CHAPTER 8.

MULTIMODAL PEER REVIEW: FOSTERING INCLUSION IN MIXED LEVEL COLLEGE CLASSROOMS WITH ELL LEARNERS

Beth Kramer
Boston University

The advantages of peer review have been well documented, making it a "mainstay" of the traditional composition classroom. Lindsey Jesnek, in her article for the *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, notes that peer review "provides for an alternate means of instruction and important social construction of learning that teachers simply can't provide in their role of authority" (18). Ngar-Fun Liu and David Carless, in their impressive study of peer review and peer assessment, also stress the engagement aspect of peer review as it allows for students to take "an active role in the management of their own learning" (280). The active nature of the process is part of its appeal for these scholars—by participating in a shared mutual project, the editing, collaboration, and teamwork skills attained through peer review may transfer into a student's writing process in a way that teacher-driven feedback cannot. Another benefit of peer review is that students can often work with others at a higher or lower "skill" level and benefit either by learning new techniques and viewing stronger work, or by learning how to teach and edit.

However, in recent years the influx of English Language Learners (ELLs) into the college classroom has complicated this assumed model. ELLs are the fastest growing subgroup of students in the public education system in the United States (Pyle 103). At Boston University, where I have taught rhetoric for the last eight years, the percentage of international students has risen steadily over the last decade to reach 24% of the 2022 student body representing 87 countries (*BU Today*). As a result, many composition classrooms become a mix of quite fluent native speakers and writers, with other students who struggle and are much less skilled writing in English. The assumed model in traditional peer review is that the ELL students, even if paired with an adept native speaker, will benefit from viewing fluent work, and the native speakers will benefit by providing guidance and insight to the ELL students. Nevertheless, the disparity in

writing ability when complicated by communication difficulties often undercuts those benefits, leaving students at each end of the spectrum frustrated. Despite this frustration, there remains much less study on peer review and its benefit and use to ELL students (Sukumaran and Dass 27).

This chapter hopes to fill this gap by confronting the complexities of peer review in the mixed level composition class. After exploring some critiques of peer review in relation to ELL needs and trends, I will detail what I have developed as multimodal peer review to address the challenges faced by this student population, problems such as anxiety about their performance and skill levels and assistance in oral and grammatical skills not needed by native speakers. While forgoing peer review or turning to anonymous online platforms to lessen anxiety may seem viable options, such responses deprive ELL students of precisely the social interaction that they need to develop core social and collaborative skills. By using multimodal tools which emphasize more frequent opportunities for oral reflection and interaction in lower-stakes assignments, educators can preserve the social and community aspects of peer review for both ELL and native speakers in these mixed classes where both groups can encounter problems. The goal is to modify peer review so that it has the flexibility to challenge and engage a diverse range of learning styles and skill levels.

PEER REVIEW, DISTRUST, AND DISPARITY

Peer review has a long history in composition, both with its supporters and its critics. On one hand, peer review is one moment of "flipping" the classroom or providing an alternate classroom model where students must take on the role of educator and showcase their active mastery in a collaborative setting. Long before it was trendy to "flip" the classroom, composition instructors were using peer review workshops as just one way to rethink the confines of the traditional professor-student dichotomy. Liu and Carless articulate the advantages of this model:

> A further important reason for engaging learners with peer feedback is that learning is likely to be extended from the private and individual domain, to a more public (i.e., to one or more peers) domain. One important way we learn is through expressing and articulating to others what we know or understand. In this process of self-expression, we construct an evolving understanding of increasing complexity. (281)

Liu and Carless capture both the engagement/social function of peer review, along with its educational mission of allowing students to showcase and present

knowledge. Peer review works against the misconception that writing is a solitary action by bringing it into the realm of public discussion and debate. They also discuss the "practical" aspect of peer review, that it allows for quicker turn-around time for comments and feedback than often a single teacher can provide (281). As Lindsey Jesnek succinctly explains, "Although peer editing has never posed as a simple or flawless process, it has been well-received by the vast majority of composition professors in recent years" (18). Its ability to engage and model a type of public discourse is one reason it has thrived in composition classrooms for decades.

