holistic score of the final draft could not be attributed to text organisation. *Note that OD and FD paragraphs have been numbered for easy reference. The letter P stands for paragraph and the number next to that letter denotes the paragraph number.*

Original draft

**Principles of Outcomes Based Education**

**P1FD**

According to Philippa Garson (March 1998:5) much of Spady’s workshop focused on four main principles. The first one is expanding the conditions of success that is taking the mystery out of what you want learners to achieve. One views that the teacher makes things easy by guiding the learner what she or he should do in order to achieve
The second principle is higher standards that is only when the learner can do something well is it finished. The third principle is expanding opportunity, that is to open up and be more flexible with time, instructional methods, materials and learning environments. Give more opportunities to learners to do things well. (Phillipa Garson, 1998:5) One view that learners should be given a chance to prove themselves, to show that what kind of people they are.

The fourth principle of Outcomes Based Education is design up, that is start from where you want to end up (Philippa Garson March 1998:5) According to the writer before starting one must think first of the results one must consider what is going to happen at the end.

Final draft

According to Philippa Garson (March 1998:5) much of Spady's workshop focused on four main principles. The first one is expanding the conditions of success that is taking the mystery out of what you want learners to achieve. One views that the teacher makes things easy by guiding the learner what she or he should do in order to achieve

Expanding opportunity, meaning to open up and be more flexible with time, instructional methods, materials and learning environments. Give more opportunities to learners to do things well. (Phillipa Garson, 1998 :5) Learners should be given a chance to prove themselves, to show that what kind of people they are.

The other principle of Outcomes Based Education is design up, that is start from where you want to end up (Philippa Garson March 1998:5) The writer views that before starting one must think first of the results one must consider what is going to happen at the end.

Student T

In the original draft, this student uses subheadings to structure his text but he removes these in the final draft. Nevertheless he had no difficulty using paragraphs to mark topic shifts in major headings. His main problem was using paragraphs to divide
subtopics of main headings. For example he mentions several ideas in a list-like fashion in a single paragraph, as illustrated below:

Original draft

The role of the learner
The role of the learner is to work effectively with other members in a group, a team, an organization and a community [1]. Learner should be responsible for their environment and other people's health by using science and technology in an effective and critical manner [2]. The learner is supposed to employ thinking is require a critical and creative solving and identifying problems[ 3]. The learner is suppose to organise, analyse, collect and evaluare information [4]. The learner must understand the world as a set of related system which means problem-solving situations do not exists in isolation [5]. The learner should be aware of the effective learning strategies, responsible citizenship, education and career opportunities and entrepreneurial abilities [6] (curriculum 2005 lifelong learning for the 21st century p16)

Final draft

The role of the learner on the development of outcomes based education is that the learner is expected to work effectively with other members in a group, a team, an organization and a community [1]. The learner should be responsible for his/her environment and other people's health [2]. Learners are expected to clean their environment and make the environment always tidy [3]. Learners should use science and technology in an effective and critical manner which means skills are required in operating computers etc and knowledge on other variety of sciences [4]. Critical and creative thinking is essential to solve and identify problems [5]. Learner is supposed to organize, analyse, collect and evaluate information [6]. The learner must the world as a set of related system meaning that problem solving context do not exists in isolation [7].

Although both drafts reveal problems with coherence, there are sentences which read better after revision, such that S4 of the final draft, for instance, is a great improvement on S3 of the original draft. Secondly, the use of lexical items such as environment and tidy in S3 of the final draft helps to link this sentence to the previous one. The word clean in S3 can be traced back to the statement that the learner should
be responsible for other people’s health. Perhaps the improvement in the holistic score could be attributed to the fact that some of the sentences in the final draft improved.

Student N
In the original draft the writer demonstrated no organizational plan, which renders her essay incoherent in that she uses paragraphs in one main heading and in the next she digresses to tabulating information and then goes back to using paragraphs in the other section and in the final section she does not use paragraphs at all. The revised draft revealed some improvement in her organizational plan. For example as the assignment required a discussion of three subtopics, she discusses her topic using these subtopics but she only uses paragraphs in the discussion of one subtopic. She follows an irregular plan in paragraph division in that she presents an idea and supports it but in other paragraphs she does not do this.

The fact that her holistic score declined from 11 to 8 despite the analysed improvement in the various aspects of her writing may suggest that assessing writing quality requires a multi-dimensional approach which integrates measurements of different kinds to the same data. For example holistic rating gives a relatively quick assessment of the coherence of a text without much deliberation on the text, whereas a descriptive analysis of what constitutes coherence gives more insight into the aspects of text that improved.

Conclusion
In terms of the organisation of texts, no major organisational changes were made. The final drafts showed that all four students organised their text according to the three main headings of the topic and they sustained this structure throughout their essays. According to Bamberg (1983: 420) when writers use headings to show the division of topics in the essay and they maintain this structure throughout, this facilitates a reader’s integration of details into a coherent whole.
However, a common problem evident in the organisation of the final drafts was that of using paragraphs to signal subtopic shifts. It would seem that the students do not know the function of paragraphing. This observation is supported by one of the participants, Student N, who said the following in the pre-interviews:

_Interviewer:_ How do you decide when to move from one paragraph to the other?

_Student N:_ You see in high school they taught us an essay must have an introduction, body and conclusion but you don't know in the body how do you divide the ideas into paragraphs. You simply write a paragraph so that the work must not look mixed up you just create a space in between so that your work can look clean.

Wikborg (1990) made similar observations in her study of coherence breaks in Swedish university-student essays. She noticed that it was not always easy for inexperienced writers to decide which of the many ideas merit a paragraph of their own (Wikborg 1990:140). It would seem that this problem is common to novice writers. Another observation was that all four students failed to sustain their initial organisational plan, and instead they tended to just list details in certain sections of their essays. This failure constitutes one type of coherence break and that is, unjustified change of topic.

4.3.2.3 (c) **Topic development**

With regard to topic development it was noted in the writing of these students that there was either no elaboration on certain sections of the texts or there was elaboration on only some of the statements made. Furthermore, when students attempted to develop topic their supporting statements did not link to the initial statement presented in the paragraph. According to Wikborg (1990: 133) one of the sources of coherence breaks in students’ text is the failure to help the reader
distinguish between the elaboration of a point just made and the presentation of a new assertion.

Student 0
This student, for instance, did not support her statements in some parts of her essay and when she did, those supporting ideas did not link with the propositions just made.

Example 1
This example demonstrates lack of topic development

Original & final draft

Firstly he said that the teachers should expand conditions of success in which the learner will be able to achieve. Secondly, learners actively involved in classroom will result the higher-standard of learning programme. Thirdly, learners must be given an opportunity to expand their knowledge and express their understanding from what they learnt in different in different ways. Lastly, educators can start their learning-programmes from where they want to end up.

The above paragraph was not revised. According to Cooper (1988: 360) a text that is rated incoherent often has sentence after sentence of new information without any overlapping arguments. Although this writer's final text was rated fully coherent, lack of topic development was evident in her essay as demonstrated in the extract above.

Example 2
This is an example of the writer attempting to support her statements. However, many of her supporting statements did not relate to the propositions made. All the supporting statements have been numbered, for example SS1 stands for supporting statement of the first sentence.
Firstly, there must availability of suitable learning advice and assessment programmes for the recognition of prior learning to guide all learners. In other words education must be given to all learners in the country which are non-racial and non-sexism [SS1]. Secondly, there must be different ways of learning programmes for learners who are unable to attend education and training institutions either as part-time or full-time candidates. For example, methods of learning programmes to be introduced must be available for those who cannot further their studies to tertiary institutions[SS2]. Thirdly learners must be allowed to take advantage of open-learning and multi-media education and training opportunities. For instance the learners critical and creative thinking must be recognised [SS3].

The above was not revised. In the first place it is difficult to figure out what the writer means by learning advice. The word advice appears inappropriate in this context. Furthermore SS1 which is supposed to support the previous statement does not perform this function in that it does not relate to the previous statement. In fact it presents new information. SS1 is also confusing in that the reader cannot work out whether the phrase which are non-racial and non-sexism refers to education or to the learners. SS2 does not clarify the previous statement. In fact it repeats that statement in a different way. At a grammatical level, the writer has used an incorrect preposition to instead of at. SS3 does not support the previous statement. Like S1 it presents new information which requires overlapping arguments.

**Student C**

Generally this student supported her statements and unlike Student O, there was a relationship between the main ideas and supporting ideas. This may have contributed to a slight increase in her holistic score, from 8.5 to 9.5, though there was no improvement in the final draft in terms of topic development.

**Original draft**

According to Gauteng Department of Education (1997: 14) every person shall
have the right to basic education and to equal access to schools and centres of learning. That is to say there should be no discrimination every child has the right to learn and they should be given a chance to prove themselves [SS1]. No learner or educator shall be unfairly discriminated by the department or by a school on the grounds of race, colour, sex, gender, class, disability, belief, conscience, religion, culture or language (Gauteng department of Education, 1997:14) [SS2]. These means that people should have the equal right [S3].

Final draft

The Gauteng Department of Education (1997:14) points out that every person shall have the right to basic education and to equal access to schools and centres of learning. There should be no discrimination every child has the right to learn and they should be given a chance to prove themselves [SS1]. No learner or educator shall be unfairly discriminated by the department or by a school in spite of sex, gender, religion or culture [SS2].

In both drafts the writer managed to support her initial statement in that the supporting ideas clarify the main idea. Nevertheless there are minor errors which do not affect the comprehension of the text. For example the use of an inappropriate phrase in spite of in the final draft and the use of an incorrect reference cohesion item they in SS1 of the final draft (the plural pronominal reference they) does not agree with the lexical item child. Finally it seems that the writer does not know that the words sex and gender are here synonymous. In spite of these problems, the fact that the writer successfully elaborated on her points may have contributed to the improvement in her holistic score.

Student T

With regard to this student’s text, some of the statements were supported while others were not. An example of supported statements is given below:

Original draft

Teacher making tests are an integral part of teaching and learning process [1].
They are linked to the outcome of learning programme and flow from lesson as a normal classroom activity [2]. Teacher make test so that students are allowed to monitor their own progress and provide valuable information for teachers in teaching and learning activities [3]. The teacher assess performance of learners by teaching and learning activities such as debates, projects, speeches, experiments and athletic sequence [4].

Final draft

Teachers use test as an integral part of teaching and learning process [1]. Teachers should be linked to outcomes of learning programme and flow from lesson as a normal classroom activity [2]. Teacher use tests to allow students to monitor their own progress and provide valuable information for teachers in teaching and learning activities [3]. The teacher assesses performance of learners by a method of teaching and learning activities through debates, projects, speeches, experiments and sequences of athletics [4].

S1 of the revised draft reads better than that of the original draft and it helps the reader to link S3 and S4 to the initial proposition that teachers use tests as an integral part of the teaching and learning process. The words tests and assessment in S3 and S4 relate to the idea presented in S1.

Student N

This student had presented part of her original draft in tabular form and due to peer comment she changed this part into essay form. This revision change necessitated reader orientation into the topic. The writer achieved this by providing context to help the reader identify the points that will be discussed under that heading. Added to this she also managed to elaborate on the points which she had only listed in the original draft. This is exemplified in S3, S5 and S7 of the final draft. This kind of improvement seems not to have been taken into account in holistic rating because in spite of this improvement, the final draft was given a total score of 8 whereas the score for the original draft was 11. The extract on the next page illustrates the difference between the original and final drafts.
**Principle: IN**

1. Facilitators: their duty is to encourage pupil's group envolvement and responsibility

2. Grades: Instead of standards children will now use grades

3. Assessment: group work makes it easier for learners to understand because they feel free to ask each other what they don't understand

**OUT**

- Teacher: responsible for teaching and maintain order in the classroom and at school
- Standards: pupils were separated according to standards
- Examination: the effort of the pupils was exposed at the end of the examinations

**Final draft**

**Principles of OBE**

The principles which will be used in outcomes based education is different from that of old learning system [S1]. Successful OBE (1997:3) give difference between the old method of teaching pupils and the new style of teaching which will be used in the curriculum 2005 [S2]. Facilitator which will replace the teacher, their duty is to encourage pupils group envolvement and responsible [S3]. Teacher centred is replaced by the learner centred which encourages them to participate and do their school work in a group rather than listening to a teacher for the whole day [S4]. Standards will be replaced by Grades [S5]. In Standards pupils were writings exams for the passing to the next standards [S6]. Examinations which exposes pupils who did not succeeded [S7]. Exams were difficult since they promote individual competition [S8]. Assessment which is introduced in curriculum 2005 is promoting group work and learners are not going to be ashamed of fail because that will encourage them to put effort in their work [S9] (Bengu 1997:14-16).
Conclusion

As Johns (1986) indicated, topic development is one of the important features of coherence. Coherent essays usually have propositions followed by a hierarchy of sentences which can be summarised into a coherent whole (Wikborg 1985: 362). This was not the case with regard to the students' final drafts. They were not consistent in their topic development. For example in one part of the text writers would develop their subtopics whereas in other sections they would simply list the various points. Presenting ideas in a series of separate sentences prevents the reader's integration of a text into a coherent whole. Therefore it seems that lack of topic development had a negative impact on the coherence of the final drafts.

Inadequate topic development could be attributed to the students' experiences in the past schooling system, limited understanding of the subject content or of the language of the textbook and inadequate language that hinders them to express and clarify ideas.

Faigley and Witte (1981: 198) also made a valid point that lack of adequate vocabulary prevents writers of low rated essays from extending, exploring or elaborating on the concepts they introduce. The findings in this study revealed that even with high-rated texts, writers were often unable to explore statements they introduce.

Furthermore, as indicated in 2.3, student academic writing is linked to the study of subject content. Therefore, adequate understanding of the course content is required in order to engage actively with knowledge. One can deduce from the extract above that these writers come from a schooling background which encouraged learning by rote instead of learning to articulate their thoughts and other people's ideas. Consequently, these students are unable to expand or elaborate on the ideas presented in the textbooks.
4.3.2.4 (d) Closure in the conclusion

Conclusions were usually signaled by phrases like, *in conclusion* or *to conclude*. According to Bamberg (1983), a fully coherent essay will conclude with a statement that gives the reader a definite sense of closure. In a conclusion one draws together one’s arguments in such a way that the problem presented in the introduction gets answered. Furthermore, Van Tonder (1999: 113) points out that conclusions refer back to the essay topic via repetition of lexical items and in the case where the link between the concluding paragraph and the given topic is absent, the reader is not provided with a sense of closure. Findings in Van Tonder’s (1999) study revealed a highly significant relationship between density of cohesive ties in the closing paragraph and coherence. She points out that cohesive ties between these paragraphs and the assigned topic might have had the effect of "reminding the reader of the theme of the essay" (Van Tonder 1999: 113). Watkinson (1998: 104) supports this point by adding that since conclusions refer back to the idea expressed in the introduction, they should not contain new information as this would raise new expectations in the reader’s mind.

In the comparative analysis of the aspect of closure in conclusions, I expected the writers to indicate closure by using concluding signals, to refer back to the assignment topic via repetition of lexical items and to round off the arguments developed in the essay.

**Student O**

*Original draft*

*Conclusion*

*It is evidence from abovewritten essay that OBE approach focus on applying skills, involve range of methods and its about understanding, success and cooperation which involves both teachers and learners. Outcomes Based Education focuses on the outcomes of learning namely - for what the pupil should know and be able to do at the end of particular course or section. It encourages learners to think creatively and be able to collect, analyse, organise and critically evaluate information. The overall focus of curriculum 2005, is to equip learners*
with knowledge, competencies and orientations needed for success after they leave school.

Final draft

Conclusion
An Outcomes Based Education approach focus on applying skills, involve range of methods and its about understanding, success and co-operation which involves both teachers and learners. This approach is also focuses on the outcomes of learning. It encourages learners to think creatively and be able to collect, analyse, organise and critically evaluate information. The overall focus of OBE is to equip learners with the knowledge, competencies and orientations needed for success after they leave school.

In both drafts this student summarised the main arguments presented in the text and she referred back to the essay topic by repeating the same lexical items used in the assignment topic and the introduction. Her final draft could have read even better had she used the same concluding signal, it is evident from the above essay, in her final draft. The use of the demonstrative reference cohesion item this in the final draft helped in breaking the monotony of repeating the same phrase Outcomes Based Education. This is the only student who attempted to present a better conclusion. She demonstrated some understanding of the function of a conclusion and this may have contributed to the improvement in her holistic score.

Student C

Original draft

Conclusion
The Outcomes Based Education is the improved method to bring together education and training for all learners. The Outcomes Based Education enable the learner to acquire the knowledge of skills, values, attitudes and understanding. The Outcomes Based Education has methods and principles and it is an effective method.

The above conclusion was not modified in the final draft. Like Student O, she managed
to summarise the main argument presented in the essay. However she does not indicate her concluding statement by using explicit signals. Neither does she present arguments why she believes Outcomes Based Education is an improved and effective approach.

**Student T**

Original draft

**Conclusion**

*In conclusion the OBE or Outcomes based education in this essay contains the introduction with guidelines, the principles of OBE, the method employed in OBE, the role of the teacher and the role of the learner*

Final Draft

**Conclusion**

*In conclusion the outcomes based education in South Africa is a process which is being implement in our schools and universities etc. The key terms which need attention were the principle, the methods, the role of the teacher, and the role of the learner*

In both drafts Student T indicates his concluding paragraph by using clear signals such as: *in conclusion*. He links the closing paragraph and the assignment topic by repeating the lexical items used in the topic and, in this way, he creates a sense of closure.

**Student N**

Original draft

**Conclusion**

*Successful Outcomes Based education aim at producing the critical outcomes. These critical outcomes will be problem solving, team work, and effective communication. It is aiming at making education and training accessible to all and gaining of qualifications.*
In both drafts the writer repeats what she has already mentioned in the text. In this way she reminds the reader about the theme of the essay. However she summarises only one aspect of OBE, that is, the methods of OBE instead of summarising the main arguments. Finally she does not use explicit signals to mark her concluding paragraph.

**Conclusion**

As Van Tonder (1999) indicated, the links that writers make between their closing paragraph and the assignment topic can have a significant effect on the creation of coherence in their texts. The fact that some of the students were able to create a sense of closure by linking the conclusion to the assignment topic suggests that their concluding paragraphs probably had a positive effect on the holistic coherence ratings of their final drafts.

These observations have been made from a very small sample. However, they have implications for teaching the writing of conclusions, an aspect which will be discussed in Chapter 5.

**4.3.2.5 (e) Cohesion**

This section addresses research question 1.2 posited in Chapter 1 (cf 1.2). Wikborg's (1990) taxonomy of cohesion related coherence breaks was used as a foundation in identifying cohesion breaks in student text. According to Bamberg's (1984) coherence grid, a text is considered incoherent if the writer uses too few cohesive ties to link
sentences or paragraphs together. An analysis of each of the four students' original and final drafts revealed that the students used a limited variety of cohesive devices. They used primarily the pronominal and demonstrative reference items to signal relations between sentences and they also used similar lexical items repetitively, for example *the teacher* and *the learner*.

There were few cohesion problems, but the following were identified: uncertain pronominal reference, incorrect use of conjunction and incorrect use of definite reference items. Cohesion errors are underlined.

**Incorrect use of a conjunction**

Reading through Student O and Student N's essay drafts I noticed that an incorrect conjunction may be used or a conjunction is used when there should be no conjunction.

**Student O**

In the case of this student, she used a conjunction in a place where there should be no conjunction. In the extracts that follow, the writer assumes that there is a relationship between the two sentences presented below, when in fact no such relationship exists. The final draft presents a change, but not an improvement.

**Original draft**

*Finally there must be coherent career which ensure relevance and progress in the educational system. Then, there are also several key principles which was brought by Spady who held workshop of Outcomes Based during his visit in South Africa.*

**Final draft**

*Finally there must be coherent career which ensure relevance and progress in the educational system. Then at the same time there are also several key*
principles which was brought by Spady who held workshop of Outcomes Based during his visit in South Africa.

Student N
This student used an incorrect conjunction, rather than instead of the correct one unlike. The original draft was not revised.

Original & final draft

They learn more from each other using group work or team work. In this case individual learning is not encouraged rather than in the past learning system

Uncertain pronominal reference
This is one type of cohesion error which prevents the reader from arriving at a plausible interpretation and as such it is assumed that this error type will tend to have a serious effect on coherence (Hubbard 1987: 13). The highlighted pronominal references exemplify this:

Student C

Original draft

The teachers or educators should not spoonfeed the learner they should be involved research, debates and experiments

Final draft

The teachers or educators should not spoonfeed the learner they should be allowed to participate when coming to things like debates and experiments

The plural pronominal reference they may be interpretable to refer either to the teachers or the learners. If it refers to the learner, then the plural referent they does not agree with the singular form the learner. The revision presented in the final draft did not improve cohesion or coherence in this draft.
**Incorrect use of definite reference item**

**Student N**

The extract below is an example of complete absence of a plausible referent for a reference item. The writer mentions *the rule* for the first time in the text. She uses the definite article *the* as if she is referring to a specific rule retrievable from the text or from the reader's background knowledge. The original draft was not revised.

