

Critical Peer Feedback For Business English Writing Through Qzone Blogs: A Mechanism Among Chinese Undergraduates

Gao Xianwei

12009017@xcu.edu.cn

School of Foreign Languages, Xuchang University, Xuchang, China

Faculty of Education, University of Malaya

Adelina Asmawi

adelina@um.edu.my

Faculty of Education, University of Malaya

Moses Samuel

mosess@um.edu.my

Faculty of Education, University of Malaya

ABSTRACT

This study explored critical peer feedback with critical thinking to improve Business English writing. Higher-order thinking skills in peer feedback is conducted to facilitate higher-level writing. This study focuses on the participants' mechanism of critical peer feedback, Qzone blog for critical peer feedback, and issues in critical peer feedback. A qualitative case study is conducted with six Chinese undergraduates. Three kinds of data including semi-structured interviews, Business English writing assignments and artifacts of critical peer feedback, are analyzed by QSR Nvivo 8. The findings reveal that critical peer feedback is a strategy of higher-order peer feedback to improve the higher-level writing. The Revised Bloom's Taxonomy is accepted for critical peer feedback. Critical peer feedback improves the quality of peer feedback and the quality of Business English writing. Qzone blog is a convenient ICT platform for critical peer feedback with many strengths. However, six issues are also perceived in the practice of critical peer feedback. The finding is significant to the process of critical peer feedback in second language writing.

Keywords: critical peer feedback; Qzone blog; Business English Writing; critical thinking; mechanism

INTRODUCTION

Peer feedback research emphasizes its efficiency in writing instruction at different settings, in which feedback content is most efficient (Narciss, 2008; Poulos & Mahony, 2008). The existing question still is how to improve the efficiency of peer feedback in L2 writing. The quality of peer feedback is significant to improve the quality of writing. High-quality peer feedback could enable students to identify the gap between their own performance and a given set of expectations and provide advice about their own writing for improvement (Lizzio & Wilson, 2008; Bayerlein, 2014). Previous studies reveal that students in higher education are less satisfied with peer feedback because of the inefficient quality of peer feedback information (Nicol, Thomson & Breslin, 2014). Feedback does not automatically lead to positive results (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Narciss, 2008; Shute, 2008; Strijbos, Narciss, & Dunnebie, 2010). This implies that high-qualified feedback does not emerge unconsciously, which needs higher stages of thinking and reasoning skills.

In order to improve the efficiency of peer feedback, some researchers realized the "mindful process" of feedback (Narciss, 2008; Poulos & Mahony, 2008). The mental process of peer feedback to improve its quality is based on the theories of constructivism and