On the other hand, Jesnek hesitates in her praise, following up with the concern: "but it [peer review] is perhaps too applauded" (18). Jesnek, while appreciative of the positive benefits that peer review provides, expresses apprehension that peer review does not meet the needs of "lower level composition students" (18). While recognizing the immense benefits in upper-level writing courses where skill levels and interest are more uniform, she anecdotally bemoans the dissatisfaction she sees surfacing in classrooms filled with less adept and committed writers. Jesnek turns to Charlotte Brammer and Mary Rees' 2007 study to search for quantitative data to address the general unease she feels about peer review in her introductory courses. This study showcases how the majority of first year composition students expressed distrust of both peer review and the merits of their reviewer (80). "This attitude of distrust toward the peer reviewer is not uncommon" Brammer and Rees explain, stressing that in many cases students are looking for answers and solutions rather than realizing the collaborative potential of the peer review process. "Correction" rather than "collaboration" is the way that they view the problem, bemoaning that many students have unrealistic or misguided expectations of the process (80-81). Both Jesnek and Brammer and Rees struggle with how to shift the student mindset about peer review and move students toward more global feedback rather than local or grammatical suggestions in beginner courses.

Jesnek further expresses the difficulty in pairing students as part of the peer review process. While she sees less disparity in upper-level composition classes, lower-level ones "contain a wide range of student writing abilities, which makes effective peer editing sessions all the more difficult to facilitate" (21). Going into great detail on the complications of different types of pairings (from similar levels to immense gaps in skills), she ends her piece finding no appropriate grouping that satisfies her course objectives. She asks educators to take a long look at peer review and to examine its "effectiveness;" she challenges her audience to rethink peer review and its merits from the student satisfaction perspective, taking into account student outcomes and perceptions (23). While Jesnek does not specifically address ELL students in her article, her focus on the particular

plight of the lower-level composition student would only become magnified when addressing the mixed-level classroom with non-native speakers.

In addition to disparity and pairing issues, peer review can also raise anxiety for ELL students about their speaking and writing ability. In their study of peer review in the ELL classroom, Kavitha Sukumaran and Rozita Dass explain that although studies have noted unease felt by ELL students serving as peer reviewers, these "are not based on empirical evidence about the origins of students' anxiety and negativity about peer feedback" (28). Through a comprehensive review of past research on ELL students and peer review, they attempt to improve the research by tracing and addressing the source of this negativity. They find that ELL students are often at odds with peer review because they approach it with a completely different mindset and set of assumptions (including anxiety about their language skills being judged by others); they find that involving ELL students in the modeling and criteria process, and moving the review online for anonymity, are some useful techniques to increase their comfort with the process (31). Sukumaran and Dass cite one student who responded that "Being online helps me to be more critical and generally not partial to my peers' feelings" (37). Therefore, moving peer review online could seem like a clear way to improve the process for ELL students. Nevertheless, this type of move, while helpful in addressing some bias and sensitivity issues that may especially impact ELL students, undercuts one of the core tenets of peer review. Making the process anonymous in a sense erases the collaborative engagement aspect that is particularly impactful in person. Sukumaran and Dass note this very detriment in their conclusion, explaining that students often view online peer review "as a technical tool rather than a tool for interaction among classmates and teacher" (38). Thus, while Sukumaran and Dass take on the important task of examining the root cause of ELL struggle with peer review, they do not offer us completely viable solutions.

Another critique of peer review made by Liu and Carless is that peer review is often assessment-focused with "students frequently being reported as driven by a natural desire for high grades . . . even when such instrumental motivations may lead to adverse impacts, such as surface learning" (279). Weak students become demoralized that they cannot produce the type of polished work they see in their partner, and strong students believe they are not getting the "help" or "correction" they need from their classmates to achieve the desired grade. Gavin Heron, in his recent study of different assessment practices, finds that strong concentration on the graded aspect of high-stakes assignments "can lead to students jumping through the assessment hoops and jettisoning efforts to engage in deeper approaches to learning" (277). Heron emphasizes that there is a risk to focusing too much on the final product over the system and process that leads to it. Peer review that only occurs late in the writing stage without opportunities

for instructors to guide and intervene, might be especially problematic for ELL students who would feel anxiety about their skill level and their ability to achieve a desired grade.