Original & final draft

*The teacher must ensure that their activities enables pupils where necessary to recognize that their allegiance to societal goals and values comes before personal concerns. The teacher must therefore be committed to presenting the rule not as his own personal doing but as a moral power ...........

**Conclusion**

Bamberg (1984) describes a coherent text as one in which the writer skilfully uses a range of cohesive ties to connect sentences and paragraphs together. Similarly, Witte and Faigley (1981) found that high rated essays were more dense in cohesion than low rated essays. This suggests that there is a relationship between the use of a range of cohesive ties and impressions of coherence.

The students’ essays relied on a limited range of devices, such as pronominal and demonstrative reference cohesion. Added to this, examples of cohesion error were also very few. For instance there were no examples of cohesion related coherence breaks from either draft of Student T’s essay.

Based on these findings, cohesion aspects probably had a negligible effect on the coherence ratings of the students’ essays.
CONCLUSION

In concluding this section, I need to point out that process writing calls for revision of the original draft and "effective" revision should lead to a more coherent final draft (FD). The previous discussion (cf 4.3.2) has highlighted some important considerations regarding revision in the four student writers mentioned in this study. It has revealed that the final drafts of students improved in certain features of coherence and this improvement can be attributed to some degree to the opportunity given to the writers to reflect and to incorporate their partners' input when they revise their original drafts. Firstly, the final drafts of two students, namely Student T and Student N improved in topic identification. The improvement in Student T's draft could be linked to the increase in his total holistic score (from 7-9: the highest percentage improvement of the group). As regards Student N, it seems the holistic raters were not influenced by this improvement because her holistic rating declined (from 11-8).

Secondly, although there were no major revisions in organising the essays, generally students managed to organise their essays according to the three main headings of the topic and they sustained this structure throughout. This suggests that organising text is one aspect of coherence that helped create impressions of coherence in the students' essays.

Thirdly, although there were no major changes made between the original and final drafts of the concluding paragraphs, students were able to create a sense of closure by linking the conclusion to the assignment topic, and as Van Tonder (1999) has shown, these links can have a significant effect on the creation of coherence in a text. One could therefore link the improvement in the total holistic scores of the final drafts to the students' ability to create a sense of closure in the concluding paragraph (cf Table 4).
With reference to cohesion, according to Bamberg (1984) writers of fully coherent texts use cohesive ties skillfully. It was noted that the four participants used very few cohesive ties and they used predominantly reference cohesion. There were very few examples of incorrectly used cohesive ties but these were not improved in the final draft.

Besides cohesion errors, there were two features of coherence in which students’ final drafts did not improve, namely, topic development and topic shifts between paragraphs. These features might have had negative effects on the holistic coherence ratings. In other studies too (e.g. Watkinson 1998; Wikborg 1990) inadequate topic development and topic shift were found to be the most frequent problems in the writing of ESL students. This suggests that ESL writing teachers should pay special attention to these areas.

Other aspects of the comparative analysis related to the writers’ incorporation of their partners’ comments. With regard to the key features of coherence, generally students did not comment on those characteristics that would impact on the coherence of the final draft. The only case where incorporation of peer comment resulted in a more coherent final draft occurred in Student N’s essay. As mentioned earlier (cf 4.3.2.3), peer comment helped this student to change part of her essay which she had presented in tabular form into an essay form. In the post-review interviews, this student mentioned this specific comment as an example of how she had benefitted from peer review. The comment made the writer aware of the need to provide context to help the reader identify the points that will be discussed under that heading. Added to this, it made the writer sensitive of the need to elaborate on the points which she had only listed in the original draft.

This section drew conclusions on the findings relating to research questions 1.1 and 1.2. The section that follows attempts to address questions 1.3 to 1.3.5 (cf 4.3.2).
4.3.3 Types of revision changes and revision by source

This section presents the findings of the comparative analysis of the types of revision changes that students made as they revised their drafts; the frequency of surface versus meaning changes; the frequency of self-initiated as opposed to peer initiated changes; whether the incorporation of peer comment helped to make the final drafts more coherent and finally, whether there was a relationship between incorporation of peer comment and the nature of interaction that pairs engaged in during peer review discussions. All these issues are dealt with concurrently in each student's case.

Research question 1.3 and its subquestion 1.3.1 are investigated in the light of claims made in other studies (for example Faigley & Witte 1981, Bamberg 1984 and Raimes 1985) that the revisions of inexperienced writers do not improve text because these students are more concerned with making surface changes rather than meaning changes. Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy of revision changes formed the basis for a comparative analysis of revision types made by each of the four students (cf 3.4.1.2). For the purpose of this study the macrostructure and microstructure meaning changes were referred to as meaning changes and it was also specified whether the meaning change was an addition, deletion or substitution.

The decision to classify these revision changes as only meaning changes was based on the fact the revisions made by these students did not seem to impact on the reading of other parts of the text. Although new information was added to the final drafts and information from the original drafts deleted, such changes could not be classified as macrostructure changes in terms of Faigley and Witte's (1981) definition.

As mentioned in the introductory paragraph of this section, the two graphs presented on the next page are addressed together. Figure A shows the extent to which each student made surface and meaning changes and Figure B the extent to which the students had incorporated their peers' comments as they revised their drafts.
Figure A: Revision Changes: Meaning versus Surface

Figure B: Revision Changes by Source
The comparative analysis of essay drafts now follows:

**STUDENT O**

Reading through Student O’s essay drafts, I found that 90% of the changes that this student made were surface changes while 10% were meaning changes. Out of a total of 20 changes made, 80% were self-initiated and 20% resulted from comments made during peer review. As figures A and B illustrate, this student concentrated more on surface errors and she incorporated peer comments the least. When she was asked during the post-review interviews why she had ignored most of the proposed changes, she said this:

"When I read my assignment once again I realized it is not necessary to make all the changes. The changes I made is when my partner indicated language errors and the omission of words. I don't make all the changes he said I only change those I feel necessary to change"

The above utterance suggests that this student made use of her own judgment whether or not to include the partner's suggestions.

The type of changes that this student made are exemplified and discussed below:

**Meaning changes**

The only types of meaning changes were deletions and permutations. The meaning changes that were suggested or commented on during the peer review process were ignored. For example the discussion about the writer's introduction (cf 4.3.2.1(a))Another meaning related comment was made on the Peer Review Sheet (PRS) and it read as follows:

*The section on methods need more detail. She should enquire much about the methods of OBE. The role of the learner and the role of the teacher also require more information.*
The above comment was made in response to the following question:

*Which sections/paragraphs/sentences need more detail? What does the writer need to do to provide detail? (cf Appendix B).*

This proposition was also ignored during revision. Perhaps the reason why the writer ignored this comment was because the reader did not state specifically what kind of information is needed under the three subheadings.

All meaning changes exemplified below were self-initiated. In examples 1 and 2 sentences were deleted. *Note that the deleted sentences appear in bold italics and they are in brackets.*

Example 1

**Meaning change: deletion**

Original draft

*Lastly educators can start their learning programmes from where they want to end up. For example, teachers can use different methods of learning in OBE classroom which will bring success, achievements and benefits to the learners (Phillipa Garson’s article 1998,5).[Apart from the abovementioned principles there are also several principles to be focussed on namely - the educators must be the facilitators of learning and the learner must be actively -involved in OBE learning programme]. There must be a wide variety of expected outcomes to ensure acquisition of knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and values*

Final draft

*Lastly educators can start their learning programmes from where they want to end up. For example, teachers can use different methods of learning in OBE classroom which will bring success, achievements and benefits to the learners (Phillipa Garson’s article 1998,5). In OBE procession there must be a wide variety of expected outcomes to ensure acquisition of knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and values.*

Comparing the two drafts, I found that the final draft reads worse than the original.
draft because the writer deleted a sentence that had signalled a topic shift. The sentence which reads: *Apart from the above mentioned principles*... prepares the reader for a topic shift. Wikborg (1990) points out that when the reader does not signal change in direction, as in this final draft, a coherence break of topic shift results. Secondly, in both drafts the writer uses the topic shift marker *lastly* to signal the end of the discussion. However she brings in a new topic without preparing her reader for this. This creates confusion in the reader’s mind.

Example 2

**Meaning change: deletion**

This is an example of a meaning change which led to the improvement of the paragraph.

Original draft

*The use of learning materials encourage an eclectic approach, by taking into account a wide range of resources. For example, the type of method used will be determined by the content to be presented (Successful Outcomes Based Education :2).* [*OBE is method of assessing the learners to help them improve. OBE teachers must guide learning not transmitting knowledge].*

Final draft

*The use of learning materials encourage an eclectic approach, by taking into account a wide range of resources. For example, the type of method used will be determined by the content to be presented (Successful Outcomes Based Education :2).*

The writer deleted the two sentences in italics. This deletion was necessary as the two statements were simply a 'tag on' at the end of the paragraph and the reader cannot work out their function in the paragraph. Watkinson (1998: 91) supports this point by indicating that one of the sources of the breakdown of coherence is this failure to make clear what the function of such statements is in an essay.
The fact that the deletion in Example 2 led to the improvement in the final draft suggests that process writing affords writers opportunities to identify and solve problem areas in their text. On the other hand, the deletion in Example 1 impacted negatively on the reading of the final draft. Perhaps if further intervention had taken place before the final draft, the reader might have discovered that the original draft read better than the final draft.

Example 3

*Meaning change: permutation*

Original draft

*The educational activities the teachers take full responsibility and control of a lesson preparation and presentation*

Final draft

*The teachers must take responsibility of educational activities and control a lesson preparation and presentation.*

The rearrangement of the original sentence helped to make the sentence comprehensible. But at the grammatical level the revised draft is not quite correct in that the writer used the plural *teachers* instead of the singular form *teacher*. Secondly, she has included the article *a* when there should be none. Thirdly, the word *control* does not fit in the sentence.

*Surface changes*

As demonstrated in figure A, the percentage of surface changes made by Student 0 was the highest in the group (90%). Of the changes made, only 3.3% resulted from peer comment. This student's partner corrected the spelling mistake of the word *assessment* and he added the underlined preposition to the sentence given on the next page.
Original draft

For instance learners will succeed with regard their own pace of studying rather than given specific time of study.

Final draft

For instance learners will succeed with regard to their own pace of studying rather than given specific time of study.

Furthermore the reader identified only one sentence, that is, the one below in the entire text as unclear, when in fact a number of sentences were not comprehensible.

This sentence was revised but this revision did not help make the sentence clearer as illustrated below:

Original draft

Then learners will come to understand how and where knowledge may transferable and when and how the test the limits

Final draft

Then learners will come to understand how and where knowledge may be transferable and when and how to the test the limits

The self-initiated types of surface changes were the following: substitutions, additions, permutations and consolidations. All the changes made between the original and the final draft are underlined.

**Substitution**

Original draft

Fifthly, methods of learning programmes must be nationally recognised equally across all types of educators and across provinces. For example, this means that educational methods should be available to all teachers in both national and provincial level
Final draft

Fifthly, methods of learning programmes must be nationally recognised equally across all types of educators and across provinces. However, this means that educational methods must be available to all teachers in both national and provincial level.

The substitution of the conjunction, for example with however improves the final draft.

Addition

The addition of the underlined phrase at the same time in the final draft was unnecessary and changing the word accessible to accessibility does not improve coherence of the final draft.

Original draft

Fourthly, teachers must be supported in developing methods and outcomes accessible to this range of new-learners.

Final draft

Fourthly, at the same time teachers must be supported in developing methods and outcomes accessibility to this range of new-learners.

Consolidation

Original draft

There should be direct involvement to the teacher. The learner should consult the teacher when ever he/she encounter the problem or misunderstand the content.

Final draft

There should be direct involvement to the teacher, in which the learner should consult while encountering difficulties with the content.

In the example above, revision did not improve the final draft. The addition of the
phrase *in which* in combining the two sentences and the deletion of the word *teacher* in the final draft confuses the reader. This confusion would constitute one type of coherence break.

**Perspective**

Although this student's final draft was highly rated, she made relatively few changes (only 10% of the total number of changes made by the group) and these were mainly surface changes (90%). She ignored the one meaning change of addition suggested by her partner. The partner also corrected formal surface features such as spelling and prepositions detectable on the writer's original draft. Revision resulting from these surface features improved those sentences.

The small percentage in the incorporation of peer comment confirms findings in other studies which suggests that the extent to which L2 writers incorporated their peers' suggestions when they revised their drafts was dependent on the type of interaction the writer had in a dyad or group (Nelson & Murphy 1993: 140). Student O as a writer interacted with her partner in a defensive and resisting manner. As a result she was reluctant to incorporate her partner's comments.

**STUDENT C**

Unlike Student O, the percentage of meaning changes that this student made was higher (63%) than that of surface changes (37%). These changes were either self-initiated or resulted from peer review. Out of a total of 35 changes, 63% were self-initiated while 37% resulted from peer review.

**Meaning changes**

This involved just one self-initiated meaning change of addition. A new paragraph consisting of seven sentences was added to a section of the final draft. Neither did
this change affect the reading of other parts of the text nor elaborate on a point previously mentioned in the text.

**Meaning change: addition**

Example 1

Final draft

*The views on Outcomes Based Education*

There are things which still want to be improved. One views that there is a lack of resources. The government should build libraries and laboratories in the cities and the locations because nowadays learners are able to do some researches and experiments, learners, do not work at the same pace dictating by the teacher without taking into account different levels of ability. In order to participate in such things there should be enough materials to use, that is why the libraries and laboratories should be available nearby. Rural schools should also be improved.

The addition of the above paragraph to the final draft was unnecessary as it formed part of an irrelevant section of the essay. It was irrelevant in that the students were expected to discuss the assignment topic under specific subheadings but this student included a separate section entitled "The views on Outcomes Based Education" before she could answer the assignment question. Furthermore, the title she used for this irrelevant section did not relate to the content. The topic sets up expectations as to the content of the essay and if there are digressions from the topic the "essay tends to become incoherent because there is no sense of textual unity and the use of irrelevant content can lead to even greater incoherence (Watkinson 1998: 98).

**Meaning change: deletion**

Another type of meaning change was a macro-meaning deletion wherein four paragraphs of two sentences each were deleted. This type of change resulted from a peer commenting about irrelevant content included under the section "Principle of OBE". The discussion went as follows:
Writer [reading her partner’s comments] You say this is not necessary, why do you say so?
Reader: I’ll tell you things like the governing body...
Writer: Why do you say they are not necessary?
Reader: Where did you find them?
Writer: From a book
Reader: I don’t remember seeing them. Are you saying governing bodies fall under principles? What are principles?
Writer: I don’t know how to explain this
Reader: The books I have read nowhere do they speak about governing bodies and what they do.

The fact that the reader questioned the relevance of the information about governing bodies made the writer aware of the need to review this. This shows that intervening in the individual’s writing process provides opportunities for writers to think about the problem areas identified during the discussion with their partners.

Surface changes
The three types of surface meaning-preserving changes made were consolidation, deletion and substitution.

Consolidation
This type of change occurred only once, as a result of the reader’s suggestion that the writer combine two sentences of her introduction into one sentence (cf 4.3.2.1).

Deletion
This was characterised by the deletion of phrases in sentences. The deleted phrases are underlined.

In the example below the deletion of the underlined phrase was made as a result of comment. The reader pointed out that the writer had used the same phrase in the same paragraph. The word in italics was also corrected by the reader. These comments
helped to make the final paragraph read better.

Original

Learners are active and take responsible for their learning by being actively involved in research, debate and experiments, they are involved in critical thinking, reasoning, reflection, and action (Oxford university press, 1997: p2). The teachers must not spoonfeed the learner they should be involved research, debates and experiment

Final draft

Learners are active and take responsibility for their learning by being actively involved in critical thinking, reasoning, reflection, and action (Oxford OBE Curriculum 1997: 2). The teachers or educators should not spoonfeed the learner, they should be allowed to participate when coming to things like debates and experiments

Substitution

This involved the substitution of the underlined phrase.

Original draft

According to Phillipa Garson (1998: 15) the teacher must let the learners know what is important before they start.

Final draft

Phillipa Garson (1998: 15) points out that the teacher must let the learners know what is important before they start.

This student changed most of her sentences which began with the phrase according to. This change was made as a result of peer comment as demonstrated below:

W: Am I wrong in saying according to ... 
R: yes, they say this is not academic writing
W: What is the right thing to say 
R: They say you can write the name of that person and in brackets have the year.
W: Where did you get this?
R: From Mr Mahlangu [Academic Skills Coordinator]
W: According to? [questions the suggestion]
R: Yes, he says it is the same as using 'I'. The best thing is to write and put the author's name in brackets

It would seem that the writer was only concerned about the comment regarding the phrase in that the sentence is incomplete. It leaves the reader asking: before they start with what? Bamberg's (1984) holistic coherence grid defines an incomprehensible text as one in which discourse is irregular because the writer omits structure words, inflectional endings or makes grammatical errors that interrupt the reading process.

This student indicated in the post-review interviews that she had doubts about the suggestion given. As a result she sought outside help as shown in the extract below:

"Ja, there were instances where my partner did not agree with what the person who has taught me assignment writing skills said, so I take what the skills person said because maybe she did not understand him well, somewhere she said I must stop using 'according to' and I went to check with other people and I found he told them they should not overuse it. Not that it is not required at all so she did not understand this person"

The fact that the reader had identified a problematic area in her partner's text, motivated the writer to seek outside help when she was uncertain about her partner's suggestion. In other studies (for example Jacobs 1987), students reported in their journals that they frequently needed help from their teacher because they did not have confidence in their peers' knowledge and ability to provide valuable feedback. In the case of Student C, she sought help from her classmates which suggests that she believes her peers can be of help.

Perspective
As compared to Student O, this student made predominantly meaning changes (63%)
and she incorporated most of her partner's suggestions as reflected in the peer review percentage (37%). The incorporation of surface and meaning comments when revising helped to enhance the coherence of the final draft. For example, one type of meaning change, namely, meaning change of deletion which the writer made as a result of peer input resulted in the improvement of the final draft in that peer comment helped her delete information which was not relevant to the topic. The inclusion of information not relevant to the topic violates a condition of coherence. In conclusion, we have here some examples of a positive link between revisions which resulted from peer review and impressions of coherence.

**STUDENT T**

This student made the highest number of changes (105) and the percentages for surface and meaning changes were similar to those of Student C and Student N. The percentage of changes resulting from peer review was the highest in the group, which suggests that he was the most receptive to peer comment. The meaning and surface changes made by this student are discussed in turn.

**Meaning changes**

This student made meaning changes of addition and deletion. New information was added and old information deleted. As was the case with Student C's meaning changes, these changes would be known as meaning change of addition or deletion.

**Meaning change: deletion**

This student deleted three pages of text, that is, ten paragraphs as a result of peer comment. Seemingly all students in the Sociology 200 class were given guidelines on how they should tackle this assignment. However this student misunderstood the purpose of guidelines in that he included the headings below and discussed each before attempting to answer the assignment topic.
He failed to understand that he had to use those guidelines in discussing the topic as a whole. During the peer review discussion his partner pointed out this mistake:

Reader: Your introduction is out of question
Writer: What do you mean by out of question?
Reader: It is not relevant. Unnecessary things and it is too long
Writer: I did this looking at the guidelines Mr Mahlangu gave

The above discussion led to the deletions mentioned earlier and in turn to the improvement in the reading of the essay, which might have contributed to the improvement in the holistic score.

**Meaning change: addition**

This type of meaning change could be attributed to the remark a peer made on the Peer Review Sheet (PRS) and comments made during the peer review discussion.

**Peer Review Sheet**

*Which section/paragraphs/sentences need more detail? What does the writer need to do to provide detail?* (cf Appendix B)

**Peer comment**

Page 4 Principles
Peer review discussion

Writer: then here?
Reader: To show that you understand the principles the way they are in the book you must apply that information like for example in the OBE classroom imagine the OBE teacher and learner in the learning activity how should the situation be like? To show that you understand you must give examples

Although the reader did not answer the second part of the question, the writer added ten new sentences under the heading Principles of OBE. This addition was necessary because in the original draft he only discussed in five paragraphs one idea, namely assessment. In the final draft, he introduced new ideas and provided examples.

Surface changes
The types of surface changes made were substitution and deletion and consolidation and distribution.

*Substitution, deletion and addition*
In most paragraphs, sentences in the original draft were rearranged by substitution and deletion of words or phrases and in most cases such changes were made as a result of peer comment. For example in all cases where the reader commented about an unclear paragraph, the writer would revise all sentences in that paragraph as isolated sentences. This kind of revision could affect the coherence of a text in that "a paragraph is coherent when the reader can move easily from one sentence to the next and read the paragraph as an integrated whole, rather than a series of separate sentences" (McCrimmon in Bamberg 1983: 417). Some of the sentences read better after revision while others did not. The examples are given below:

Original draft

*Learners will process access and use of information from variety of sources and situations.*[1] The learner will process use of skills to investigate related
phenomena to the natural sciences. [2] To evaluate information the learner has to collect, analyse and organise in a critical manner. [3]

Final draft

Learners will access and use of information from variety of sources and situations. [1] Learners should employ the process of skills in investigating related phenomenon to natural sciences. [2] In evaluating information the learner has to collect, analyse and organise in a critical manner. [3]

The writer was expected to rework the entire paragraph as an integrated whole, but he deleted the underlined word in sentence 1 of the original draft and added a phrase in sentence 2 of the final draft. These revisions helped to make the final draft more comprehensible. The above extract was discussed during peer review and an excerpt of this interaction is illustrated below:

Reader: the role of the learner again. [she reads the paragraph] Learners will process access and use information from a variety of sources and situations....... A ke tlhaloganye gore o traya goreng [ I don’t understand what your are trying to say]

Writer: [silent]

Reader: I think problem ya gao ke ya sentence construction like mo [I think your problem lies with sentence construction like here]

Writer: Mo ne ke traya go summarisa [Here I was trying to summarise]

Reader: Yes, when you summarise it must be brief in point form mara e tshanetse go nna le meaning/ Yes, when you summarise it must be brief in point form but it must have meaning

Writer: Maybe a ka sebedisa diparagraph [Maybe I did not use paragraphs]

Reader: Ja, that is what makes your essay meaningless and vague. When you summarise your facts must flow gore ke kgone go understanda gore o batla goreng especially in a paragraph the primary line is important and it is supported by ideas that follow. [When you summarise your facts must flow so that I can understand what you’re trying to say, especially in a paragraph the primary line is important and it is supported by ideas that follow].

133
The discussion is presented in the language that the pair used during interaction. This is meant to give the reader an idea of the language used in interactions. Below is another example of how Student O as reader interacted with the writer, Student T:

Writer: Why do you say you don’t understand these sentences?
Reader: Do you know why I don’t understand this? Let me read this to you [reads the paragraph] Some scholars see achievement and independence as traits that are central. Subculture with academic goals these achieving higher grades and hardworking. Delinquent subculture is students who rejects many of their school achievement and social values. [she laughs] You see I don’t understand this

Writer: I was trying to ...
Reader [reader interrupts] Oh cut and paste [she laughs] This is cut and paste
Writer: Ja

This type of interaction is similar to what Zhu (1995) calls the reader-reporting pattern or Lockhart and Ng’s (1995) authoritative stance. The writer seems intimidated by this authoritative stance in that he does not ask any clarification even though he may not understand his partner’s comment about cut and paste. Despite the type of interaction the writer was engaged in, he changed almost all the areas that were identified as problematic. For example, he revised the problematic paragraph this way:

Original draft

Some scholars see achievement and independence as traits that are central[S1]. Subculture with academic goals these achieving higher grades and hardworking[S2]. Delinquent subculture is students who rejects many of their school achievement and social values [S3].

Final draft

To some students what is central to them is to see themselves achieving and being independent.[S1] There is also a subculture with an academic goal which is trying to achieve higher grade and who are hardworking. [S2]
Comparing the original draft and the final draft, I found that the meaning of the first sentence (S1) of the revised draft is clearer. In S2 meaning remains unclear.

**Consolidation and distribution**

Original draft

_Educators proposed a strategies for change [1]. A culture of learning and teaching should be developed in teachers, parents, and learners, changing their attitude and to move to an optimazation of opportunities and school time [2]._

Final draft

_Educators proposal on strategies for change must include a culture of learning and teaching that should be developed in teachers, parents and learners [1]. They should change their attitude and move to an optimazation of opportunities and school time [2]._

In the final draft the writer brought sentence 1 and part of sentence 2 of the original draft together. This consolidation helped in making sentence 1 of the final draft read better than the original. However, in the final draft, the use of the pronominal reference _they_ in sentence 2 confuses the reader in that it is not clear whether this reference refers to educators or teachers, parents and learners. This would constitute a coherence break, 'uncertain pronominal reference'.

**Perspective**

Although the interaction between this student and his partner Student 0 was not characterised by real negotiation of meaning in that his partner was only interested in pin-pointing mistakes in the writer's text, he considered nearly all of his partner's comments when revising. His partner commented on surface as well as meaning features of the text and these comments were taken into account during revision. For example, the reader commented about irrelevant information in one section of the writer's text and this comment resulted in the deletion of ten paragraphs from the original draft. The fact that the writer deleted unnecessary information from the original
draft impacted positively on the coherence of the final draft. Furthermore, he added new information to a section of the text as a direct result of peer input. This addition helped in making the final draft more coherent in that he introduced new ideas and supported them with examples whereas in the original draft he discussed only one aspect of a heading in five paragraphs. These two revisions could be linked to Student T's improvement on the holistic rating score of the final draft.

Peer comments about the surface features of the text made the writer reflect on those comments and some of the changes that resulted from these comments improved the writer's sentences.

With reference to the type of interaction the writer had with his partner and how this affected the final drafts, it was found that Student T as writer incorporated all of his partner's comments despite his partner's authoritative stance and her inability or unwillingness to make any suggestions for improving the writer's draft. Student T could be described according to Berkenkotter (1984: 313) as the "authority crisis" revisor. Such writers lose their authority as writers and become the most receptive to peer comment. They feel compelled to accommodate their reader's expectations. It would seem that Student T felt intimidated by his partner's personality and attitude and therefore felt compelled to include his partner's comments even though he may not understand the comment or the comment may not be specific enough. Nevertheless, Student T improved most of the sentences and paragraphs that were identified as unclear.

STUDENT N

This student made both surface and meaning changes independently and as a result of peer input. Out of a total of 36 changes, 61% were self-initiated and 39% resulted from peer review.
Meaning change: addition

New information was brought into the text as a result of peer suggestion. This is illustrated below:

Reader: Page 4 and 5, in an essay we do not write in point form
Writer: I was showing the old system and the new method
Reader: No don’t tabulate
Writer: Okay

As indicated in the conversation above, the writer had presented part of her essay in tabular form. As a result of the above comment, she added new information by providing some background information on the subheading and attempted to develop some of the points she had presented in tabular form (cf 4.3.2.3). This addition improved the reading of that part of her text. In the post-review interviews this student pointed out that she attributed the improvement to the input made by her partner during peer review. She put it this way:

Interviewer: Was your partner’s feedback valuable?

Student N: A lot ...... in OBE I tabulated the principles of OBE so my partner made me change that. She said it was not necessary to tabulate ‘cause the assignment did not ask us to tabulate. This helped me ‘cause I had to go and change this like in class they explained the mistakes most of the students had made and tabulating was one of the mistakes and I felt like if I didn’t get feedback I ’d have made that mistake too.

Surface changes

The following types of surface changes were made: substitution, addition and consolidation.

Substitution

Example 1

Original draft

Learners must organise and manage themselves because a small group of people is able to work effectively with each others.
Final draft

Learners must organise and manage themselves because a small group of people is able to work effectively together.

The substitution of the underlined phrase in the original draft improved the reading of the sentence.

Example 2

Original draft

The teacher must be proud of their profession

Final draft

Teachers must be proud of their profession.

The substitution of the underlined phrase with a plural form teachers helped to improve the sentence because there is an agreement between the plural lexical item teachers and the pronominal reference their.

Addition

Original draft

In previous education a single style of teaching which does not take into account the different styles of learning from different learners.

Final draft

In previous education, a single style of teaching was used which does not take into account the different style of learning from different learners.

The sentence above was identified as unclear during peer discussion. The reader tried to get the writer to identify the problem on her own by making her read this sentence.
aloud at least twice. She probed in order to get the writer to explain what she was trying to put across to the reader. The reader realised that what the writer was saying orally is different from what she had in writing. When the writer revised her draft she added the underlined phrase to make the intended meaning clearer to the reader.

The interaction between this student and her partner Student C went as follows

**Writer:** Page 3 paragraph 2 o re ga o utlwisis? [...... you say you don't understand?]

Mo ke o botsa gore system ya kgale e neng ba e berekisa ne ba berekisa style se se one sa go teacha ba sa lebelle gore wa benefita o re bjang [Here I'm telling you that the old system they used, they used a single style of teaching, without looking at whether you benefit or not]

**Reader:** E bale [read it]

**Writer:** In previous education, a single style of teaching was used which does not take into account the different style of learning from different learners

Ja, ne ba berekisa style se se one se se sa lebelleleng gore bana ba utlwisisa ka go se tshwane [Yes, they used a single style which did not consider that children don't understand in the same way]

**Reader:** Hao tlhalose ka botlalo [You don't explain this fully]

**Writer:** Ke tlhalosa dimethods [I'm explaining the methods]

**Reader:** E bale gape [read it again]

**Writer:** [reads] "In previous education a single style of teaching which does not take into account the different styles of learning from different learners". [writer explains] They used one style of teaching without taking into account that children are different and they don't understand in the same way

**Reader:** Le byanong a ke utlwisis [I still don't understand]

**Writer:** Ke trya go tlhalosa, ke re di methods in the past ne ba berekisa style se se one sa go teacha se ne se sa lebelle gore bana ga ba utlwisisa ka go tshwana and OBE e berekisa different methods gore bana ba utlwisis. [I'm trying to explain, I say methods in the past they used one teaching style which did not take into account that children don't understand in the same way and OBE uses different methods to help the children understand]

**Reader:** Okay ke ao utlwisisa ge o bolela mara the way oe kwetseng ga ke e tlhaloganye [Okay, I understand you as you say it but the way
you wrote it, it is not clear]

In the above type of interaction there is real negotiation of meaning in that the reader asks for clarification and tries to elicit further clarification when meaning is still not clear.

The above interaction has also demonstrated that when reader and writer interact in what Zhu (1995) calls a reader-writer sharing pattern, in which both parties negotiate meaning through requesting and offering clarification, the reader discovers the writer’s intended meaning and this helps the writer to improve the reading of his or her text. With regard to Student N and her partner Student C, interacting in this manner helped the writer reflect on the areas that were identified as unclear and she was able to revise those areas in such a way that they were comprehensible in the final draft.

**Perspective**

Like Students C and T, this student incorporated most of her partner’s suggestions and she made almost the same number of surface and meaning changes as these two. Her partner, Student C, commented on both surface and meaning features of the text. In revising her text, Student N made a meaning change of addition as a result of peer input and this change had a positive effect on the coherence of her final draft (cf 4.3.2.1). The surface changes commented on during peer review helped to make the sentences of the final draft more comprehensible.

4.3.4 Students’ attitudes towards peer review

Chapter 2 outlined the benefits of peer review from the perspective of the exponents of this teaching approach (cf 2.2). This section addresses research question 1.4 which looks at the students’ attitudes towards peer review. Post-review interviews were held with each student to find out how each had experienced peer review process. The
views that these students expressed suggest that they had all found peer review beneficial. Each student’s opinion is articulated below:

**Student O**
This student claims that having someone read her draft made her aware of the mistakes which she could not identify on her own. This belief concurs with students’ views expressed in other studies (e.g Mendonca & Johnson 1994).

"Yes, it is useful because you can see your mistakes and when you write an essay you just write and when another person reads your essay she discovers mistakes which you have not picked up".
"Say for instance I give my first draft to a friend to read and tell me my mistakes before I submit it like language errors and maybe I was off the topic and when I submit it to my lecturer I would prefer that she gives me feedback too showing me my mistakes so that next time when I write my assignment I can improve my standard of writing"

**Student C**
This student verbalised her sentiments in this manner:

A lot because there are lot of things which I was not aware of. There are things that are not allowed in academic writing for example writing e.g. and i.e I was not aware of this until my partner gave me some light. She also made me aware of the fact that I have to read my work after writing because I used to write an assignment then submit it and she found mistakes in my assignment but when I was writing I felt like I ‘m writing the correct thing and when she read my assignment she felt like I have written something which I do not mean. If I had read my assignment first I would have picked up my mistakes

This student’s view supports one of the claims made by the proponents of peer review and that is, peer review gives students opportunities to clarify and explain the ideas that they wish to express. Added to this, it makes students aware of the problems that lecturers as readers experience as they to try to figure out what the student’s intended meaning is.
Student T
The idea expressed by this student highlights the importance of intervening in the student’s writing process as opposed to giving unclear remarks on the final product, as it is normally the case with most lecturers.

His account is given below:

“It has highlighted some of the things we never paid attention to and it helped us improve our assignment writing like the presentation of the assignment for instance bringing the introduction and body on one page [this student wrote the introduction on one page and the conclusion on the other page]. You see no one has ever told me to bring the two on one page. Lecturers would simply write ‘why’... they never said what I must do. In most cases assignment comments come in a form of question marks... if the lecturer does not understand what you are saying he puts a question mark”

Student N
The value of peer review expressed by this student was reflected in her final draft (cf 4.3.2.3) She conveyed this benefit in this manner:

A lot. cause like in the introduction, you have to prepare the reader say what you want to write about. But in my first assignment I explained structuralism in detail in about half a page in the introduction I did not explain what I will be discussing in the essay I just started explain structural functionalism, so I had to change and say in my introduction what the essay will entail. Again in OBE I had tabulated the principles of OBE so my partner made me change that. She said it is not necessary to tabulate, because the assignment did not ask us to tabulate. This has helped me because I had to go and change this like in class they explained the mistakes that most of the students have done and tabulating was one of the mistakes and I felt like if I did not receive feedback I would have made that mistake too.

4.3.5 CONCLUSIONS

To summarise the findings on Hypothesis 1 and research question 1.1, one needs to point out that although the statistical results show no significant differences in the drafts, a comparative analysis of each student’s text revealed that some of the
changes the students made impacted positively on the coherence of the final drafts. The improvements in the final drafts could be attributed to revisions that impacted on certain features of coherence. For instance, students’ drafts improved in areas such as, identifying the topic in the introductions (e.g Students C and Student T), organisation of text and creating a sense of closure in the conclusion.

Inadequate topic development, topic shifts between paragraphs and cohesion errors were areas of coherence that impacted negatively on some of the students’ texts. These problems might have had an effect on the statistical results.

As regards the types of revisions made, students made both meaning and surface changes. Of the four students, the percentages of meaning changes of three were higher than those of surface changes. One student made predominantly surface changes (90%) (cf figure A). Although a case study approach was used to explain the results of this hypothesis, the finding that three out of four students made predominantly meaning changes does not support other researchers (e.g Faigley & Witte 1981, Bamberg 1984) who contend that revisions of inexperienced writers do not improve because they are more concerned with making surface changes than meaning changes. At the same time I cannot conclude that inexperienced writers generally make more meaning changes than surface changes because these findings were based on a small sample and with case study approaches the aim is not to generalise the findings but to better understand those findings from a finer-grained perspective.

In addition to the above, it is important to mention that some of the meaning changes, like deletion of irrelevant detail and addition of information in order to develop existing ideas, as in Student N’s final draft (4.3.2.1) should have had a positive effect on the holistic coherence rating of her final draft. With regard to surface changes, some of the changes, like the addition or deletion of words or phrases helped to make the
sentences read better in the final text.

Regarding the correction of grammatical errors, the comparative analysis of drafts revealed that students seemed not to be concerned with rectifying these kinds of errors even in their final drafts. They appeared unable to identify and correct language errors on their own. This problem may be ascribed to their low levels of proficiency in the English language. Perhaps these students may not be concerned with language errors because they are aware that they are using the language imperfectly and because teachers usually correct language errors when marking assignments, they may be expecting their lecturer to correct the language they produce.

As regards the extent to which the students incorporated their peers' comments and suggestions, figure B has shown that a significant number of changes were self-initiated, except for Student T, while a relatively small percentage were a direct result of peer review. This figure has also shown that Student O incorporated her partner's comments to a limited extent (20%) as compared to the self-initiated changes (80%). On the other hand, Student T incorporated most of his partner's comments (52.5%) as opposed to 48% of self-initiated changes. That students incorporated peer input to a lesser extent concurs with the findings of Connor and Asenavage's (1994) study and the finding that some students (e.g. Student T) were more receptive to peer feedback than others is supported by Nelson and Murphy's (1993) results.

The fact that Student O's percentage for peer review changes was small as compared to the self-initiated changes, supports Nelson and Murphy's (1993: 140) contention that when writers interact in a defensive manner they are most unlikely to incorporate their partners' comments. Student T on the other hand was most receptive to peer comment despite the type of interaction he had with his authoritative partner. Berkenkotter's (1984: 313) contention that the writer's response to his or her partner's comments was to a great extent affected by the "writer's personality, level
of maturity and the ability to handle writing problems" could be true in Student T's case.

One other important finding was that generally the four students incorporated their peers’ suggestions, even in situations where the readers did not give specific comments or suggestions for improvement. Writers made efforts to think about the problem areas identified by their partners and they attempted to improve them on their own. This finding supports claims made by the proponents of peer review groups, that peer review provides students with an immediate audience which is able to help identify the problem areas in the writer’s text.

With reference to the language used during peer discussion, examples of quotes given in 4.3.3 show that students used English mainly to refer to or read specific parts of the texts. When students were requesting clarification, or clarifying, or justifying their points they used code-mixing. Code-mixing refers to mixing languages within the same sentence (Chapole et. al 1999: 45). Generally students used English words or phrases within Sotho sentences. Because of the students’ low levels of proficiency in English, they struggle to converse in English and, I believe, had they been compelled to use the target language, they would not have said much. Findings in other studies confirm this. For instance Jacobs (1987) sought to describe students’ reaction to working in groups and he discovered that during interaction, students used their L1 even though they were encouraged to use English. The students felt that if they were to use English throughout the peer review session they would not have said much because they would have been concerned with not making grammatical mistakes (Jacobs 1987: 329). A similar observation was made by Villamil and De Guerrero (1996: 60) where students used their L1, Spanish“ for conducting interactions and solving revision problems”.

These findings suggest that claims that peer review affords students opportunities to
speak the target language do not hold, because L2 students perceive their L1 as a “practical and effective tool to achieve task goals, that is revising an English text” (De Guerrero & Villamil 1994: 492).

Finally, one can conclude that holistic rating gives a general impression of the coherence of a text, whereas the descriptive analysis of students' texts gave a clearer picture of the areas of texts that actually improved. There were also negative results as a result of using a single form of intervention, that is, peer feedback to improve writing quality and these were evident in texts that read worse after revision. Some of the students, for example Student T and Student O, revised sentences which were not problematic and these changes made those sentences less comprehensible. One possible reason why students failed to improve unclear areas in their texts was perhaps because they did not fully grasp the assignment content and were confronted with unfamiliar concepts used in Outcomes Based Education. This point is supported by a South African researcher, Leibowitz (1994: 126) who claims that writing in the discipline is influenced by other aspects of the curriculum such as failure to grasp new concepts during lectures or failure to understand course content (Leibowitz 1994: 126).

4.4 RESULTS FOR HYPOTHESIS 2

This hypothesis is repeated here for convenience:

There will be a significant difference in the holistic ratings between the final drafts of the experimental group and the control group

The Mann-Whitney U test was performed on the holistic scores to compare the distribution of scores between the experimental and the control group. The results showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the scores. Therefore this hypothesis is not supported. The Mann-Whitney results are presented below:
### TABLE 7: TOTAL SCORES OF THE FINAL DRAFTS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student O</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student T</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student N</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std deviation</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTROL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 illustrates the total holistic scores for each student and the group means and standard deviations of the two groups.

**Assignment**  
Mann-Whitney Statistic  
\( U = 6.5 \)  
p-value \( 0.6631 \)
4.4.1 Interpretation of the results

As in the case of Hypothesis 1, the statistical results here do not provide support for the hypothesis. It is important to mention that since the study employed a relatively small sample the results are inconclusive.

4.5 CONCLUSION

To conclude this discussion on the findings it can be stated that triangulation through multiple measures, data sources and methods made it possible to clarify and illuminate the findings on the research hypotheses and questions set out in Chapter 1.

The findings can be summarised as follows:

**Did the final drafts of the experimental group improve following intervention?**

The Mann-Whitney results for Hypothesis 1 revealed no significant differences in the original and final drafts of the experimental group.