Therefore, if peer review were to be redesigned with student satisfaction and outcomes in mind, simply taking it online would not be going far enough. While it might address some of the vulnerability that ELL students face, it would leave out the important discussion, listening, and collaborative thinking that is embedded in peer review. In addition, peer review would ideally need to become distanced from the grading process and would function best with emphasis on the thinking and analytical processes that lead to better writing. With this difficulty, is it even possible to modify peer review in a way that would satisfy so many different objectives?

ELL TRENDS AND CHALLENGES

Better understanding the needs and challenges for ELL students will help to answer this difficult question. Peer review is a complicated process for ELL students because of the academic and social pressures they may face in college classrooms. As Guogang Li and Patricia A. Edwards reveal in their comprehensive overview of best practices for teaching ELL students, the requirements for ELL students include being able to "understand and produce Academic English, both orally and in writing. If [they] don't, there is a real chance of falling behind [their] classmates, making poorer grades, getting discouraged, falling further behind, and having fewer educational and occupational choices" (Li and Edwards 16). What Li and Edwards are emphasizing is the way that language learning and composition are tied to broader social and emotional success for ELL students. These scholars highlight that this type of perceived failure can translate into real-world obstacles that can affect later career choices and prospects (16).

At the college level, the issue is compounded as the number of international students studying at US universities has skyrocketed. According to the 2017 Executive Summary produced by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the number of international students has risen for eleven consecutive years to reach over one million students. The study reveals: "In 2016/17, there were 85 percent more international students studying at U.S. colleges and universities than were reported a decade ago" (*Open Doors*). The 85% increase in only a decade is an impressive figure, and one celebrated by many media outlets like *USNews* for the improvements to campus diversity (Haynie). But what these celebratory figures often elide are the resulting social and academic consequences that occur for ELL students in college classrooms with a large disparity in writing and language ability.

The social and academic consequences for ELL student were recently raised in a report published by Yale University on Mental Health and Chinese International students. The researchers reveal: "In addition to adjusting to a new educational system and a new social environment, international students face unique sources of stress such as homesickness, culture shock, language barrier, financial difficulties, immigration requirements, racial discrimination, and strenuous academics" (1). The last comment, "strenuous academics," most certainly relates to the daunting task of producing academic work in a non-native language; it helps explain the subsequent statistic that "45% had depression symptoms and 29% had anxiety symptoms" (5). Ketevan Mamiseishvili, in her study of retention among ELL students at US universities, also notes that resources are often spent on the recruitment of international students, but much less on their retention and care (2). But she falls short of outlining ways that educators can adjust classroom practices to assist this student population.

Helen Gao, a graduate student at Harvard University writes honestly of these struggles both academically and emotionally in her *NY Times* piece. Gao reveals:

> The Chinese students acknowledge the usual challenges of living abroad—like the language barrier and cultural differences—but cite academic pressure as the most likely cause of stress. Despite all they have heard about a liberal arts education, they are often surprised by the rigor needed to succeed. The results-oriented mind-set with which many Chinese tackle their studies doesn't fit well in a system that emphasizes the analytical process and critical thinking. (Gao)

Gao is addressing an important component of working with international students in the composition classroom. While they do bring a wonderful diversity to the student dynamic, part of that diversity may include conflicting ideas of collaboration, critical thinking and "results-oriented" methods. Gao's comments reflect a reality that ELL students strongly benefit emotionally and academically from peer engagement in the classroom which prevents isolation and allows for peer modeling and improved literacy. Socially, peer discussion over shared projects and collaborative tasks would also prevent disconnection between ELL students and native speakers. Yet, at the same time, traditional views of peer review and group work may not fit this student body; simply pairing students with disparity in skills and asking them to "comment" on a paper could lead to frustration and additional disconnection. ELL students might find themselves looking for direct, methods-oriented feedback that is purely quantifiable, and native speakers might not be able to look past the grammatical mistakes of less fluent work.