The comparative analysis of students' drafts revealed the following:

- Some of the students' final drafts improved on these aspects of coherence: identifying the topic in the introduction, organisation of text, topic development and creating a sense of closure in the conclusion. Generally, the students' final drafts did not improve on topic shifts between paragraphs and cohesion.

- As regards the types of changes that students made, Figure A illustrates that out of the four students, three paid more attention to meaning changes as
opposed to surface changes and in some cases the two types of changes resulted in more coherent final drafts whereas in other instances they impacted negatively on the final drafts.

All four students incorporated their peers' comments when revising and this appeared generally to have had a positive effect on the final drafts. Secondly, the comparative analysis revealed that the manner in which readers and writers interact with each other when discussing essay drafts affects the extent to which writer's incorporate their peers' suggestions. For example, Student 0 interacted with her partner in a defensive manner and as a result she incorporated her partner's comments the least (cf Figure B).

With regard to students' attitudes towards peer review, the students expressed definite support for this approach.

Had this study employed quantitative methods only in assessing peer intervention on writing quality, one would have had to conclude that this procedure is totally ineffective but detailed comparative analysis, as shown in the findings reported in this chapter suggests that it was to some extent effective.

One can therefore conclude that triangulation through multiple measures and data sources helps the researcher understand that process writing can impact positively not only on the quality of writing but also in terms of advancing student knowledge about writing, improving their ability to give feedback and creating a sense of audience.
Were the essays of the experimental group more highly rated than those of the control group?

The Mann-Whitney results showed no significant difference in the scores of the experimental group and the control group. Due to the small sample size the results are not conclusive.

The main focus in Chapter 5 will be on the implications of these findings and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The objective of this chapter is to give a brief overview of the entire study and to summarise the findings with regard to the aims set out in Chapter 1 (cf 1.2). The implications of these findings with regard to the use of peer review in the teaching of writing in academic disciplines are discussed. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research.

5.2 REVIEW

As indicated in Chapter 1, the aim of the current study was to establish the effects of peer feedback on English Second Language (ESL) student academic writing. In the light of problems that students experience with academic writing tasks (cf 1.1) institutions of higher learning in South Africa attempted to address this problem by implementing writing development programmes (cf 2.1). This study explored one of the writing development initiatives namely, the use of peer review in student academic writing. In particular, using quantitative methods, the study examined whether the final drafts produced by the students exposed to peer feedback were more highly rated than the original drafts. Secondly, the original and final drafts of the same group were qualitatively compared to find out whether changes made between drafts resulted in more coherent final drafts. Finally, the study examined quantitatively whether the final drafts produced by the experimental group were more highly rated than those produced by the control group.

Chapter 2 began with a brief overview of the writing development programmes implemented at tertiary institutions in South Africa. Furthermore, it discussed the notion of peer review as conceptualised within a process approach as well as a
socioconstructionist approach that sees writing as a social activity and a means to foster learning. Finally, a survey of some of the qualitative and quantitative research on the aspects relevant to the present study were given.

Chapter 3 dealt mainly with research methods and procedures. The two research designs used, namely, the quasi-experimental and qualitative case study approaches, were explained. The research procedures as they related to the research questions and qualitative and quantitative analysis were outlined.

In Chapter 4 the results of the research questions set out in Chapter 1 were discussed and interpreted quantitatively and qualitatively, where applicable.

5.3 FINDINGS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

This section focuses on the main findings and contributions of the present study.

5.3.1 Triangulation in the study of peer review

As McGroarty and Zhu (1997: 2) contend, peer review is multidimensional and therefore a deeper understanding of this notion requires a multidimensional approach which combines research methods, data sources and measures. Of importance to such a multidimensional approach is the concept of triangulation which entails the use of different kinds of data, methods, and measures to investigate a single problem (McGroarty & Zhu 1997: 2).

Studies on peer review discussed in this dissertation have examined this notion through a single method or single data source. For example, Chaudron (1984) used quantitative methods to investigate the effect of peer revision on the quality of writing using scores on student compositions as the only source of data. Qualitative research has explored student discussions and interaction during peer feedback (e.g Lockhart & Ng 1995; Villamil & De Guerrero 1996) by using tape recordings of
student discussions as the only source of data. According to McGroarty and Zhu (1997:4), utilising a single method or data source prevents internal validation of the findings.

The present study took cognisance of the threats to internal validity by employing methodological triangulation, data triangulation and triangulation of assessment. In terms of examining the main problem in this study, namely, the impact of peer feedback on the quality of the final draft, I employed a combination of quantitative (in the form of a quasi-experimental design) and qualitative (in the form of a descriptive case study) methodologies using data from a variety of sources. These sources are essays produced by the experimental and control groups for the pre-test, extracts from students' original and final drafts, transcripts from students' discussions, written comments on the Peer Review Sheet and on the actual drafts and transcripts of the post-review interviews and final drafts produced by the control and experimental groups. Students' essays were assessed holistically using the holistic coherence rating scale and descriptively using specific features of coherence discussed in the previous chapter. Furthermore, the analysis of quantitative data was performed using non-parametric tests while qualitative data was subjected to a comparative analysis. The advantage of using non-parametric tests in the context of the present study is that these tests are most powerful when one is dealing with a very small sample size (cf 3.5.1).

In terms of Research Question 1 and the specific research questions which to some extent relate to this question, it appears that the results derived from the different methods, data sets and measures to some degree corroborated each other. For example, the statistical results on students' original (OD) and final drafts (FD) revealed no significant difference between the drafts. Similarly, the descriptive findings showed that in some of the cases there was no difference between the original and final drafts because the self-initiated revisions or the incorporation of peer comments did not result in improvement. Nonetheless, a comparative analysis of ODs and FDs as well as the total holistic scores of some of the students
indicated improvement (cf Table 4 in 4.3).

The fact that the present research employed mainly a case study lends itself to data triangulation. Case studies by their very nature require the incorporation of a variety of sources. This allowed for more confident interpretation of the research findings as well as a deeper understanding of the effects of peer revision.

Methodological and data triangulation enabled me to verify some of the research findings. For example, the qualitative findings relating to research question 1.3.5 (cf 1.2) revealed that the type of interaction that writers and readers engage in determines the extent to which they will incorporate peer comments, a finding which is also supported by other studies (Berkenkotter 1984; Lockhart & Ng 1995; Mendonca & Johnson 1994). This finding was checked against the findings relating to the frequencies of self-initiated and peer review changes. For example, as a writer, Student O interacted with her partner in a defensive and aggressive manner and it appears this might have affected the extent to which she incorporated her partner's comments. Similarly, Student T as a writer was most receptive to peer comments and this was indicated in the frequencies of peer review versus self-initiated revisions (cf Figure B in 4.3.3). This means that the findings from different data sources corroborated each other.

In some instances, the findings of research question 1.3.4 and 1.4 supported each other. For instance, the comparative analysis of Student N's ODs and FDs revealed that the writer's incorporation of peer feedback helped to make the final draft more coherent, which suggests that the student had in fact benefitted from peer review. When this student was asked during the post-review interviews about the value of peer review, she expressed a positive attitude towards this approach and she could mention specific instances to demonstrate the benefits of peer review.

With reference to research question 1.3, studies on the types of revision changes made in composition writing (e.g. Faigley & Witte 1981; Zamel 1983) have
revealed that unskilled ESL student writers focus more on surface changes than meaning changes when revising. However, the findings in my study revealed the opposite in that three out of four students paid more attention to meaning changes than surface changes (cf Figure A). The students focused on meaning changes even though they were writing in the context of student academic writing. As pointed out in Chapter 2 (cf 2.4), the less-skilled writers lack skills needed to explore and generate ideas in a text. However, some of the students in my study were able to make changes that affect meaning in that they were able to generate ideas from the reading material.

With regard to the results of Hypothesis 2, the statistical results do not support the hypothesis.

The above discussion has shown that triangulation of various kinds allowed for accurate interpretation of the results in that the findings could be verified against other results dealing with the same problem. Although triangulation helped to enhance the internal validity of the study, external validity could not be attained. External validity refers to the extent to which the results can be generalised to populations, situations and conditions (Wiersma 1995: 5). As indicated throughout the dissertation, this study was essentially a case study and usually with case studies the aim is not to generalise the findings but to gain deeper understanding of the problem being investigated from the perspective of the people selected for participation in the study. Cohen and Manion (1980: 200) make allowances for lack of external validity by pointing out that without internal validity external validity will not be possible. However, an internally valid study may or may not have external validity.

5.4 FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

As indicated in Chapter 1 (cf 1.1), the primary aim of this study was to describe the revisions of a group of four students in the peer review context and to establish
whether those revisions impacted on coherence of the final drafts. The discussion that follows proposes teaching strategies that would help improve coherence in student writing and suggests strategies that would enable students to provide effective feedback on one another's writing.

5.4.1 Revision and its impact on coherence

In a process approach that sees writing as a non-linear and recursive process in which ideas are explored, clarified and reformulated, revision has been identified as an important factor in achieving quality in the final product (cf 2.4.1). Murray and Johanson (1990: 67) distinguish between two kinds of revision. The first is revision that writers do as they write, which involves stopping frequently to read what they have written. The second is the kind of revision writers do between drafts, which is the kind of revision relevant to my study in that the present study primarily investigated the impact of student revision on the coherence of the final draft.

The quantitative results regarding the impact of student revision on the subsequent drafts revealed no significant difference between the original and final drafts in terms of their holistic coherence rating. On the other hand, the qualitative descriptive findings on student revision revealed that students' final drafts improved on some of the features of coherence discussed in Chapter 3 (cf Table 2 in 3.4.1.1). For example, the final drafts improved in the areas of topic identification in the introductions, organisation of content and creating a sense of closure in the conclusion, and there was no improvement in topic shifts, topic development and the use of cohesive devices.

With regard to the introductions and conclusions of the essays, some students appeared to be able to provide explicit statements to signal the theme in the introduction. Others were able to create a sense of closure in the concluding paragraphs. However, as far as the introductions were concerned, only two out of four students provided orientations to help the reader understand the theme (cf
With reference to content organisation, in both the original and final drafts, the four students were able to use the subheadings provided in the assignment topic to structure their essays. However, under each subheadings it was not easy for these writers to decide when to shift from one topic to another. They appeared not know for example, which ideas required their own paragraphs.

As regards topic development, students were inconsistent in their topic development. They tended to develop ideas in one section of the text and resorted to listing ideas in another.

With regard to cohesion, which is an important aspect of coherence, generally in both drafts students used very few cohesive ties and when these ties were used they were limited to pronominal references and conjunctives such as: *and,* *because,* and *on the other hand.* Furthermore, cohesion related coherence breaks such as uncertain pronominal reference, incorrect use of conjunction and incorrect use of definite reference items occurred in the final drafts.

The findings discussed above suggest that an important focus for writing instruction should be on specific features of coherence that students experience problems with. In the case of the present study, providing orientations in the introduction, topic development and the use of paragraphs to signal topic shifts are some of the features that might be taught to help students produce more coherent texts. The implications of the abovementioned findings in terms of teaching writing are discussed.

Scarcella (1984: 685) provides guidelines that could help students write effective orientations in the introductions:

- Convey the organisation of the essay through subtle means so that the
readers are conscious of the content of the essay rather than its organisation.

- Engage the reader's attention by using attention-securing devices as direct assertions.

With reference to topic development, Wikborg (1985) indicated (cf 2.3.1.2) that a fully coherent text must have a superordinate or general statement which should be supported by a hierarchy of statements that can be summarised into a coherent whole.

To illustrate the teaching of topic development, Cooper's (1988) model of paragraph development could be employed. This model involves asking students to take the first statement of a paragraph from their original drafts and create a chain of overlapping statements. The students continue with the topic development activity by choosing another sentence from the original draft and use it as a possible second topic sentence for another chain of supporting statements.

Alternatively, writing teachers could make use of the writing respondent technique discussed in Chapter 2 (cf 2.1) to help students elaborate on the statements they tend to make. For example, in cases where students do not explicate the concepts they use questions like: What do you mean by a liberal or an African?. The student then uses these questions as an aid to support their propositions. Teachers could use the same technique as part of the training process to guide students' attention to the global concerns of the text before engaging them in peer reviews.

With regard to the teaching of paragraphing to signal topic shift, Smith (1984: 21) suggests that if teachers have to teach paragraphing and paragraph development, they must teach students to see writing "as a form of dialogue and the paragraph as a unit of implied dialogue".
She maintains that just as spoken discourse is sustained through patterns of question-asking, the same applies to written discourse. For example, in paragraphs that begin with topic sentences, the topic sentence implies a question that needs to be answered by the rest of the paragraph and before the writer moves to another topic he or she must be certain that the statement or question posed at the beginning of the paragraph is fully answered. As in oral discourse, a paragraph break signals the end of a dialogue unit.

Finally, since both cohesion and coherence play an important role in the creation of impressions of coherence, Bamberg (1983: 427) suggests that writing teachers create classroom situations that enable students to understand what makes a text coherent and to teach them ways of revising their writing to meet those conditions.

5.4.1.1 What types of revisions do ESL writers make?

Qualitative studies on the difference between skilled or experienced and less skilled or inexperienced writers (e.g Faigley & Witte 1981; Sommers 1980; Zamel 1983) provide some insight into the way these writers deal with revision. What seems to distinguish skilled from less skilled writers is their understanding of what constitutes revision. For example, Sommers' (1980) investigation of revising strategies of student writers revealed that in the case of experienced writers revising formed an integral part of composing because it led to the discovery, clarification and integration of ideas whereas in the case of the less experienced writers, revising was characterised by changes on the level of the sentence. Zamel (1983:166) points out that when inexperienced writers do not perceive writing as a process of discovering, clarifying and integrating ideas, they are less likely to make meaning changes. Additionally, Faigley and Witte (1981: 411) assert that revisions of inexperienced writers do not improve text because they manifest themselves in surface changes.

Although my study involved inexperienced writers, the results differ from those of
the studies above in that three out of the four participants, focused on meaning changes as opposed to surface changes. However, their meaning revision changes did not impact on the reading or understanding of other parts of the text. The meaning changes involved mainly adding sentences to clarify or help develop existing ideas. As demonstrated in Chapter 4 (cf 4.3.2.3) students seemed unable to develop their ideas adequately.

Surface changes helped to make some of the final drafts read better while others read worse. In other cases revision did not improve the final drafts. The fact that the students were unsuccessful in revising some of the sentences suggests that these students have not yet acquired competence in English which is required when they write for an academic audience.

Regarding the implications on the revision findings, Faigley and Witte (1981: 411) point out that the teaching of revision should not be separated from planning and reviewing skills. Inadequate planning delays the writer’s exploration of the ideas relevant to the writing task and inadequate reviewing of initial drafts results from the writer’s poor conception of the audience needs. Raimes (1985: 250) adds that the less skilled ESL writers need more practice in generating, organising and reviewing ideas.

5.4.2 The use of peer review in student writing

This section gives a brief overview of the statistical results pertaining to the effect of peer review on student academic writing. This is followed by the implications of these findings regarding the use of peer review particularly in writing programmes at tertiary institutions in South Africa.

The statistical results of Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 have shown that in terms of this study taken generally peer review did not have a positive effect on student writing.
In the light of these results and the potential benefits of peer review (cf 2.2) and the support for peer review verbalised in the post-review interviews of the present study, it is worthwhile exploring the above findings in terms of their implications for the teaching of writing.

Firstly, looking at the implications of the results in the Vista university context, I would propose that the Academic Skills Programme (ASP) be located at the heart of the academic mainstream and the relationship between ASP and teaching departments should be formalised in order that the latter have a greater transformative impact on activities and processes occurring in academic disciplines. Unless this happens, initiatives such as using peer review in the teaching of writing across disciplines will not be achievable.

Secondly, looking at this issue in the context of higher learning in general, the aim of assigning writing tasks will need to change for both students and lecturers because if lecturers give assignments with the sole purpose of getting students to obtain a year mark and if students continue to value the mark they obtain much more than the benefits they obtain from written comments or any form of feedback, then implementing peer reviews in writing development will be a futile exercise.

Thirdly, before students are exposed to peer reviews, the writing teacher in partnership with the subject specialists should organise writing workshops where students are divided into groups and can work together to produce a single writing task. DiPardo and Freedman (1988:120) support this by pointing out that groups function collaboratively when members work together on a “single cooperatively owned product”. Mangelsdorf (1992: 282) points out that modeling peer reviews and showing students how to work collaboratively takes time and patience from students and teachers. She reports in her study that the more class time she devoted to peer review, the better were the final drafts.
Finally, Mangelsdorf (1992: 283) reminds writing teachers that when students begin with peer reviews one should not expect the responses to each other to be completely adequate. But with practice, students’ reviews improve along with their reading and writing skills and when they see this improvement their belief in the efficacy of this procedure increases. Further suggestions are given in the next section.

5.4.3 Peer interaction and the extent to which L2 writers incorporate peer comment

The findings pertaining to the above statement were that all four writers used some of their peers’ comments when revising. However, the extent to which the students incorporated these comments differed (cf Figure B). For example, Student T included peer comment more than any other student in the group, whereas Student O included a very small amount. This finding indicates that some students were more receptive to comment than the others. This finding concurs with those in other studies (e.g Nelson & Murphy 1993; Connor & Asenavage 1994).

Furthermore, the present study revealed that the manner in which readers and writers interact with each other affects the writers’ incorporation of peer comment (cf 4.3.5). For example, in the interaction between Student T and Student O there was no real negotiation of meaning in that Student O as reader was only interested in pinpointing unclear areas in her partner’s text without giving the writer a chance to clarify or to give his opinion about his text and as a writer she resisted peer comment. Student T, on the other hand, appeared to be threatened by his partner’s authoritative attitude and he seemed compelled to incorporate most of his partner’s comment. Other studies have also revealed that the extent to which L2 writers incorporated their peers’ suggestions in their revised drafts was dependent on the type of interaction the writer had in a dyad or group (e.g Nelson & Murphy 1993; Berkenkotter 1984 in 2.4.2).
Added to this, findings from post-review interviews regarding the reasons why some of the students did not include some of peer comments were that:

- Students believe that they have to receive feedback from someone who is more knowledgeable like their teacher or someone they consider experienced in the field of writing or the course content. One student pointed out that he would prefer to obtain feedback from the Academic Skills Co-ordinator or me (the researcher) rather than his fellow student because he considers the former as more experienced and knowledgeable (cf 4.3.4).

- At times peers gave incorrect information. Jacobs (1989) made similar observations (cf 2.4.4).

Comments made on the Peer Review Sheets and actual drafts revealed that some of the reviewers gave incomprehensible or vague comments that would not assist writers when revising their drafts (cf 4.3.5). In other instances, readers gave specific comments but the writers were unable to implement the proposed changes.

The implications of the above findings suggest that students need to be guided on how they should be involved in collaborative activities. Connor and Asenavage's (1994) study has revealed that students' previous collaborative activities determine how well they will respond to and benefit from each other's writing. They propose that when forming groups, teachers should consider factors like students' previous experiences in collaborative activities. In addition, I would suggest considering the participants' personalities, as other studies have noted (for example Lockhart & Ng 1995; Berkenkotter 1984) that participants' personalities may affect their interaction with other peers and the degree to which they are receptive to each other's comments. Berkenkotter (1984: 313), for example, found that the 'resisting revisor' deliberately disregarded his peers' comments (cf 2.4.3).

Villamil and De Guerrero (1996) suggest that students need to be made aware of
the behaviours that hinders the improvement of text during training. In order to accomplish this, Lockhart and Ng (1995) advise that teachers should guide students more explicitly on how to interact collaboratively by providing them with transcripts of collaborative feedback, discussing the characteristics and benefits of collaboration and then demonstrating how to engage in collaborative interaction. I think instead of providing transcripts of collaborative activities one could get students to view video tapes of collaborative and non-collaborative peer interaction.

Furthermore, they point out that learning to engage in collaborative response is a process that needs to be developed throughout the writing course. This suggests that the one-off training session that I had with the participants was too brief and insufficient.

The fact that students seem to need feedback from someone they consider knowledgeable about writing and that they do not always trust their peers' abilities to give feedback implies that writing teachers should combine peer reviews with other forms of feedback.

The fact that at times students received vague or non-specific feedback suggests that extensive training in the strategies for giving specific feedback is crucial. As Zhu (1995: 516) indicated, training students for peer reviews “via teacher-student conferences has significant impact on the quantity and quality of feedback provided”. Zhu (1995) used teacher-student conferences because they enabled teachers to interact with students and to provide individualised instruction. Students attended the conferences in groups of three and they volunteered to bring an assignment that could be critiqued by the group. These conferences ranged from 15 to about 25 minutes in length. These sessions consisted of two parts. In the first part, the student who brought the assignment to be critiqued read aloud his or her text while the teacher and other peers followed in copies of the essay and made brief comments. In the second part, the instructor and the students discussed the strength and weaknesses of the essay and provided suggestions for revision.
The students were allowed to give their comments and suggestions first.

Teachers explicitly asked students to comment on aspects related to the content and organisation first. When students wanted to focus on local features first the teacher would guide students' attention to the global concerns using directives such as: "grammar is important but let's look at the big picture first" (Zhu 1995: 502).

The teacher prompted the students to give specific feedback by asking students to clarify or specify their comments and suggestions. For example, if a student made a general comment that something in the text was confusing, that student had to explain what was confusing and where necessary, the teacher would model how specific comments could be made (Zhu 1995: 502).

Teachers provided procedural facilitation in the conferences through the use of questions that directed students' attention to those aspects of writing students needed to focus on during peer reviews. During these conferences, when students failed to identify a problem in the text, the instructor would give them some instruction on writing. For example, teach them how to develop a paragraph. This training procedure requires quality time and effort.

Besides training students in collaborative activities, Zhu (1995: 517) points out that successful peer response requires various kinds of knowledge and skills, for example, knowledge of written discourse, knowledge of the goals of the task and skills to initiate and sustain negotiation. Lack of such skills and knowledge reduces the effectiveness of interaction and negotiation during peer reviews.

5.5 Limitations of the study and suggestions for further research

Several limitations constrain the extent to which the findings of this study can be generalized. Firstly, the small sample size does not allow generalization to other
writers in other contexts. Research with a larger sample is necessary to confirm these findings.

In the analysis of revision changes using Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy, I was uncertain whether to classify some of the deletions and additions made as macro meaning changes or micro-meaning changes because a macro-change is a major change that should affect the reading of other parts of the text. For example, the purpose of the newly introduced information is to develop further a proposition already introduced. However, this was not the case with the meaning changes made by these students (cf 5.4.1.1). In this case, Faigley and Witte (1981) suggest that better methods of recording revision changes need to be explored.

A further limitation was that because in the Sociology department students do not receive feedback on writing in progress, it was difficult to get students to write first drafts. As a result, I allowed students to use the drafts they had submitted to their lecturer for marking as first drafts (cf 3.6).

Another limitation with regard to analysis of revision changes is that I did not train a second person to analyse surface and meaning changes made. As a result, the classification and counting of revision changes are based on the work of a single analyst.

This study did not thoroughly investigate how interaction patterns impact on the revision of a text. Although research has been done in this area (for example Lockhart & Ng 1995; Berkenkotter 1984; Nelson & Murphy 1993), it is necessary to explore this area in the South African context where students are not exposed to formal writing courses or are seldom engaged in collaborative activities. This research could also examine whether there is a relationship between incorporation of peer feedback and the quality of the revised draft. Since my study examined interaction patterns among dyads, only further research could compare how dyads and groups affect the nature of interaction during peer discussions.
As indicated earlier (cf 5.3.4) the students in my study received a one-off training in peer review. The importance of prior training and experience for achieving successful peer reviews was stressed by several authors such as (Chaudron 1984; Zhu 1995; Boughey 1997b).

A further limitation in the current study is that as the students' tutor I had relatively little knowledge and experience in organising peer reviews. Added to this, the students had little training on the procedures for providing feedback and they had no previous experience participating in peer reviews nor did they have experience working in collaborative activities. If the situation in South African universities allowed, Zhu's (1995) study on the effects of training for peer response on students' comments and interaction could be replicated to determine the applicability of his findings in the South African context.

A further limitation is that students were not provided with the transcripts of peer discussions to check the areas they had discussed and the suggestions made. It is assumed that if peers were supplied with this, they would have incorporated more of their peers' suggestions. As indicated previously, peer reviews require sufficient time. I was limited by the fact that students had to submit their assignments at certain dates so I had to conduct peer reviews within the stipulated times.

5.6 Suggestions for further research

In this section, an attempt is made to briefly outline some of the main implications for further research that can be derived from this study.

The fact that the present study was a case study based on only four students offers opportunities for further study. It would be worthwhile repeating this study with a larger group, employing mainly a quantitative design with supporting qualitative data. This might throw further light on the present findings.
Further research could examine with a larger group of inexperienced writers in the context of student writing whether the students would focus on surface changes and pay little attention to meaning changes as Faigley and Witte (1981) and Zamel (1983) studies suggest, or would it yield the same results as that of the present study.

Another issue that could be investigated is coherence in essays written in content subjects such as Psychology or History. The marks given on these essays could be compared with the scores on holistic rating to find out if there is a relationship between the marks awarded and holistic coherence rating.

As indicated in Chapter 1, peer review is a new concept in the teaching of writing at tertiary institutions in South Africa. The only study that I was aware of that employed peer groups is Boughey’s 1997b. The difference between her study and mine is that her students used the feedback they had received from their lecturer in revising their drafts and they revised as a group whereas mine used peer feedback and revised their drafts individually. Further research on peer review in South African tertiary institutions could compare two groups of students exposed to the same writing course. One group could receive peer feedback and the other teacher feedback and later both groups could be compared in terms of the quality of their final drafts.

As the current study has demonstrated, peer review can be investigated from different perspectives. For example, further research could explore the effect of self-initiated revisions versus peer feedback on writing quality. This could be a quantitative study comparing the frequencies of coherence breaks in self-initiated and peer review revisions.

Furthermore, to establish further what makes the students choose not to incorporate their peers’ suggestions and secondly, how do they revise their original drafts, researchers could apply Raimes (1985) strategy of composing aloud on a
tape. Although the strategy has been criticised by some researchers (e.g. Zamel 1983) for interfering with the thought processes as one composes, it would be a useful activity in peer review. For example, students could be asked to revise their original drafts aloud in a peer review session rather than have them revise at home. During these sessions, peers could ask their partners to clarify comments that were not clear or ask their partners to assist them with suggestions for improvement.

5.7 CONCLUSION

This study has primarily attempted to explore peer review within the context of student academic writing. Although there were several limitations to the study and there are many areas which still need to be researched, it is felt that the study was an eye opener to me as a researcher and an academic development officer interested in the development of student writing. My experience in writing this dissertation has certainly given me deeper understanding of what process writing means and the struggles that writers have to go through to achieve coherence in academic writing.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: BAMBERG 'S (1984) HOLISTIC COHERENCE RATING SCALE

4 = Fully Coherent
Writer clearly identifies the topic
Writer does not shift topic or digress
Writer orients the reader by creating a context or situation
Writer organizes details according to a discernable plan that is sustained throughout the essay
Writer skilfully uses cohesive ties such as lexical cohesion, conjunction, reference, etc to link sentences and/or paragraphs together
Writer often concludes with a statement that gives the reader a definite sense of closure
Discourse flows smoothly - few or no grammatical and /or mechanical errors interrupt the reading process

3 = Partially Coherent
If writer does not explicitly identify the topic, s/he provides enough details so that the reader can probably identify the specific subject
Writer has one main topic but there may be minor digressions
Writer provides some reader orientation, either by briefly suggesting the context or by directly announcing the topic
Writer organizes details according to a plan, but may not sustain it throughout or may list details in parts of the essay
Writer uses some cohesive ties such as lexical cohesion, conjunction, reference etc. to link sentences and or paragraphs together
Writer does not usually conclude with a statement that creates a sense of closure
Discourse generally flows smoothly although occasional grammatical and/or mechanical errors may interrupt the reading process

2 = Incoherent
Some of the following prevent the reader from integrating the text into a coherent whole:
Writer does not identify the topic and the reader would be unlikely to infer or guess the topic from the details provided
Writer shifts topics or digresses frequently from the topic
Writer assumes the reader shares his/her context and provides little or no orientation
Writer has not organizational plan in most of the text and frequently relies on listing
Writer uses few cohesive ties such as lexical cohesion, conjunction, reference, etc. to link sentences and /or paragraphs together
Writer creates no sense of closure
Discourse flow is irregular or rough because mechanical and/or grammatical errors frequently interrupt the reading process

1 = Incomprehensible
Many of the following prevent the reader from making sense of the text:
Topic cannot be identified
Writer moves from topic to topic by association or digresses frequently
Writer assumes the reader shares his/her context and provides no orientation
Writer has no organizational plan and either lists or follows an associative order
Writer uses very few cohesive ties such as lexical cohesion, conjunction, reference, etc. and sentences do not seem connected or linked together
Discourse flow is very rough or irregular because writer omits structure words, inflectional endings and /or makes numerous grammatical and mechanical errors that continuously interrupt the reading process

0 = Unscorable/Miscellaneous
Essay consists of only one T-Unit
Writer writes only to reject the task
APPENDIX B: PEER REVIEW SHEET

Write's Name................. Reader's Name: ............... 

Read your partner's essay carefully and give feedback by using guiding questions provided. Give specific comments, like: "I think you should give an example to substantiate your idea in the second paragraph".

1. Does the writer's introduction clearly state the purpose of the essay? Give reasons for your answer.

2. Which sections/paragraphs/sentences need more detail? What does the writer need to do to provide the detail?

3. Which sections/paragraphs/sentences are not clear (i.e., where in the essay do you say, "I don't understand this?")? What does the writer need to do to make his/her meaning clearer?

4. In what portion(s) should unnecessary or unimportant details be removed?

5. Which sections need to be moved to a different position in the essay?

6. What kind of language errors made it difficult for you to understand what the writer is saying?

7. Write any comments you'd like to make concerning your partner's draft.
APPENDIX C: TRAINING FOR PEER REVIEW

The five students assigned to the experimental group were given a one-off training in peer reviews. Each student received a copy of an assignment belonging to a student in the control group. This student was not included in the final sample because he dropped out of university before the empirical study began. Before I let the students read the essay, I explained process writing and the purpose of doing peer review. Then I gave each a copy of the Peer Review Sheet (cf Appendix B). I went through the review sheet, giving examples and showing them how to give specific feedback. The students were given a chance to read the assignments silently and to respond in writing on the Peer Review Sheet and where applicable on the actual draft.

The discussion of the assignment went as follows:

Researcher: What should the introduction entail?
Student N: Introducing the topic
Researcher: What do you mean by introducing the topic?
Student N: To prepare the lecturer for everything that you are going to write about
Student O: Starting with the introduction, the writer did not follow the topic. He did not say that he is going to compare and contrast the two theories
Researcher: What do the others have to say?
Student T: It is the same mistake
Researcher: Do you all agree with Onica? (They nodded)
Researcher: Rebecca, is there anything you want to say? (This is the student referred to as Student M. She just smiled)
Student T: He is comparing two theorists instead of two theories
Student C: He does not compare.
Student O: This person did not understand the assignment topic. He does not know the difference between theories and theorists, his assignment is complex, I think he must have just taken a textbook and copied from it.
Student N: Maybe he thought he had to compare two people
Researcher: We are through with the introduction. Is there any specific feedback you want to give? Is there any information which needs more detail or is unnecessary?
Student O: Most of the things in this assignment are unnecessary. Firstly because he does not compare nor contrast and he speaks about structural functionalist only.
Student C: He simply copies from the textbook. He has committed plagiarism
Researcher: On page two he started the sentence with 'However' is there anyone who has picked this up.
[I found that no one has. So, I explained when do we use 'however')
I then asked: Is there anything else that you've picked up?
Student O: His assignment does not flow
Researcher: Any specific feedback?
Student O: The writer contradicts himself more often
Researcher: Any other thing?
Student T: The issue of not understanding the topic is not only this writers' most of us students we have that problem. You find that we don't understand certain terms in the topic. For example most of us did not know what they mean by basic proponents and the lecturer expects us to understand these terms.
Student N: Yes, especially if you don't attend classes. You won't understand these terms if you have not been to class. The lecturer explains any new terms or at times she asks us to go and look up those terms.

I drew their attention to other problem areas they have not identified in the essay. Then I explained that they are going to work in pairs and outlined the procedure.
This training session lasted for 1.5 hours and participants were not exposed to further training.
APPENDIX D: ORIGINAL AND FINAL DRAFTS
Appendix D presents the original and final drafts of the four students who participated in the peer review process. The differences between the two drafts demonstrate the kind of changes that students made after peer intervention. For example, the blank spaces in the original or final drafts show that either a deletion or addition type of change was made.

STUDENT 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original draft</th>
<th>Final draft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. INTRODUCTION**  
I hereunder, in this essays will debate on Outcomes Based Education (OBE) by using the following headings, namely: definition of the key-terms, principles, methods, the role of the teacher and lastly the role of the learner. | **1. INTRODUCTION**  
For this essay on Outcomes Based Education, following headings will be used, namely: definition of the key-terms, principles, methods, the role of the teacher and finally the role of the learner. |
| **2. PRINCIPLES**  
In accordance on Outcomes Based Education, the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) outlines several principles stated below:  
Firstly, there must be availability of suitable learning advice and assessment programmes for the recognitions of prior learning to guide all learners. In other words education must be given to all learners in the country which are non-racial and non-sexism.  
Secondly, there must be different ways of learning programmes for learners who are unable to attend education and training institutions either as part-time or full-time candidates. For example, methods of learning-programmes to be introduced must be available for those who cannot further their studies to tertiary institutions.  
Thirdly, learners must be allowed to take advantage of open-learning and multi-media education and training opportunities. For instance, the learners critical and creative thinking must be recognised.  
Fourthly, teachers must be supported in developing methods and outcomes accessible to this range of new-learners. In addition, teachers as facilitators must be monitored and supported in meeting quality education to show assurance. | **2. PRINCIPLES**  
In accordance on Outcomes Based Education, the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) outlines several principles stated below:  
Firstly, there must be availability of suitable learning advice and assessment programmes for the recognitions of prior learning to guide all learner. In other words education must be given to all learners in the country which are non-racial and non-sexism.  
Secondly, there must be different ways of learning programmes for learners who are unable to attend education and training institutions either as full-time or part-time learners. For example, methods of learning-programmes must be available for those who cannot further their studies to tertiary institutions.  
Thirdly, learners must be allowed to take advantage of open-learning and multi-media of education and training opportunities. For instance, the learners critical and creative thinking must be recognised.  
Fourthly, at the same time teachers must be supported in developing methods and outcomes accessible to this range of new-learners. In addition, teachers as facilitators must be monitored and supported in meeting quality education to show assurance. |
Fifthly, methods of learning programmes must be nationally recognised equally across all types of educators and across all provinces. For example this meant that educational methods applied should be available to all teachers in both national and provincial level.

Finally, there must be coherent career which ensure relevance and progress in the educational system (Discussion Document, 1996:21).

Then, there are also several key principles which was brought by Spady who held workshop of Outcomes Based Education during his visit in South Africa. Spady’s great concern is to help teachers to gain better understanding of OBE.

Firstly, he said that the teachers should expand conditions of success in which the learner will be able to achieve. For instance learners will succeed with regard their own pace of studying rather than given specific time of study.

Secondly, learners actively-involved in classroom will result the higher-standard of learning -programme.

Lastly, educators can start their learning-programmes from where they want to end-up.

For example, teachers can use different methods of learning in OBE classroom which will bring success, achievements and benefits to the learners (Phillipa Garson’s Article, 1998:5).

Apart from the abovementioned principles there is also several principles to be focussed on too, namely-the educators must be the facilitator of learning and the learner must be actively involved in OBE learning programme.
There must be a wide variety of expected outcomes to ensure acquisition of knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and values. Learning is relevant to real life situation and experience of the learners.

For instance, there are so many things which happens in real life such as socio-political, and socio-cultural in which learners experience in different learning perspective.

In addition, the teacher should focus on application of knowledge of the learners, what actually the learner learnt from. Both the learners and teaches must builds on skill and knowledge which is already acquired. Hence, there must be cross-curricular intergration of knowledge and skills to prepare learners for real-life. For instance, learners real-life must be shaped by their knowing and skills they have achieved through experience (Successful Outcomes Based Education: p2)

3. Methods
There are number of teaching and learning methods the teacher and the learner has to employ in order to realise their desired goals, teaching style, use of learning material and the ability to learn and succeed.

The teacher in his/her lesson preparation and presentation can use any methods that can yield the desired result. The teacher can either use the discussion method, question and answer method, source method, and narrative method. Learners, then, must engage in group or team, pairwork, debate, role play and experiment. For example teacher divide the class into small groups and give each group name and let the learners help the teacher to choose the name of their group, then, each group could have a wall chart that can be put up in the classroom.

In OBE procession there must be a wide variety of expected outcomes to ensure acquisition of knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and values. Learning is relevant to real life situation and experience of the learners.

For instance, there are so many things which happens in real life such as socio-political, and socio-cultural in which learners experience in different learning perspective.

In addition, the teacher should focus on application of knowledge of the learners, what actually the learner learnt from. Then both the learners and teaches must builds on skill and knowledge which is already acquired. For example, there must be cross-curricular intergration of knowledge and skills to prepare learners for real-life. Learners real-life must be shaped by their knowing and skills they have achieved through experience (Successful Outcomes Based Education: p2)

3. Methods
There are number of teaching and learning methods the teacher and the learner has to employ in order to realise their desired goals, teaching style, use of learning material and the ability to learn and succeed.

The teacher in his/her lesson preparation and presentation can use any methods that can yield the desired result. The teacher can either use the discussion method, question and answer method, source method, and narrative method. Learners, then, must engage in group or team, pairwork, debate, role play and experiment. For example teacher divide the class into small groups and give each group name and let the learners help the teacher to choose the name of their group, then, each group could have a wall chart that can be put up in the classroom.
Another way in which the methods of OBE approach can be used is when learners are active and take responsibility for their learning by actively involved in research, debate and assignments. Learners are able to work on their own pace. In addition, learners should know what outcomes they are expected to achieve.

In OBE approach a variety of approaches are to be used in learning process giving opportunity for all learning styles to be accommodated. The use of learning materials encourage an eclectic approach, by taking into account a wide range of resources.

For example, the type of method used will be determined by the context to be presented (Successful Outcomes Based Education; 2) OBE is method of assessing the learners to help them improve. OBE teachers must guide learning not transmitting knowledge.

4. THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER

With the shift of Outcomes Based Education, the role of the teacher has changed to that of facilitator. The teacher as an facilitator of the learner has to play a vital role in the educative-teaching situation. The role of the OBE teacher mainly refers to the teacher's involvement in various educational activities aimed at making the educational goal certainly and worthwhile. The focus is on the teacher's involvement in the classroom situation as well as the role he/she plays in the school. The educational activities the teachers take full responsibility and control of a lesson preparation and presentation. The teacher has various roles in his/her every teaching, such as being the leader, educator as well as parent in the absence of parents. The teacher has to involve the learners in each and every phase of the lesson so as to make educative teaching or Outcomes Based Education successful. The efforts the teachers takes with the co-operation of the learners involved will result in academic excellence.

An Outcomes Based Education is a methods of assessing the learner. At the same time methods of OBE approach must be used is when learners are active and take responsibility for their learning by actively involved in research, debate and assignments. In addition, learners are able to work on their own pace, where they must know what outcomes they are expected to approach.

In OBE approach it encourages a variety of methods to be used in learning process by giving an opportunity for all learning styles to be accommodated. The use of learning materials encourage an eclectic approach, by taking into account a wide range of resources.

The type of method used will be determined by the content to be presented (Successful Outcomes Based Education; 2)

4. THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER

With the shift of Outcomes Based Education, the role of the teacher has changed to that of facilitator. The teacher as an facilitator of the learner has to play a vital role in the educative teaching situation. The role of OBE teacher requires the teacher's involvement in various educational activities arrived at making the educational goal certainly and worthwhile. For instance, the role of the teacher's involvement in the OBE classroom situation as well as the he/she plays in the school is highly-needed. The teachers must take responsibility of educational activities and control a lesson preparation and presentation. However, teacher must have various roles in his/her everyday teaching such as being the leader, educator as well as parent in the absence of parents. At the same time, the teacher has to involve the learners in each and every phase of lesson, so as to make educative teaching successful. The efforts the teachers take with the co-operation of the learners involved will result in academic excellence.
OBE requires teachers and trainers to focus on the outcomes of education rather than teaching information. For example, in an OBE classroom, the teacher must not only provide the learners with information, but also ask the question so that the learner can give the answers (The Media in Education Trust, 1997).

In addition, the OBE teacher will understand the distinction between critical outcomes and specific outcomes and how these are related. Teachers will be able to demonstrate and understand the need to use a variety of teaching strategies to achieve outcomes-based education in the classroom. They will be able to demonstrate a knowledge of strategies that they can use to support learners. For example, teachers operating within OBE will help the learner understand how the concept of social class is and is not the same in the discipline of sociology and political concepts. The learners will come to understand how and where knowledge may be transferable and when and how to test the limits. The OBE teacher requires to demonstrate that they are motivated to use a wide variety of educational resources in the classroom. Then they will be able to distinguish between good and bad educational materials.