Therefore, Gao's article highlights the vulnerabilities that ELL students may face socially and academically in a composition class if the process and goals of peer review are "assumed" rather than taught. The question then shifts: can peer review be implemented in the mixed-level composition class so that listening, oral skills, and critical thinking are still emphasized, while making adjustments for ELL vulnerabilities such as anxiety about writing ability and diverse understanding of analytical methods? And can peer review still be a challenging and productive exercise for native speakers, who are also looking to grow and develop their own critical thinking and writing skills?

ELL LEARNERS AND THE POSITIVE POTENTIAL OF PEER REVIEW

Given the vulnerability of ELL students and the difficulty of implementing peer review in the mixed level classroom, an obvious response might be to forgo peer review altogether. Anecdotally, I have heard colleagues voice this concern and suggest that in classrooms with extreme disparity in skill, only teacher-centered feedback is meaningful. However, despite the concerns surrounding peer review, scholars keep revisiting the benefits of collaboration and engagement that peer review provides at the same time that it can improve oral and literacy outcomes. Considerable research emphasizes how peer engagement allows ELL students to thrive socially and academically. On one hand, students exposed to collaborative opportunities tend to have stronger performance in the classroom. Peer review, with its built-in cooperative framework, has the potential to improve language outcomes, literacy, speaking and listening skills. On the other hand, it also is a way to introduce students to the type of deep thinking and meta-processes that higher education relies upon. And perhaps most importantly, peer review has the potential to break barriers and create new communities in the classroom, especially for ELL learners. Examining the research behind these benefits points against forgoing peer review and rather towards modification and adaptation.

In "Academic Effects of Peer-Mediated Interventions with English Language Learners: A Research Synthesis," researchers discover that: "Students who had access to cooperative and collaborative interventions had significantly higher literacy achievement scores than students who did not have access to cooperative and collaborative interventions" (Pyle 107). Yingling Chen, in his study of ELL student perceptions toward collaborative work, builds on this idea expressing that "collaboration means to practice in a safe environment which is made up of an accepting and diverse group of people who have a common interest . . . When students work collaboratively, second language learners have chances to enhance their oral skills and experience conflict on goals and tasks" (2). It is this ability

to reflect on and confront ideas that he feels is central to ELL student growth; he goes on to suggest that "through collaborative learning, the results show that students quickly realize that they are able to solve problems as a group that they would not be able to solve as individuals" (3). Both sets of scholars emphasize that with a supportive environment, peer review provides an opportunity not just to receive feedback but also to practice important oral and teamwork skills. Peer review is part of community building and social connection and also has strong ties to higher literacy and writing outcomes. Even though educators risk their classrooms becoming distracted by too much socialization, these scholars highlight the importance of the collaborative process even more than the written product itself.

Along these lines, Liu and Carless suggest that peer review methods "develop skills such as critical reflection, listening to and acting on feedback, [and] sensitively assessing and providing feedback on the work of others. Students can learn not only from the peer feedback itself, but through meta-processes such as reflecting on and justifying what they have done" (289). ELL students would most certainly benefit from increasing these collaborative opportunities and strengthening moments when they could more fruitfully understand "meta-processes" crucial for social and academic success in the US university classroom. If, as Gao suggests, ELL students are often confused by the discussion-oriented and exploratory aspects of liberal arts study, then it seems vital that they experience these processes in the classroom in ways that show how these types of methodologies lead to stronger written and spoken work. Peer review could be such a mechanism that allows students to discuss ideas, brainstorm, evaluate, critique, and ask questions in a classroom setting open to instructor guidance and intervention.