For example, teachers should recognize the role they have to play in resourcing the classroom, and they will know how to access resources and use these creatively.

The teachers play an important role in accessing for effective learning. They will have an understanding of the concept of Outcomes Based Education and its implication for teaching and learning (The Media in Education Trust, 1997).
5. THE ROLE OF THE LEARNER

The learner as the secondary receiver of education has to play a vital role in his/her search for knowledge. To be knowledgeable the learner has to be actively involved in each and every step aimed at achieving the desired goal.

The role the learner plays requires discipline, respect, obedience, patience and cooperation as well as the will to succeed. The learner being the one in need of help from education, has to play a very important role in order to have a round connection with the teacher. For example, learner in classroom should listen - attentively, ask questions and answer questions, and must write his homework to keep his work up to date.

There should be direct involvement to the teacher, the learner should consult the teacher whenever he/she encounters the problem or misunderstand the content.

There should be teacher-learner relationship. The learners must be divided into groups and be given different topics and assignment to discuss, in order to measure what which they have mastered the content. For example, when working in pairs or in small groups the learner should compare understandings, clear-up difficulties, make preliminary arguments, seek agreements or clarify disagreement. And finally the group prepares the report for the whole group. Then Outcomes Based Education can successfully if learners take initiative in what they doing that can be by means of self-study (Professor Sibusiso Bengu, 1997:27)

5. THE ROLE OF THE LEARNER

The learner as the secondary receiver of education has to play a vital role in his/her search for knowledge. To be knowledgeable the learner has to be actively involved in each and every step aimed at achieving the desired goal.

The role the learner plays requires discipline, respect, obedience, patience and cooperation as well as the will to succeed. The learner being the one in need of help from educator, has to play a very important role in order to have a round connection with the teacher. For example, learner in classroom situation should be quiet, listen attentively, ask questions, answer questions and write given homework to keep his/her work-record up to date.

There must be direct involvement to the teacher, in which the learner should consult while encountering difficulties with the content dealt with.

The learners must be divided into groups and be given different topics and assignment to discuss in order to measure what which they have mastered the content. For example, when working in pairs or in small groups the learners should compare understandings, clear-up difficulties, make preliminary arguments, seek agreements and or clarify disagreement. Then finally the group prepares the report to the whole group. For an Outcomes Based Education to be successfully learners must take initiative in what they doing that can be by means of self-study. Learners should learn through their own-pace (The Media in Education Trust, 1997).
It is evidence from above-written essay that OBE approach focus on applying skills, involve range of methods and its about understanding, success and co-operation which involves both teachers and learners. Outcomes Based Education focuses on the outcomes of learning, namely: for what the pupil should know and be able to do at the end of particular course or section. It encourages learners to think creatively and be able to collect, analyse, organise and critically evaluate information. The overall focus of curriculum 2005, is to equip learners with the knowledge, competences and orientations needed for success after they leave school.
### STUDENT C

**Original draft**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

These essay discuss the Outcomes Based Education. The following headings are going to be used, principles, methods, the role of the teacher and the role of the learner.

2. **THE OUTCOMES BASED EDUCATION**

In order to move from a system which teaches the content of a syllabus at the expense of skills, requires an entirely new approach to learning. This new approach is called Outcomes Based Education or OBE (Oxford University press 1997:2)

One views that these is the improved new methods to be used in schools to teach pupils or student. These has to do with curriculum 2005.

Outcomes Based Education shifts the emphasis from the teacher to the learner where previously a teacher was expected to ensure that the student or pupils knew the contents of a syllabus in Outcomes Based Education, educators facilitates or guide learners to achieve outcomes which incorporate knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and values (Oxford University press 1997:2)

The writer views that knowledge, skills, attitude and values are mainly the outcomes which the learners are expected to achieve through a learning process.

According to Mary Andriaanse (July 1998:5) the implementation of Outcomes Based Education and curriculum 2005 has been neglected by the provincial Early childhood Development subdirectorates. This worries SADTU a lot. They then resolved that Early childhood Development in Grade 1 urgently needed support in the implementing Outcomes Based education and curriculum 2005.

---

### Final draft

1. **INTRODUCTION**

These essay discusses the Outcomes Based Education and the following headings are going to be used, principles, methods, the role of the teacher and the role of the learner.

2. **THE VIEWS OUTCOMES BASED EDUCATION**

In order to move from a system which teaches the content of a syllabus at the expense of skills, requires an entirely new approach to learning. This new approach is called Outcomes Based Education or OBE (Oxford University press 1997:2)

One views that these is the improved new methods to be used in schools to teach pupils or student. These has to do with curriculum 2005.

Outcomes Based Education shifts the emphasis from the teacher to the learner where previously a teacher was expected to ensure that the student or pupils knew the contents of a syllabus in Outcomes Based Education, educators facilitates or guide learners to achieve outcomes which incorporate knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and values (Oxford University press 1997:2)

According to Mary Andriaanse (July 1998:5) the implementation of Outcomes Based Education and curriculum 2005 has been neglected by the provincial Early childhood Development subdirectorates. This worries SADTU a lot. They then resolved that Early childhood Development in Grade 1 urgently needed support in the implementing Outcomes Based education and curriculum 2005.
2. THE PRINCIPLES OF OUTCOMES BASED EDUCATION

According to Philippa Garson (March 1998:5) much of Spady's workshop focused on four main principles of the Outcomes Based Education. The first one is, expanding the conditions of success that is taking the mystery out of what it is you want learners to achieve. One views that the teacher makes things easy by guiding the what she or he should do in order to achieve.

The second principle is higher-standards that is only when the learner can do something well it is finished.

The third principle is expanding opportunity, that is to open up and be more flexible with time, instructional methods, materials and learning environments. Give more opportunities to learners to do things well (Philippa Garson, 1998:5) One view that learners should be given a chance to prove themselves, to show that what kind of people they are.

There are some differences between the old system of teaching and the system of Outcomes Based Education. Oxford OBE curriculum (1997:3) states that the old system a single style of teaching is used which does not take into account different styles of learning and in Outcomes Based Education a variety of approaches are used in the learning giving opportunity for all learning styles to be accommodated.

There are things which still want to be improved. One views that there is a lack of resources. The government should build libraries and laboratories in the cities and locations because nowadays learners are able to do some researches and experiments, learners do not work at the same pace dictating by the teacher without taking into account different levels of ability. In order to participate in such things there should be enough materials to use, that is why the libraries and laboratories should be available nearby. Rural schools should be improved.

Expanding opportunity, that is to open up and be more flexible with time, instructional methods, materials and learning environments. Give more opportunities to learners to do things well (Philippa Garson, 1998:5) Learners should be given a chance to prove themselves, to show that what kind of people they are.
The fourth principle of Outcomes Based Education is design up, that is start from where you want to end up (Philippa Garson March 1998:5).

According to the writer before starting one must first think of the results one must consider what is going to happen at the end.

According to Gauteng Department of Education (1997:14) Every person shall have the right to basic education and to equal access to schools and centres of learning. That is to say there should be no discrimination every child has the rights to learn and they should be given a chance to prove themselves. No learner or educator shall be unfairly discriminated against by the Department or by a school on the grounds or race, colour, sex, sexual orientation, gender, class, disability, belief, conscience, religion, culture or language (Gauteng Department of Education, 1997:14) These means that people should have the equal right.

All learners and educators shall be protected from all forms of physical and mental violence at schools and centres of learning. The powers of governing bodies should reflect their capacity to render effective service (Department of Education 1997:14)

The government should see to it that every learner or educator is protected and services should be rendered to ensure the safety.

According to the Oxford University Press (1997:2) educators are facilitators of learning and learning is relevant to real life situation and experience of the learner. One views that through the educator who is the facilitator a learner can have experiences and can achieve something. The teacher facilitate or guides learners to achieve outcomes which incorporates knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and values.

Outcomes Based Education is a cross-curricular integration of knowledge and skills to prepare learners for real life (Oxford University press 1997:5)

The other principle of Outcomes Based Education is design up, that is start from where you want to end up (Philippa Garson March 1998:5)

The writer views that before starting something one must first think of the results. He or she must consider what is going to happen at the end.

The Gauteng Department of Education (1997:14) points out that every person shall have the right to basic education and to equal access to schools and centres of learning.

There should be no discrimination every child has the right to learn and they should be given a chance to prove themselves. No learner or educator shall be unfairly discriminated against by the department or by a school inspite of sex, gender, religion or culture.

All learners and educators shall be protected from all forms of physical and mental violence at schools and centres of learning. The powers of governing bodies should reflect their capacity to render effective service (Department of Education 1997:14)

The government should see to it that every learner or educator is protected and services should be rendered to ensure the safety.

According to the Oxford University Press (1997:2) educators are facilitators of learning and learning is relevant to real life situation and experience of the learner. One views that through the educator who is the facilitator a learner can have experiences and can achieve something. The teacher facilitate or guides learners to achieve outcomes which incorporates knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and values.

Outcomes Based Education is a cross-curricular integration of knowledge and skills to prepare learners for real life (Oxford OBE curriculum 1997:5)
In the previous education system, education was separate from training. Education focused on knowledge, while training taught skills without requiring knowledge or understanding. By separating these fundamental aspects of learning, the education system of the past was a failure as it did not prepare learners for real life but the Outcomes Based Education will solve this problem by bringing together education and training for all learners.

According to Gauteng Department of Education (1997:14) The Department shall respect the right and duties of parents to provide direction to their children regarding the rights, in the exercise of their rights as learners, in a manner consistent with the evolving capacity of the children concerned.

The writer views that parents should have a chance to guide their children. The educators and parents should work hand in hand when guiding a learner and the government should respect that. In Outcomes Based Education wide variety of expected outcomes ensure acquisition of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values (Oxford University press, 1997:p2).

Outcomes Based Education learners have a chance to acquire some skills, attitudes and values. This is the improved method. According to the Gauteng Department of Education (1997:14) The function of the governing body of a school shall be to enhance the quality of education for all learners within the parameters of policy established by the national and provincial departments of education in terms of their legal responsibilities and competencies.

According to one, the governing body of a school should uphold the rules and regulations in order to enhance the quality of education for all learners. The governing body should emphasise the importance of education to the learners by keeping the quality of education to them.
State involvement in school governance should be limited to the minimal level required for legal accountability. The professional administration of a school falls within the ambit of the principal and his or her staff. (Gauteng Department of Education 1997:14). There should be unity or integration between the principal and the staff and professional administration of a school.

The methods of Outcomes Based Education
According to Philippa Garson (1998:5) South African teachers are now using the activity-based and group-work teaching methods. One views that group-work teaching method is very effective because these makes learners to participate.

Learners are active and take responsible for their learning by being actively involved in research, debate and experiments, they are involved in critical thinking, reasoning, reflection and action (Oxford University Press, 1997:p2). The teachers must not spoonfeed the learner they should be involved research, debates and experiments.

According to Philippa Garson (1998:5)
Getting students’ noses out of books and stopping them from simply memorising things is having a positive effect. One views that learners should study they should not just memorise thing in order to obtain a passing mark. They should learn to understand what they are reading.

A variety of approaches are used in the learning process giving opportunity to all learning styles to be accommodated. Learners are able to work at their own pace. (Oxford University Press, 1997:p3) The learners should handle the situation themselves, working on their own pace.

Learners are active and take responsible for their learning by being actively involved in critical thinking, reasoning, reflection and action (Oxford University Press, 1997:p2). The teachers or educators must not spoonfeed the learner they should be allowed to participate when coming to things like debates and experiments.

Philippa Garson (1998:5) believes that getting students’ noses out of books and stopping them from simply memorising things is having a positive effect. Learners should study they should not just memorise thing in order to obtain a passing mark. They should learn to understand what they are studying.

A variety of approaches are used in the learning process giving opportunity to all learning styles to be accommodated. Learners are able to work at their own pace. (Oxford University Press, 1997:p3) The learners should participate in their studies through new improved methods, they should not just take anything from the teacher.
The role of the teacher
According to Oxford University press, (1997:2) the teacher facilitates or guide learners to achieve outcomes which incorporates knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and values.

One views that as the teacher is the facilitator the learner should achieve the outcomes.

The teacher is the facilitator, in Outcomes Based Education the emphasis is on the teacher facilitating the learning process rather than delivering the content of a syllabus (Oxford university press 1997:16)

The teachers should practice what they preach they should also do their homework, for example they should come to the classes being prepared.

According to Phillipa Garson (1998:5) the teacher must let the learners know what is important before they even start. To one’s view teacher should communicate with learners they could share what they are supposed to study.

The Role of a learner
According to Oxford university press (1997:4) the learner will work effectively with others as a member of a team, group, or organisation and community. Working with groups enhance the interaction between the learners.
The learners will organise and manage themselves and their activities responsibly and effective, collect, analyse, organise, and critically evaluate information (Oxford university press 1997:4).

The learners are going to acquire a knowledge of skills through the methods of Outcomes Based Education. They are then able to organise and critically evaluate information.

Phillipa Garson (1998:50 points out that the teacher must let the learners know what is important before they even start. The teacher should communicate with the learners, they could share what they are supposed to study.

The Role of a learner
According to Oxford university press (1997:4) the learner will work effectively with others as a member of a team, group, or organisation and community. Working with groups enhance the interaction between the learners.
The learners will organise and manage themselves and their activities responsibly and effective, collect, analyse, organise, and critically evaluate information (Oxford university press 1997:4).

The learners are going to acquire a knowledge of skills through the methods of Outcomes Based Education. They are then able to organise and critically evaluate information.
According to Oxford University Press (1997: p4) the learner will demonstrate an understanding of the world as a set of related systems by recognizing that problem solving situations do not exist in isolation. To one’s view learners should unite and work together in order to achieve the outcomes.

**Conclusion**

The Outcomes Based Education is the improved method to bring together education and training for all learners. The Outcomes Based Education enable the learner to acquire the knowledge of skills, values, attitudes and understanding. The Outcomes Based Education has methods and Principles and it is an effective method.

To one’s view learners should unite and work together in order to achieve the outcomes. According to Oxford OBE curriculum the learner will demonstrate an understanding of the world as a set of related systems by recognizing that problem solving situations do not exist in isolation.

**Conclusion**

The Outcomes Based Education is the improved method to bring together education and training for all learners. The Outcomes Based Education enable the learner to acquire the knowledge of skills, values, attitudes and understanding. The Outcomes Based Education has methods and Principles and it is an effective method.
Outcomes Based Education is a new system of learning that is interested in the outcomes of the learning content or rather of the learners. It is interested in the role of the teacher, the role of the learner, and the basic principles and the new methods which will be used to replace the style of teaching that was used in schools.

Outcomes Based education is initiated by the South African Qualifications Authorities (SAQA). They established structures and processes to develop standards and qualification criteria on the National Qualifications framework. (NQF) It monitors the quality of education and training by continually assessing both education training providers and learner continually.

The minister of Education Sibusiso Bengu announced in 1997 to be the year of orientation and start training for curriculum 2005. The curriculum was started in 1998 which is this year with Grade 1 and grade 7 and in the year 2005 the scale must be fully implemented.
2 (a) Methods
In the past system of learning, teachers were the ones that were expected to do all the work. Actually learners were not supposed to participate but to be passive in class and the teachers do all the talking. The teacher's word was final and no learner was expected to ask a teacher a question about what was taught. They somehow followed the functionalist approach that believe that a child is a blank sheet without any knowledge. Then that child is brought into school to acquire that knowledge (Sociology of education 1998:26).

Now OBE brought a new meaning to learning. Learners are the ones that do the work. They use more practice than theory. They bring real life into the classroom. They associate themselves with what they learn. They learn more with the question and answer method. Again they learn from each other using group work or teamwork. In this case individual learning is not encouraged rather than in the past learning system. Learners are encouraged to work effectively with each other as members of the group. In the past learning system, competition amongst the learners was encouraged. But now group participation is more important. It gives the learners a chance to express themselves and in this easy shy learners also get the chance to talk. Learners now depend on each other for successful learning (Curriculum 2005 1997: 16).

In previous education, a single style of teaching which does not take into account the different styles of learning from different learners. But Outcomes based education has variety approaches of learning will be used to accommodate the different styles of learning from different pupils (Successful OBE 1997:5).

2 Methods
In the past system of learning, teachers were the ones that were expected to do all the work. Actually learners were not supposed to participate but to be passive in class and the teachers do all the talking. The teacher's word was final and no learner was expected to ask a teacher a question about what was taught. They somehow followed the functionalist approach that believe that a child is a blank sheet without any knowledge. Then that child is brought into school to acquire that knowledge (Sociology of education 1998:26).

Now OBE brought a new meaning to learning. Learners are the ones that do the work. They use more practice than theory. They bring real life into the classroom. They associate themselves with what they learn. They learn more with the question and answer method. Again they learn from each other using group work or teamwork. In this case individual learning is not encouraged rather than in the past learning system. Learners are encouraged to work effectively with each other as members of the group. In the past learning system, competition amongst the learners was encouraged. But now group participation is more important. It gives the learners a chance to express themselves and in this easy shy learners also get the chance to talk. Learners now depend on each other for successful learning (Curriculum 2005 1997: 16).

In previous education, a single style of teaching which does not take into account the different styles of learning from different learners. But Outcomes based education has variety approaches of learning will be used to accommodate the different styles of learning from different pupils (Successful OBE 1997:5).
Outcomes based Education will introduce the integration of knowledge, which is relevant for learning and connected to the real life situation. Education is going to make things best since learners will do things that will make them discover, have fun, communicate with each other and also not been afraid of failing and most of all education will make learners feel good and confident about themselves. Expression of oneself is going to be more easier since participation in class will prepare them not to be shy but feel confident about themselves and about what they are doing infront of other people.

Outcomes based Education will introduce the integration of knowledge, which is relevant for learning and connected to the real life situation. Education will be more easier for learners to understand, to discover what they did not know, to have fun when interacting in a group and communicate with each other which will promote understanding and most importantly to be confident about self expression and coordination.

Standing infront of other people must not create a problem because in this way they are preparing themselves for the world of responsibility and reliability.
2(b) Principle IN
1. Facilitator: their duty is to encourage pupil’s group involvement and responsibility
2. Learner centred: Learners are encouraged to participate in their education
3. Grades: Instead of standards children will now use Grades
4. Critical outcomes: Critical thinking in order to solve problems will be introduced.
5. Specific outcomes: By acting as a group learners will be able to learn more from each other since they will produce new knowledge.
6. Work programme: Work is arranged in a way that is suitable for the learners to cope with.
7. Learning areas: learners should demonstrate and transfer visible things that is applicable to their everyday life
8. Resources: Learners will be taught about the things they see and will not be easily forgotten.
9. Time Rigid: teachers will be more concerned with the work of the learners than with the time.
10. Assessment: Group work makes it more easier for learners to understand because they feel free to ask each other what they do not understand. The facilitator will evaluate their work and assist where need to be assisted.

Original draft
OUT
Teacher: responsible for teaching and maintain order in the classroom and at school.
Teacher centred: teachers were the only participants in class
Standards: pupils were separated according to standards
Aims: the teacher’s aims was a pupil to pass and go to next standard.
Objectives: pupils were learning to pass but not to understand everything they were taught
Syllabus: pupils were taught according to syllabus, too much work in a limited time.
Subjects: many subjects that were not important for pupils to know them were used at school.
Textbooks: pupils were taught with drawn pictures in the textbook, everything that was written in the textbook was the year syllabus
Time flexible: time was important because when examination is written the syllabus must be finished.
Examination: the effort of the pupils was exposed at the end of the year’s examinations, if you pass one goes to the next standard and if one fails, will remain in the same standard.

The difference between old education and new outcomes based education is that learners will be responsible for their education and the facilitator will only help where learners ask for his/her help whereas in old education the teacher was responsible for telling them but not helping them (Curriculum 2005 :14-15).
3. Principle of OBE

The principles which will be used in outcomes based education is different from that of old learning system. Successful OBE (1997:3) give difference between the old method of teaching pupils and the new style of teaching which will be used in the curriculum 2005. Facilitators which will replace the teacher, their duty is to encourage pupils' group involvement and responsible. Teachers were there to maintain order and teaching of the syllabus.