Mikel Cole addresses this collaborative need for ELL students in his 2013 study: "In contrast to teacher-centered models of instruction, instructional approaches that employ peer-mediated learning offer tremendous promise to improve language outcomes and interrupt the pervasive messages of silence that ELLs face" (148). While Cole does not address composition peer review directly, he does emphasize the importance of having ELL students interact, question, and assist native speakers in a variety of projects or "mediated" work. Cole finds that classrooms must employ opportunities to allow peer-to-peer feedback, and that resisting these models because of disparity can have "dire" consequences for the progress of ELL student learners who become withdrawn and "silenced" (163). Although he is focusing on all types of collaborative learning beyond peer review, he finds "ELLs performed much better in settings where they were not segregated from their non-ELL peers" (163). There is an obvious benefit in exposing less fluent writers and speakers to those at a stronger level for literacy and language fluency. ELL students should not feel, in his view, that their ideas are

not important or that they do not have the capacity or means to make worthy reflections on peer work. Therefore, Cole's research discourages moving away from peer review because of its difficulties, and points towards modifications that take into account the particular requirements of ELL students.

Thus, these scholars overwhelmingly highlight that we would be doing ELL students and our classrooms a disservice to forgo peer review altogether. However, the research informing ELL trends simultaneously argues for changes and adaptations to be made to the practice. Based on the theory informing of ELL best teaching practices, I will outline in the following sections how I have modified peer review into a multimodal practice in my rhetoric courses to adapt to the influx of ELL learners. By integrating peer review into more frequent, lower-stakes guided workshops, and integrating podcast technology in meaningful ways, I have worked to preserve key writing, community building, and critical thinking skills in the process while acknowledging the social, oral, and literacy needs of ELL students.

FREQUENT, LOW-STAKES PEER REVIEW

One key way to transform peer review is to make it a practice that occurs throughout a course at all stages of the writing process. Some traditional ways of implementing peer review in the composition classroom occur at the draft stage of the writing process, usually for a high-stakes assignment that will soon receive a summative graded assessment by the professor. According to Dante Dixson and Frank Worrell in their analysis comparing assessment methods, summative assessments usually occur at the end of "learning segments" and are less frequent and almost always graded (156). Quite often, peer review mirrors this process and occurs close to an assignment due date. Students are paired off, exchange papers, and provide written and/or oral feedback throughout the draft. Although students do not provide grades, much weight is placed on how they evaluate a product close to the period in which it will be evaluated by the instructor.

However, this type of review process adds to the misconception that peer review is solely for the purpose of eventually achieving a higher grade, and it makes pairings of weak students with strong students that much more discouraging. Shifting the focus of peer review to frequent smaller stakes assignments can serve multiple purposes in the mixed level composition classroom. By moving peer review to a more frequent "peer *feedback*," over "peer *assessment*" as Liu and Carless suggest, instructors can model the peer review process at much earlier periods throughout the semester, in ways that are less intimidating and overwhelming to non-native speakers (279). The idea is to make students more aware that their goal is to guide and collaborate with their peers, rather than

critique and judge in a top-down way. It is not about students deciding if writing is "strong" or "weak," but working together throughout the writing process to make the product as thoughtful and rich as it can be.

For example, I have had success in pairing students with differences in skill level to provide peer feedback on paper proposals at the start of a research unit. This type of in-class engagement facilitates a classroom atmosphere of open discussion and cultivates a climate of scholarship crucial to the ultimate written product. It also places the emphasis on global feedback compared to local suggestions, as the ungraded proposal is the first stage in having students conceptualize larger issues and questions at stake with their topic. Since the proposal is ungraded, feedback is not about perfecting the grammar but rather thinking deeply about argument and idea. Instructors can also easily model what a short peer review of a proposal might include, so that ELL students unfamiliar with peer review have clear expectations and understanding of the process itself early in a writing project.