Teacher centred is replaced by the learner centred which encourages them to participate and do their school work in group rather than listening to a teacher for the whole day. Standards will be replaced by Grades. In standards pupils were writing exams for passing to the next standards. Examinations which exposes pupils who did not succeeded. Exams were difficult since they promote individual competition. Assessment which is introduced in curriculum 2005 is promoting group work and learners are not going to be ashamed of fail because that will encourage them to put more effort in their work (Bengu 1997:14-16). Textbooks with pictures of experiments or for examples with animals and plants for biology will no longer be used because they do not provide enough evidence for learners. Going out in a field where experiments are visible is a new principle which outcomes based education is more interested in. The South African Qualification Authorities has not just decided to change education structure without looking at prones and cones of it. Thy have taken decisions that will be put into practice and see if this will help or make it worse but for one thinks change will be better to reduce the high rate of fail.
3. The role of the teacher

3.1 Flexible
The teacher must be able to create opportunities that can make learners to be involved and active. For learning to take place effectively, it is the duty of the teacher to see to it that learners know and understand what they are expected to do.

3.2 Creative
The teacher must create opportunities that will help learners for decision making. He/she must help learners to solve problems by using particular methods that will be easier for the learners to understand.

3.3 Objectivity
The teacher must always prepare all his/her lessons before coming to classroom and that will resemble a good example to the learners. He/she must always be supportive and ask guiding questions that will help them.

3.4 Responsibility
The teacher must aim high and work hard for striving to achieve his/her goal which is not only teaching pupils but to make learning be easy.

3.5 Effective
The teacher must at all times monitor the groups that will be formed at class and make sure that they are doing their work correctly and they are following the right procedure.

3.6 Productive
The teacher must be able to gather learning material that will help learners to know what he/she is talking about and that will promote pupil/teacher participation.

Teacher and learners must have a good relationship that will help them not to be afraid of each other and be able to ask questions and be free to associate with each other (hand out curriculum 2005:1997)

4. The role of the teacher
A teacher must be the head of the class, he/she must be the light for young people who have not experienced anything about reading, wriitting, organising materials and advice to help them follow the right procedures when doing an assignment. The teacher must ensure that their activities, enables pupils, where necessary, to recognise that their allegiance to societal goals and values comes before personal concerns (Du Toit 1998:29). The teacher must therefore be committed to presenting the rule, not as his own personal doing, but as a moral power superior to him/her and of which he is an instrument, not the author. He must make the student understand that it imposes itself on him as it does on them, and that he/she is constrained to apply it (Durkheim 1961). By been flexible, the teacher must be able to create opportunities that can make learners to be involved in group participation. He/she must be creative in order to allow learners in decision-making process of their school work. The teacher must be able to provide or ask learners questions that will help them. He must be able to prepare all the lessons before coming to the class. Be supportive and develop skills of the pupils which society needs in order to function and which the pupils need in order to survive in society. Teachers must never lose sight of the fact that, although they are the agents of transmission, they themselves are under obligation to the same societal requirements. He/she must be effective, in order to monitor the groups at all times. To make sure that they are doing their schoolwork correctly. And the teacher must also be responsible he must aim high and strive to achieve his predetermined goal and that makes a good example to the pupils.
Qualities of a facilitator
Conflict manager: he/she must be able to resolve crisis between groups of learners.
Organiser: Organise materials that will during the lesson in the classroom
Playful: Show some active participation that will send, a good message to learners.
The teacher must be proud of their profession and must know that they are the key to success or future of the learners.

Qualities of a good teacher’s conflict manager: he/she must be able to resolve the pupil’s conflict in the class, if the learners working together, they sometimes come across conflicts which only the teacher can resolve must be playful by showing some active participation that also involve learners. He/she must be an organiser, gather some educational materials since visual examples are not very easy to forget, they present a good communication. Teachers must be proud of their profession, aim to reach their goals and know that education is in their hands and must give it to the learners and it free and accessible to all who want to have it (Bengu 1997:15)
The role of the learner

Popene et al (1997:421) students are involved in bureaucracy of school that means that they must learn norms such as punctuality, respect for teachers and academic honesty. Sociology of Education (1998:27) Learners should understand that the world is a set of related systems that is problem solving is easy if people are able to communicate with each other to attain a predetermined goal or set of objectives. They must communicate effectively by using visuals skills which is good for teaching, learning and remembering. Learners must organise and manage themselves because a small group of people is able to work effectively with each others. They must be more than just working together, learners must also respect each other and most of all be reliable to each other in the team. Learners must identify and solve problems by using critical thinking and use sources of information for instance, newspapers, magazines, and television to solve their problems. They must individually collect information, analyse it and choose the answers that are best and agreed upon by all members. Using of science and Technology must be effectively and showing responsibility towards the environment and health of others. Learners should not be selfish and must be self-disciplined and cooperative to promote a good team and good participation towards fellow members (Editor’s voice 1998:10)

Conclusion

Successful Outcomes Based education aim at producing the critical outcomes. These critical outcomes will be problem solving, team work, and effective communication. It is aiming at making education and training accessible to all and gaining of qualifications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original draft</th>
<th>Final draft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Introduction Guidelines</strong>&lt;br&gt;The abbreviation OBE can be defined the outcome based education which is a design that is result oriented, learner centred and based on the belief that all individuals can learn.</td>
<td>The department of education in South Africa embarked on a curriculum review in 1995 with key stakeholders involved in a process. The new curriculum is based on lifelong learning which was an ideal for all South Africans. The new curriculum will be shift from the one which has been content based to the which is outcome based. OBE is the outcomes based education designed on orientated results, learner centred and based on the belief that all individual can learn. OBE is going to help the South African education by equipping learners with competencies. knowledge they need when they complete their training or leave school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. How is it going to help South African education?</strong>&lt;br&gt;It is going to equip learners competencies knowledge and orientation need when have completed their training or leave school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Historical background of OBE</strong>&lt;br&gt;In 1995 the department of education embarked on the curriculum review of education in South Africa. The previous curriculum was structured by the previous government without consultation with the society. The curriculum was racially based, segregated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Find whether there is no other information hidden behind this OBE</strong>&lt;br&gt;The government should allocate a budget system that will cater of all pupils or students who are impoverished or whose parents are not working. OBE should see to it that demands of pupils do not exceed expectations of the child whereby pupils can overrule the school governing body for its incompetence by violence and intimidation for misappropriation of funds who could only listen to material being imparted on them.</td>
<td>The new system opened a way for pupils were exam driven to study. In the new system assessment in done on learners on an on-going basis. Learners used rote-learning in the old system, New system caters for reasoning, critical thinking reflection and action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Old system emphasised on what the teacher hopes to achieve while new system emphases on outcomes what the learner becomes and understands. Old system placed content into rigid time-frames New system flexible time frames allowing learners to work at their own pace.

Curriculum development process in the old system is not opened to public comment. New system encourage comment and input from the wider community, Old system the syllabus is content-based and broken down into subject. The new system integrates knowledge, relevent learning and connected to real-life situations.

6. Success on OBE or future OBE
The future OBE is going to be on technology advancement of learners education. Technology is dominating our education and job market.

7. Advice from Parliament about OBE
Parliament passed an Act on school in 1996 giving everyone a right to basic education. The school Act also apply on OBE on changes on education. Changes in education must be in accordance four values and principles of the constitution namely: Human dignity i.e achievement of equality and advancement of human rights and freedoms, Non-racism and non sexism, Rule of the law meaning courts having higher authority than Parliament or Government, and all adults should vote. According to the South African School act there should be democratically elected school body governing This body consists of community members They should deal with school administration, finances, development and policy. Parliament also advises schools to have an SRC student representative council to address students needs, keep them informed about school events and school community, promoting unity among students, encouraging good relations between teachers and parents, encouraging good relation between teachers and students (Gauteng Today 98 p.10)
Principles of outcome based education are emphased in putting great emphasis on creating conditions leading to success. The emphasis is based on success of all learns with time longer controlling the learning process learns will be able to develop at their own pace. Learners should illustrate what they have learnt differently and no longer through exams only. Assessment is regarded as the integral part of the whole system critical and creative thinking will be assessed. Learners will no longer be awarded with marks for just remembering the learning content. Learners will know what they learn and why, encouraged to take responsibility for their learning and this will help them to be motivated. (Curriculum 2005, lifelong learning for the 21st century P1 2)

Principles of affective and assessment and reporting The teacher in the classroom should reflect and link outcome of the learning programme by employing assessment strategies, outcomes of the syllabus. The outcomes of learning in stages will describe standards against which students achievement is reported and assessed. Affective and informative assessment practise involves selection of strategies deriving from well structured teaching and learning activities. Effective and informative assessment practice involves teaching using different assessment strategies in different situation, demonstrating their knowledge and understanding and deeds related to the outcomes of learning programme. Effective and informative report of students taking a number of forms including profile of students, traditional reporting test on basis skills, parents and student interviews student enovations, commands in workbooks, portfolios certificates awards. (Outcome based education in South Africa background information to Educators 27 March 1997 p.30-31) Effective and informative assessment strategies are designed to ensure equal opportunity for success regardless gender, age, physical and other disabilities of students.

On the principles of outcomes based education the great emphasis is on the creation of conditions that leads to success. Time is no longer going to be a hindrance in the learning process. The learners will be given a chance to develop of their own pace. Exam writing is no longer going to be a mode only for learners to illustrate what they have learnt, different methods are also catered in the outcomes based education to show what they have learnt. OBE emphasises on encouraging the learner to take responsibility which will Forster motivation on their part. (Curriculum 2005, lifelong learning for the 21st century P12)

Principles of outcome based education require the encouragement of the community in the wider range to have input on comment of curriculum development. The old system was a closed process to public comment. There are time frames which are flexible in permitting learner to work at their own pace. Previously rigid time frames were placed on the content. With outcomes based education on an on going basis learners are assessed while in the previous time assessment was exam driven. Outcomes based education emphasises critical thinking, reasoning, reflection and action on the part of the learner. Rote learning was used in the old curriculum. The outcome based education caters for knowledge intergration, relevant learning which in connected to real life context. The previous curriculum was based on the syllabus whose content should be broken down into subjects. (Curriculum 2005, Lifelong learning for the 21st century P6-7)

There should be a report on Student on their profile, traditional reporting, basic skills test, parents, student interviews, student enovations. Command in workbooks, portfolios, certificates and awards, which are effective and informative.
The school and the community should have a joint responsibility developing assessment and reporting policies and practices in accordance with expectations and needs outlined in the principles. Effective and informative assessment and reporting practices is sensitive to self-esteem, general well of student, provide feedbacks (outcome based education in South Africa. background information to Educator 27 March 1997 p31)

(b) Methods

On outcome based education educators will design strategies on instruction to maximise the outcomes of the learner's achievement. Instructional strategies will include multiple learning opportunities for learners. Educators will provide feedback frequently to learners regarding their achievement and provide additional opportunities of learning when necessary. Educators move from a talk and chalk-rote system of learning to a flexible one enclosing the needs and the different styles of learning and preferences (Outcome based education in South Africa. A background information for educators 27 March 1997)

Educators proposed a strategies for change A culture of learning and teaching should be developed in teachers, parents and learners, changing their attitude and to move an optimazation of opportunities and school time.

There should be an assessment strategy designed to ensure success on equal opportunity regardless of gender, age, physical and other students's disabilities in the outcomes based education. (Outcome based education in South Africa, background Information to Educators 27 March 1997 p 30-31)

With regard to methods, educator will design strategies on instruction maximising the outcomes of the learner's achievement in the outcomes based education. Strategies on instruction will include learning leaning opportunities of learners. Feedback should be provided to learner on their achievement and additional opportunities of learning by the educators. There is a move from talk and chalk-rote learning system to the one encompassing needs and different learning styles and preferences which are flexible (Outcomes based Education in South Africa, background information for educators 27 March 1997 P43)

Educators Proposal on strategies for change must include a culture of teaching and learning that should be developed in teachers, parents, and learners. They should change their attitude and move to an optimazation of opportunities and school time.
There should be a process occurring at the effective, cognitive and psychomotor level. Progression should occur such that there is development of learning from a stage of concrete thinking. The firm establishment of concept and outcomes should be achieved before moving to work which is more advanced. A climate that develops an atmosphere that is friendly should be developed and should motivate learners in view of optimizing, learning should be a priority. A balance should be maintained between a group and individuals and class work. There should be a usage of implementation in diagnostic and developmental approach.

A holistic approach should be applied to teaching through role playing, music, stimulation and games, dance songs, activities stories and other actions using multi-media and a variety of resources such as newspapers magazines etc. Teaching through different ways such as investigation discovery problem solving, inquiry approach, memorization and through repetition. Use of effective class management. (Outcomes based education in South Africa, background information for educators 27 March 1997 p.42)

Teaching and learning approaches should be appropriate to outcomes and learners. Most appropriate type of learning used for different groups of learners, learners in rural areas and in informal settlements. A practicable, manageable learning and teaching approaches should be used. Learner should be encouraged to take own responsibility for his own learning in homework, planning work and setting target. (Outcomes based education in South Africa, background information for educators 27 March 1997 p.43)
### The role of the teacher

Teachers are central in the implementation of OBE approach. OBE require teachers to focus on education rather than teaching information. They will plan activities around this outcomes. OBE serve to encourage teachers to translate the learning programme into something achievable. OBE encourages teachers to find ways of providing conditions of success in the classroom. Teachers are encouraged to broaden their views, to be proactive, interactive and share their ideas with others that is teaching jointly with others in some language areas. Education department will no longer produce any curricular. Teachers will implement their own programme as long as necessary outcomes are produced. (Curriculum 2005, Lifelong learning the 21st century p. 28-29)

Teacher making tests are an integral part of teaching and learning process. They are linked to the outcome of learning programme and flow from lesson as a normal classroom activity. Teacher make test so that students are allowed to monitor their own progress and provide valuable information for teachers in teaching and learning activities.

The teacher assess performance of learners by teaching and learning activities such as debates, projects, speeches, experiments and athletic sequence (Outcome based education in South Africa background information for educators 27 March 1997 p 33-34)

### Outcomes based education on the role of the teacher

Outcomes based education on the role of the teacher. Teachers are central in implementing the OBE approach. This approach require teacher to focus on education rather than teaching information. Teacher plan the will be activities around this outcomes. The teachers will be encouraged to translate the learning programme into something achievable. To find conditions of success, teachers are encouraged to broaden their views, to be proactive, to be interactive and share their ideas with others that is teaching jointly with other teachers in some language areas. Teacher will be expected to implement their own programmes as long as necessary outcomes are produced. Education department is expected to no longer produce any curricular. (Curriculum 2005 Lifelong learning the 21st century P.28-29)

Teachers use tests as an integral part of teaching and learning process. Teachers should be linked to outcomes of learning programme and flow from a lesson as a normal classroom activity. Teacher use tests to allow students to monitor their own progress and provide information is valuable for teachers in teaching and learning activities.

Teacher assesses performance of learners by a method of teaching and learning activities through debates, projects, speeches, experiments and sequences of athletics. (Outcomes based education in South Africa background Information for educators 27 March 1997 P33-34)
The role of the teacher is to promote the self-learning in a learner, motivates learners to take achievement and growth to promote learning in groups which include the teaching and learning strategies, classroom and group management, control and discipline. The teacher should promote the atmosphere of learning which is positive, make effective communication with learners. Strategies are adjusted by the teacher into stages of the learners development. (An article on norms and standards for teachers Education, Training and development p. 89)

Teacher as an employee of an educational department is a subordinate to a principal, a colleague to other teachers. A teacher is also a judge, a disciplinarian, a confidant, and purveyor of morals and a parental substitute. A teacher is knowledgeable and communicate effectively. Teacher is expected by parent to hold strong values, remain objective, neutral on public issues which are confidential. Teacher is expected to participate community life not to share it faults. Teachers is expected to play a parental role in institutions such as divorce, cohabitation and birth out of wedlock.

Teacher is expected to be a custodian of the child. (Sociology, first South African edition p.304)
(d) The role of the learner

The role of the learner is to work effectively with other members in a group, a team, an organization and a community. Learner should be responsible to their environment and other people's health by using science and technology in an effective and critical manner. The learner is supposed to employ thinking is require a critical and creative solving and identifying problems. The learner is supposed to organize, analyze collect and evaluate information. The learner must understand the world as a set of related system which means problem-solving situations do not exist in isolation. The learner should be aware of the effective learning strategies, responsible citizenship, education and career opportunities and entrepreneurial abilities. (Curriculum 2005 lifelong learning for the 21st century p 16)

Learners will access and use information from a variety of sources and situations. The learner will use skills to investigate related phenomena to the natural sciences. To evaluate information the learner has to collect, analyze and organize in a critical manner (Outcome based education. Theory Practice introductory guide p.11 and 35) The learners will be able to describe and explore major forces that influence culture and cultural changes and the home and target culture for example media, economics, media and technology than is an outcome on grade 12. The learner takes part in debate on current issues discussed on people's views and home culture (Outcome based education in South Africa, background information for educators 27 March 1997 p 38)

The role of the learner on the development of outcomes based education is that the learner is expected to work effectively with other group members, as a team, an organization and a community. The learner is supposed to be responsible to his/her environment and other people's health. Learners are expected to clean their environment, and make the environment always tidy. Learners should use the science and technology in an effective and critical manner. Critical and creative thinking is essential to identify and solve problems. Learner is supposed to organize analyze, collect and evaluate information. The learner must the world as a set of related system meaning that problem solving contexts do not exist in isolation (Curriculum 2005 lifelong learning for the 21st century P.16)

Learners will access and use of information from variety of sources and situations. Learners should employ the process of skills in investigating related phenomenon to natural sciences. In evaluating information the learner has to collect, analyze and organize in a critical manner. (Outcomes based education. Theory in Practice introductory guide P.11 and 35) The learner will be able to describe and explore major forces influencing culture and cultural changes and the home and target culture. For example media, communication, economic, media and technology that is an outcome on grade 12. Lear should take part in debate on current issues, discuss peoples views and home culture (Outcome based education for educators 27 March 1997 p38)
The main characteristics in the role of student in a typical school. Some scholars see achievement and independence as traits that are central. A certain anthropologist suggested that to a good student is to give the teacher what she wants. Students are involved in various subcultures in college and universities. Subculture of fun is students engaged in dating, parties, student organizations etc. Subculture with academic goal those achieving higher grades and hardworking. Delinquent subculture is students who rejects many of their school academic and social values (Sociology, first South African edition 1998 p 306-307)

In conclusion the OBE or Outcome based education in this essay contains an introduction with guidelines, the principles of OBE, the method employed in OBE, the role of the teacher and the role of the learner.

The role of a student in a typical school. To some students what is central to them is to see themselves achieving and being independent. The outcomes education based curriculum does not oppress formations of subculture at schools collages and university. Students are entitled to join any subculture they want. There is room for a subculture of fan such as being engaged student organization, parties and dating etc. There is also a subculture with an academic goal which is trying to achieve higher grade and who are hardworking. The is also a delinquent subculture who will reject many of the school academic and social value although this is not allowed to operate in the outcomes based education measure should be taken students or pupils with such behaviours. (Sociology, first South African edition 1998 P306-307)

Advice from Parliament on the outcomes based education. Starting with the school at passed in 1996 that give everyone a right to basic education this Act also applies to the outcomes based education.

Parliament want change in education to be in accordance with values and principles of the constitution. Human dignity which is the achievement of equality and advancement freedom and human right. Non-racialism and non sexism. Courts should higher authority over the Parliament or Goverment. There should be an election of a school governing body which is elected democratically, looking of school administration, policy, development and finances. Parliament advised schools to have student representative councils that meets students needs, information etc

In conclusion the outcomes based education in South African is a process which is being implement in our schools and Universities etc. The key terms which need attention were the principle the methods, the role of the teacher and the role of the learner.
APPENDIX E: PEER REVIEW DISCUSSIONS

Pair 1

Writer (W): Student T
Reviewer (R): Student 0
Res: Researcher

W: The role of the learner. I don’t understand what you mean, because I was trying to highlight what the student is doing.

R: The reason I wrote I don’t understand is because of grammatical errors. I don’t understand you write “the main characteristics in the role of the student in a typical school. Some scholars see achievement and independence as traits that are central ... you see I can’t follow what you’re trying to say.

W: I was trying to talk about the role of the student.

R: I don’t understand this sentence, you say, the main characteristics in the role of student in a typical school, there’s grammatical error.

W: Yes, that error has obscured meaning.

Res: What were you trying to say?

W: I wanted to say the characteristics of the role played by the student in the school.

R: I don’t understand this sentence, you say, the main characteristics in the role of student in a typical school, there’s grammatical error.

W: I was trying to talk about the role of the student.

R: Do you know why I don’t understand this, let me read it to you: Some scholars ................. [reads the whole paragraph] ... subculture with academic goals those achieving higher grades [laughs]. You see I don’t understand this.

W: I was trying to ...

R: Oh cut and paste [laughs]. This is cut and paste.

W: Ja.

R: You did not number your pages so it is going to give us a problem. It is important to number your pages.

W: Here?

R: The role of the learner again. The reads: ‘Learners will process access and use information from a variety of sources and situation............’ [reads the whole paragraph]. I don’t understand what you’re trying to say.

W: [No response]

R: I think your problem lies with sentence construction like here Writer interrupts.

W: Like here I was trying to summarise.

R: Yes, when you summarise it must be brief in point form but it must have meaning.

W: Maybe I did not make paragraphs.

R: Ja, that is what makes your essay to be meaningless and less understandable. When you say, you summarise your facts must flow so that I can understand what you’re trying to say, especially in a paragraph the primary line is important and it is supported by the following ideas.

W: Here?

R: I don’t understand that term.

W: Purveyor.

R: Is that a term?

W: Ja.

R: Explain it.

W: Purveyor of morals is a person who instills morals.

R: Okay, alright.

R: Here again, sentence construction, ‘the teacher is expected to participate community life not to share it faults.

W: I have omitted a preposition.

R: Okay.

W: What is it that you don’t understand here?

R: The whole paragraph, under the methods, you see you did not number your pages.
W: I was talking about the methods of the teacher, what they must do
R: Where I said I don't understand, I have a problem with your sentences like for instance the first sentence of paragraph, "a climate that develops an atmosphere that is friendly should be developed and should motivate learners in view of optimising learning should be a priority" It is long and I can't understand it
Here again, "teaching and learning approaches should be appropriate to outcomes and learners' I don't understand this," a predictable manageable learning and the .......
W: You see here it comes from the textbook
R: Okay cut and paste
R: "acquiring or occurring There should be a process occurring at the effective...I was not sure whether it is occurring or acquiring an effective ...
W: [No response]
R: Here again I don't understand what you mean when you say ' The firm establishment of concept and outcomes should be achieved before moving to work which is more advanced'. This looks incomplete and your next paragraph starts with a climate.... can you see that your ideas do not flow?
[No response]
W: And then here?
R: To show that you understand the principles the way they are in the book you must apply that information like for example in the OBE classroom imagine the OBE teacher and the learner in the learning activity how should the situation be like. To show that you understand you must give examples [laughs]
W: That paragraph I have taken it as it is [from the textbook] So if I have to include examples....
W: [writer reads another sentences] 'effective and informative assessment strategies are designed ..... [writer has left out a preposition 'of' in the sentence]
R: [laughs] You see, that's because of writing at night, last minute
W: You say grammatical error, where? I have this problem of omitting words
R: 'effective and informative assessment and reporting practices is sensitive to self-esteem, general well of student, provide feedback. I have encircled general well of student because I don't understand it
W: Maybe I have omitted some of the words
W: Then here?
R: 'The emphasis is based on success of all learns [laughs] what
W: I want to say learners .
R: [reads the whole paragraph under principles]
W: Like in these paragraphs I have omitted some of the words
R: Here at the bottom it is the same mistake as the one above
W: So, my essay is full of such mistakes
R: Ja, you say things that are not clear
Writer interrupts
W: I was summarising
R: And you used cut and paste, you took something from the book threw it in, you should use example so that I can understand where you're going
W: What about the introduction
R: Your introduction as I read it is out of question
W: What do you mean by out of the question?
R: It is not relevant
W: It is not relevant in the sense that I have included things that I was not supposed to include
R: Unnecessary things and it is too long for an introduction
W: Ja, things that I was supposed to include in the body I have used them in the introduction. I did this looking at the guidelines given by Mr Mahlangu
W: Page 6 under the heading the role of the teacher you say this sentence is not clear
R: "Then learners will come to understand how and where knowledge may ...."
R: Do you know what your problem is?
W: No, I don’t know, where cause in the first place you say the learner will not came to understand. Please read that sentence of mine again
R: The learner will come to understand....... and how the test the limits. You see you said ‘the’ instead of they
W: Okay that’s a problem
R: No, it is not a problem it’s a mistake
W: Okay mistake let me say so
R: That’s an error
W: [laughs] Okay error.
R: Ja, we write under pressure

Writer: Student O
Reviewer: Student T

W: Now here
R: You have separated them, You needed more detail, you have left out very crucial information
W: Another thing is you, you [emphatically] you say I in this essay... check your comments you say I was supposed to define term OBE not key term
R: They say write an essay and here they say define the abbreviation OBE
W: So how can you define... [reader interrupts]
R: OBE is an abbreviation
W: Is this an abbreviation?
R: So when you define it you say the outcomes based education is... you say what it is
W: But this is what I have done
R: No, you are saying the definition of key terms
W: It’s this one and this one
R: But they did not direct you there and the definition of curriculum 2005
W: Here it is below [laughs]
R: That is not a definition you talk about curriculum 2005 and say Bengu started it
W: What I’m saying is how does Bengu view curriculum 2005. So what will I say curriculum 2005 is I have taken Bengu’s description of curriculum 2005. [reads from the text] when I say curriculum 2005 is a new curriculum am I not defining it according to these people? [Pause]
R: But you had to define OBE
W: OBE and curriculum 2005 there is no difference
R: There’s no difference
W: Yes I have also defined OBE
[Writer laughs] ‘my broer’
R: You don’t understand I dispute your point on this
[Writer interrupts]
W: The way I understand this thing, I have defined this abbreviation OBE
R: I have a problem with those key terms. According to the guidelines we received we were only supposed to define OBE
W: Okay [sarcastically]
W: You say the writer should not have started by saying ‘I’[reading the comment on the PRS] what do you mean ?
R: [reads] ‘I hereunder’
W: What’s wrong with that?
R: That’s a grammatical error
W: Grammatical error how?
R: You can’t start a sentence with I hereby say..NO
W: But that’s an introduction even when you say in this essay we will discuss outcomes based education that does not make sense [says this angrily]
R: Okay listen here "I hereunder" what does that mean?
W: I hereunder, in this essay will discuss will debate. Listen let me give you an example It is the same as in this essay I will discuss
R: It is not the same
W: It is not the same? Oh so you have the problem with that 'I'
R: I hereunder? it does not make sense it is grammatically incorrect and you say in this essay will debate, what are you debating, in a debate it is either you agree or disagree but you here, there is no debate
W: Let me tell you this issue of OBE is still under debate. I have debated because I don't agree
R: You did not debate
W: Who me? okay
R: You only gave views
W: Yes, when I debate I have to give views
R: Where there is a debate there must be issues where you agree or disagree
W: That is not always the case
R: You only gave your views maybe if you had said it is a correct way ...
W: No, I can't say that because it is still under debate
R: You should have stated that this issue is still debatable
W: [reads from the text] was to be introduced
R: You are saying using the following headings, they prepare you in your essay there should be contrasting views
W: When I said I will debate I understood clearly what I meant
R: You should have said I agree with OBE when it says this and that but you said in this debate
W: Okay I will remove that debate
Res: Will you please carry on
R: No that's all

Pair :2
Writer: Student C
Reviewer: Student N

R: You say these essay discusses the outcomes based education and the following headings are going to be used
W: What was I supposed to write?
R: You must say you are going to discuss principles methods... and here you write as if you are just going to use these headings
W: Do you know why on the assignment sheet they said discuss the outcomes based using the following headings
R: Yes, you will be explaining them because outcomes based education is based on the principles, methods and the role of the teacher
W: So, do you feel that the way I have put it...
[Reader interrupts]
R: Do you know why they said using the following heading. Because if they said discuss OBE you were just going to write anything on OBE you could have maybe written about the role of the teacher only
W: You mean I did not write what is required
R: Your essay does not prepare me on what you're going to write about it just talks about what you are going to use. Do you understand?
W: No I don't say it again
R: You are saying using the following headings, they prepare you in your essay there should be principles, methods etc now I tell you that if they did not write this each one was going
to write on any

W: But I said I'm going to write about outcomes based education using the following headings
R: But this is not what you wrote. They way you saying it now is not what you've written. You said you are going to use the heading and not that you are going to write about it
W: Read it again
R: [she reads the introduction]..., are going to be used
W: Where in outcomes based education
R: No, that's not what you said. This is not one sentence you have put a full stop here and when you start another sentence after the full stop it means you are bringing another idea.
W: Are you saying these things are not related?
R: No, that's not what you said. This is not one sentence you have put a full stop here and when you start another sentence after the full stop it means you are bringing another idea.
W: Are you saying these things are not related?
R: I say she must make it one sentence and remove this full stop
W: So, must I put a comma?
R: Ja
Res: Once she has put a comma, how will it read?
R: This essay discusses the outcomes based education and then ... maybe you should delete one sentence
W: What must I say. This essay discusses the outcomes based education using the following...
R: or by referring to the following...
W: You don't like using
R: I feel these sentence do not relate
W: What is my mistake is it comma and full stop
R: But when you remove the full stop it is going to change. I want it to like with discuss so that we know what you are going to talk about
W: But this is what I have written
R: Paragraph 3
W: With Outcomes Based Education educators guide the children they do not spoonfeed them
R: Hear what you're saying, yes, it guides them 'through which understanding skills' I don't understand this
W: It guides them on how they can acquire these skills
R: But we want to know how you have points and there are no examples
W: I have taken this from the textbook
Res: Remember to say for example page 2 paragraph 2 be specific
R: Here?
W: Oh that's the name of a person. Philipa Garson talks about Spady
R: She did not indicate that this is a person's name she said according to Phillippa Garson, much of Spady's workshop... So I don't know whether Spady's workshop is the name of a person or group
W: You say this is not necessary, why do you say so
R: I'll tell you, things like the governing body
W: Why do you say they are not necessary?
R: Where did you find them?
W: In another book
R: I don't remember seeing them. Are you saying governing bodies fall under principles. What are principles? Maybe I don't understand what principles are
W: I don't know how to explain this
R: The book that I have looked at nowhere did they speak about governing bodies and what they do
R: Page 8 the role of the learner, you said the learners will organise and manage themselves and their activities responsibly and effective, collect, analyze, organise... They want to know what the learners will be doing as they analyze, organise etc. You have just written these points without explaining them. Do you understand?
W: What I'm explaining here is that the method of outcomes based will help them to collect, organise and analyze information.
R: You should have explained that under the heading METHODS. Here you are talking about the learner.
W: The role of the learner and that of the teacher involves principles and methods.
R: No, no you have discussed the teacher's role so, here they want to know about the learner. I don't know how this go together.
W: They do go together. OBE methods helps the learner. So they want to know what the learner gains in OBE.
R: Yes, you have them but I dispute the fact that you have them in point form.
W: Am I wrong in saying according to ...?
R: Yes, they say this is not academic writing.
W: What is the right thing to say?
R: They say you can write the name of that person and in brackets have the year.
W: Where did you get this?
R: From Mahlangu.
W: According to?
R: Yes, he says it is the same like using 'I'. The best thing is to write and put the author's name in bracket unlike saying according to. Do you understand?
He said it is better to write like Conny and in brackets the page number states that this and this.
W: Okay.

Writer: Student N
Reviewer: Student C

W: Page 3 paragraph 2 you say you don't understand. Here I'm saying the old system they used one style of teaching without looking at whether one benefits or not.
R: Okay read it.
W: 'In previous education a single style of teaching which does not take into account the different styles of learning form different learners'. They used one style of teaching without taking into account that children are different and they don't understand in the same way.
R: You don't explain this fully.
W: I'm explaining the methods.
R: [reads it again]
W: [reads in once more]
R: I still don't understand this.
W: I'm trying to explain, I say methods in the past they used one teaching style which ignored the fact that the children don't understand in the same way and OBE uses different methods which accommodates all children.
R: Okay, I understand it as you say it but they way you've written it is not clear.
W: Do you want me to show in each point I make where I got the information from?
R: Yes. This is too long.
W: I got all these points from one book.
R: But it is too long.
W: When she marks she will see what I have written.
R: Page 4 and 5 in an essay we are not supposed to write in point form.
W: I was showing the old method and the new method.
R: No don't tabulate W: Okay.
Appendix F: POST-REVIEW INTERVIEWS

Interviewer: There were instances where your partner suggested that you make changes and you did not. What could be your reasons for this?

Student O: When I read my assignment once again I realize that it is not necessary to make changes. The changes that I have made is when my partner indicated language errors and the omission of words. I don’t make all the changes that he mentioned I only change those that I feel are necessary to change.

Student T: At times you don’t consider your partners comments as important or what he says is not valid.

Student N: Sometimes I felt like my partner’s feedback was not helpful like I had to go back to books and read again, like where she said she does not understand or suggesting that I move sections to other places, I did not go according to her suggestions I made a decision on my own not based on what my partner has said. I felt it was not necessary to make certain changes. I would make changes on my own where I feel I had made mistakes. I felt that my sentences made sense, so I could not understand what my partner meant when she said she does not understand, so I felt like if I change it I won’t understand it myself or a person who is going to read would not understand. I felt like if I understand what I have written it is not necessary to change it.

Student C: Ja, there were instances where my partner did not agree with what the person who has taught me assignment writing skills said, so I take what the skills person said because maybe she did not understand him well. Somewhere she said I must stop using ‘according to’ and I went to verify with other people and I discovered that he told them that they should not overuse it [i.e. according to] not that it is not required at all. This shows that she did not understand this person.

Interviewer: Will you explain to me step by step what you did when you wrote the second draft?

Student O: The first thing I did was to look at my introduction and fix it, avoid some of the words I was told to avoid like using 'I' after that I tried to correct my sentence construction and spelling, using the correct words so that my assignment can have meaning. I removed sentences which I felt were meaningless. I also looked at my tense, I used the present tense.

Interviewer: Is that all?

Student O: I also avoided concepts which I don’t understand. I checked my assignment I read it again to see if it is alright to submit it because I had a lot of spelling mistakes.

Interviewer: In the past did you go through the process of writing drafts and checking all that you have said?

Student O: I would write the first drafts and select points which have meaning so that I could provide examples. But I did not do this all the time sometimes.

Student T: In my first draft I followed Mr Mahlangu’s [The Academic Skills Co-ordinator] guidelines of writing an introduction it was very long it was about two pages, so what I had improved in my second draft was to reduce my introduction to half a page.

Interviewer: What did you leave out from your introduction?

Student T: The principles I moved them to the body and write two lines on this in my introduction.

Interviewer: Did you go back and consult other books?

Student T: I did not use any new books because I was just making changes there and there.

Student N: Firstly I looked at the response of my partner and then those she suggested that I change I looked at whether it is necessary to change those or not and those I felt I shouldn’t change I have left them as they were I also looked at the mistakes that she has not discovered which I felt needed to change. I didn’t know how to quote from articles and I fixed that. My first draft had a lot of mistakes so I fixed all my mistakes.
Interviewer: Did you go to look the library to look for more sources?
Student N: Yes, I changed some of the books that I have used before.
Interviewer: Did you obtain any other information from somewhere other than textbooks?
Student N: Yes, in class but that was after we have submitted our assignments
Student C: I looked at the feedback from my partner and the mistakes that she has discovered and I went back to sources I have used and read them again and I wrote it again.
Interviewer: Was your partner’s feedback valuable?
Student O: Ja, I think it was valuable, because it has helped me to realize that when I write an assignment there are certain things I should pay attention to.
Interviewer: Can you be specific?
Student O: Like as I have said avoiding the use of the word ‘I’ and checking my work before I submit it and check also the words that I omit and to have more facts in my assignment so that I can get more marks. With this feedback I have improved my academic style of writing an assignment.
Student T: Ja, to some extent.
Interviewer: Can you tell me more?
Student T: Yes my presentation, the technical aspects.
Interviewer: Ok, Think about your assignment what is it that you found valuable?
Student T: Technical aspects, I had my introduction on one page and the conclusion on the other page and the body on different pages.
Interviewer: Is there a reason why you had an introduction on page and the body on the next?
Student T: I have been doing this for a long time.
Student N: A lot. cause like in the introduction, you have to prepare the reader say what you want to write about. But in my first assignment I explained structuralism in detail in about half a page in the introduction I did not explain what I will be discussing in the essay I just started explain structural functionalism, so I had to change and say in my introduction what the essay will entail. Again in OBE I had tabulated the principles of OBE so my partner made me change that. She said it is not necessary to tabulate, because the assignment did not ask us to tabulate. This has helped me because I had to go and change this like in class they explained the mistakes that most of the students have done and tabulating was one of the mistakes and I felt like if I did not receive feedback I would have made that mistake too.
Interviewer: Are there things that you have learnt in the first assignment that you applied in the second assignment?
Student N: Yes, a lot like for example what is expected in academic writing, Again like points which I had under the sub-heading Methods I had to put them under principles and like if a mention a term I have to explain it and give examples. So, When I write my second draft I looked into such things.
Student C: A lot because there are lot of things which I was not aware of. There are things that are not allowed in academic writing for example writing e.g. and i.e I was not aware of this until my partner gave me some light. She also made me aware of the fact that I have to read my work after writing because I used to write an assignment then submit it and she found mistakes in my assignment whereas when I was writing I felt like I’m writing the correct thing and when she read my assignment she felt like I have written something which I do not mean. If I had read my assignment first I would have picked up my mistakes.
Interviewer: Would you prefer to obtain feedback from a senior student, peer, or your lecturer?
Student O: Feedback helps us to realize our mistakes and we can learn from our mistakes and we can improve our writing so that we can get better marks.
Interviewer: If you had a choice would you prefer......
Student O: I prefer feedback from all of them. Say for instance I give my first draft to a friend to read and tell me my mistakes before I submit it Like language errors and maybe I was off the topic and when I submit it to my lecturer I would prefer that she gives
me feedback too showing me my mistakes so that next time when I write my assignment I can improve my standard of writing.

Student T: From a peer I don't think I can get information, unlike if I go to Mr. Mahlangu concerning presentation of the assignment because he has more experience.

Interviewer: did you feel like you don't trust your partner's feedback.

Student T: Ja, this does not mean that I undermine her but I feel I won't get more information from her.

Interviewer: What about things concerning your writing?

Student T: She could be helpful but not that much.

Interviewer: Is this the reason why in your first assignment you did not use most of your partners' feedback?

Student T: Yes; because I did not trust her insight I feel she still lacks something.

Student N: In the past two assignments I used the feedback from my peer and the lecturer, and I found them helpful and if I have to write an assignment again I would follow such steps unlike writing an assignment and submitting it to the lecturer for marking if someone looked at your assignment before I found that it made it easy to write. So, I prefer peer first, then a lecturer.

Student C: It is important to obtain feedback so that they can show me my mistakes I can get feedback from anyone.

Interviewer: Is there any other thing you would like to say concerning the peer review process?

Student O: What I could say concerning peer review is that it has helped me a great deal in my assignment writing and I must pay attention to certain things and avoid certain things. What I have benefitted from this peer review is that my academic style of writing has improved.

Interviewer: What do you mean by improving academic style?

Student O: Like in most cases when I write my assignment when I give my opinion I use the word 'I' through peer review I have learnt not to use 'I' but to use another alternative like the writer says or said ... and it has also helped me with language construction and I often omitted words and through the help of my partner I was able to look into such things and also that I should put more effort in my assignment writing I must research the topic so that I could gain more facts and that I should not do an assignment for the sake of doing it and getting it over and done with, I should not write it to forget what I have written, I must be able to remember the information if I come across it in the examination and that I should write what I understand and that will help me not to forget. I wish we could have peer review even next year.

Student T: It has highlighted some of the things we never paid attention to and it helped us improve our assignment writing like the presentation of the assignment for instance bringing the introduction and body on one page. You see no one has ever told me to bring the two on one page. Lecturers would simply write 'why' they never said what I must do. In most cases assignment comments come in a form of questions marks if the lecturer does not understand what you are saying he puts a question mark. I would prefer that the lecturer should at least say come and see me. In every course there is a style required in assignment writing for example I was doing history and when I apply the history style in sociology you find that they do not understand.

Students must be taught how to write assignments they are still lacking in this area. In sociology they just take it that you are in the second year and therefore you know how.

Student N: Maybe next year I feel I need to contact you and have a peer even if we don't record it, but give feedback to each other. We have gained a lot of things we were not aware of. We used to just write and submit and get marks. We were not aware that when we write we improve our writing so I found the steps that we followed useful and next time we will be able to use those response sheet when writing our
Interviewer: Are there any weaknesses you have observed in the peer review process?

Student N: The problem is we had little time to do this, if we had no classes and we did this from morning the whole day you find that we had to leave to attend classes

Student C: Peer review is important it made me realise my mistakes when writing assignments and it has taught me something like writing an introduction and conclusion and somewhere my partner said that I should not write long sentences because they are confusing
### APPENDIX G: HOLISTIC SCORES FOR THE ORIGINAL AND FINAL DRAFTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>RATER 1</th>
<th>RATER 2</th>
<th>RATER 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX H: HOLISTIC SCORES OF THE FINAL DRAFTS FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>RATER 1</th>
<th>RATER 2</th>
<th>RATER 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student T</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student RN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student MN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student MK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student GW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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