Before I implemented frequent, low-stakes peer review, students would display reluctance or frustration if they were not paired with a friend or were placed with someone at a weaker level. However, when I adjusted peer review to occur consistently in most classes during the semester, native speakers and ELL students became much less resistant to the process. While ELL students might be more hesitant with the first experience, conversations flowed more easily as the semester went on, and they had many opportunities to practice listening and discussion skills, leading to richer and more nuanced feedback each time. All students had the opportunity to work with almost everyone in the class by the end of the semester, lessening the tension and anxiety of a few high-stakes interactions. Also, by reviewing the comments made between students, I had indications about how students were understanding the topic and conceptualizing ideas at a stage when I could easily intervene or shift my own teaching methods.

In addition to using peer review earlier in the course outside of formal drafts and papers, I have also broken down peer review so that students are rarely assessing an entire draft at once. To accomplish this task, I modify peer review so that it becomes integrated into a series of lessons leading up to a high-stakes assignment. Frequent, low-stakes peer review is a version of the popular "scaffolding" teaching strategy. As Pedro Silva explains, scaffolding "consists of providing a temporary structure which will allow the learner to identify each of the components of any specific topic, while creating a provisional structure which will allow the development of a specific skill" (89). In his analysis of scaffolding in relation to first year writing assignments, Silva discusses the way in which scaffolding gradually introduces the necessary parts of an assignment to allow

for the learner to reach their ultimate success level. This technique is particularly important for beginner students, as Gareth Green and his research team similarly convey, because often "they ha[ve] not yet developed the procedural schemata" for the given task (146). Similar to ELL students who might lack familiarity with the process and/or mindset of peer review, Green sees scaffolding as designing assignments and workshops so that the sequence of assignments builds the framework of thinking for the later tasks (146). In this model, the instructor takes a strong role in breaking down lessons into component parts and giving their students tools that they become less dependent upon as the final products emerge.

I utilize this directed workshop concept in creating a "scaffolded" peer review series; for example, in one class I may divide students into pairs and have them workshop a much smaller segment of their draft, such as only the introduction or only the conclusion. By combining this peer review with an instructor-led lesson on introductions or conclusions, it allows me to add much more structure and direction into the workshop, and to move away from an assessment to a more collaborative learning paradigm. Providing templates and models, such as introductions written by former students, can offer some of the necessary framework to give both strong and weaker students varying goals/objectives for their later peer review session. This modification shifts students from thinking about peer review as providing all the "correction" or grammatical help they need for this one large assignment, to thinking more about the ideas and parts that come together to make an argument into a larger whole. For instance, my ELL students often realize through a workshop series where they receive three different views of their introduction that there are multiple ways of beginning of an essay, and after a subsequent workshop on conclusions, they start to understand how choices they make about their introductions inform their endings. It also breaks down the process so that weaker writers are gradually introduced to longer assignments and papers.

There are also opportunities for students to work with more than one partner over this type of series, helping to expose students to a range of writers at multiple skill levels. This benefits ELL students as well as native speakers, who grow by guiding others but also benefit from reading the work of other strong writers. Further, I have the ability to see a range of student papers across these sessions, helping me guide certain papers and modify my own approach when needed. Therefore, rethinking peer review as a continuous, frequent, and low-stakes practice can be crucial to providing structure to ELL students while also having multiple check-in moments from the instructor's perspective. It also helps cultivate a community of writers who learn how important discussion and collaboration are to their final written project.

PODCASTS AND AURAL ARGUMENT
AS PART OF PEER REVIEW

In addition to making peer review more frequent and integrated with teacher-led workshops, technology can also be an important modification to make peer review more inclusive for ELL students. Yi Xu, when looking at the effects of electronic peer review in the classroom, has some findings that may prove useful when addressing the challenges for students at varying skill levels. He explains that while first year students "do not necessarily benefit more (nor less) from e-editing itself, they do benefit from new experiences in the classroom. They tend to treat assignments more seriously when the assignment appears to be "new" and "interesting" (13). Xu finds that electronic peer editing in itself did not cause as much increase in learning as did the packaging of peer review in a novel and modern way. While this might seem intuitive on one level, he also builds upon prior research which finds that with "students' different preferences, it seems most advisable to use a combination of the technological method as well as the traditional method in a language or writing classroom" (13). Xu offers the perspective that we need to be flexible in our approach to peer review, experimenting with different vehicles and technologies to keep it fresh and exciting for all students.

Building upon his ideas, I have found the podcast form can serve as an excellent vehicle in this process, allowing me to transform frustrating parts of the peer review process while preserving key aspects. The strong relationship between podcasts and listener engagement has been well researched, and many recent scholars have noted the connection between ELL learning outcomes and opportunities to listen and hear texts as well as read them (Cole and Kramer 9). As Linda Flanagan reveals in her study of skills gained by ELL teens using podcasts, "An unfamiliar word that might stop them on the page doesn't compel them to tune out from a story told aloud. Also, kids for whom English is a second language benefit from hearing spoken English and following along with an accompanying transcript" (Flanagan). Flanagan highlights that fluency and comprehension increase for students when aural texts are utilized in the classroom, and that it can lead to increased engagement and literacy.

To integrate podcasts into a research composition unit, for example, I often have students listen to a few episodes of Sarah Koenig's *Serial* podcast, to both model an inductive method of research exploration and to acquaint students with modes of aural argument. *Serial,* produced by WBEZ and *This American Life*, is Sarah Koenig's research-based podcast that traces the murder of Hae Min Lee and the subsequent incarceration of her ex-boyfriend, Adnan Syed. The audio narrative explores multiple possibilities for the murder without being

reductive and does an excellent job introducing and analyzing evidence from diverse viewpoints. I use the podcast as a model for the students' own research assignments, where they are asked to study a complex ethical issue and to integrate evidence from varying perspectives. When my students are then closer to draft stages of their own research, I will often play moments from the podcast before students look at portions of their classmates' drafts. This podcast prelude evolves into a modified peer review that gives them targeted direction for how to discuss written moves and techniques such as balancing multiple points of view or reflecting on evidence. Students listen to how the narrator in the podcast introduces a key point and provides analysis, and then look for similar sophisticated moves in their classmates' work. While students of all levels enjoy the multimodal aspect and the variation it provides to traditional peer review, ELL students in particular benefit from this type of direction. Comments between students tend to be more specific and focused on analytical processes like integrating quotes, leading to better substantiated written products. Many students respond on their end-of-year reflection that this podcast peer review was integral to how they understand research writing and critical thinking.

In addition, the podcast form itself can be integrated into the peer feedback process. I often have students record their comments to their classmates on written work and create a "podcast" of peer feedback to their classmate. Like the *Serial* podcast that they listen to, creating an exploratory peer-feedback podcast highlights writing as an act of exploration and discovery and prevents approaches that try to sum or wrap it all up with one large comment. Students realize that the paper itself doesn't need to be "solved;" a recorded podcast of suggestions mirrors Koenig's strategy of each voice adding feedback to the argument, moving it towards not perfection but fluidity. For example, if is a student is leaving audio comments on the first half of their classmate's draft, they do not need to fix every grammatical mistake or give one comment that encapsulates a singular point of view. Rather, they can move through the essay and discuss areas that resonate with them, places which are confusing, and perhaps end with questions like Koenig does, rather than a reductive comment. This is a way in which ELL students can strengthen oral, listening as well as written skills, and it moves discussion into more global rather than local feedback. This multimodal transformation of peer review provides necessary guidance for ELL students, while strengthening oral presentation and listening skills for all students.

In fact, multimodal peer review has incredible possibilities beyond aural argument, and instructors can institute variations to teach visual as well as aural analysis. While in my courses I have been focusing on aural texts, movies and digital texts can be used as similar vehicles in peer review; students can have a choice to make a digital photo gallery of comments or a movie representing their

suggestions. This approach poses a challenge to strong writers but can also give ELL learners a range of flexible options to participate in the peer review process. Overall, I have found both ELL students and native speakers are more engaged in these multimodal projects, and that not only do the final papers have more depth and structure, but students leave better enjoying and understanding a scholarly writing approach. While extreme disparity in communication cannot be erased, these types of collaborative, multimodal projects build skills that are crucial to composition classes and increase the kinds of bonds between learners that we hope to cultivate in our courses. Overall, using technology strategically in peer review will engage students at all levels and will provide moments for learning and collaboration that are particularly suited to the ELL student population.

INCLUSION IN THE MIXED LEVEL CLASSROOM

Preserving the strengths of the peer review process, while adjusting for challenges presented by mixed level composition classrooms, will inevitably require compromise in the coming years. By utilizing frequent, low-stakes multimodal peer review, we can find new ways to engage and support ELL students as well as writers at all skill levels. Part of the solution must rest in acknowledging the immense task faced by ELL students who approach writing and critical thinking from diverse perspectives, and being adaptable to a host of flexible, multimodal techniques to create an atmosphere of inclusion and growth. Mamiseishvili's study reveals what keeps ELL students enrolled and successful in college beyond their first year:

> If international students successfully integrate in the academic system of campus, they will more likely stay enrolled in the institution. Specifically, the findings highlight the importance of study groups and peer interactions [. . .] about coursework, assignments, or other academic matters. (13)

Taking Mamiseishvili's view that peer review in fact models most of the factors necessary for ELL students to learn successful study and social skills, the impetus for revisiting and revising peer review becomes that much more pressing. Constructing the right models inside of class, for ELL students as well as adept writers, will energize our classrooms and build the type of globally inclusive communities that we hope to foster in higher education. By using multimodal tools which emphasize more frequent opportunities for oral reflection and interaction in lower-stakes assignments, educators can preserve the social and community aspects of peer review for both ELL and native speakers. This will involve rethinking traditional pairing and comment methods and adding instructor-guided

workshops that break down essays into more manageable parts. In addition, we can work to use technology like podcasts in innovative ways to both model and teach listening and speaking skills. Rather than simply taking the process online or forgoing it altogether, implementing multimodal peer review will allow us to preserve its strengths while transforming it for the 21st century.

WORKS CITED

Brammer, Charlotte, and Mary Rees. "Peer Review from the Students' Perspective: Invaluable or Invalid?" *Composition Studies*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2007, pp. 71–85.

BU Today, "Here's Who BU Invited to Join the Class of 2026." http://www.bu.edu/articles/2022/class-of-2026-admitted-students/.

Cole, Mikel W. "Rompiendo El Silencio: Meta-Analysis of the Effectiveness of Peer-Mediated Learning at Improving Language Outcomes for ELLs." *Bilingual Research Journal*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2013, pp. 146–66.

Cole, Rick, and Beth Kramer. "Podcasts and the Twenty-first Century College Classroom." *IMPACT: The Journal of the Center for Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning,* vol. 6, no. 2, Summer 2017, pp. 8-12.

Chen, Yingling. "Perceptions of EFL College Students Toward Collaborative Learning." *English Language Teaching*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2018, pp. 1-4.

Dixson, Dante D., and Frank C. Worrell. "Formative and Summative Assessment in the Classroom." *Theory into Practice*, vol. 55, no. 2, 2016, pp. 153-159.

Ferlazzo, Larry. *Peer Review, Common Core, and ELLs*, March 30, 2016, https://www.edutopia.org/blog/collaborative-peer-review-core-ells-larry-ferlazzo-katie-hull-sypnieski.

Flanagan, Linda. "What Teens are Learning From Serial and Other Podcasts." KQED.org, March 11, 2015, https://www.kqed.org/mindshift/39461/.

Gao, Helen. "Chinese, Studying in America, and Struggling," *NY Times*, 12 Dec. 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/12/opinion/chinese-students-mental-health.html.

Green, Gareth P., et al. "Deep Learning in Intermediate Microeconomics: Using Scaffolding Assignments to Teach Theory and Promote Transfer." *The Journal of Economic Education*, vol. 44, no. 2, 2013, pp. 142–57.

Han, Xuesong, et al. "Report of a Mental Health Survey Among Chinese International Students at Yale University." *Journal of American College Health,* 2013, pp. 1-8.

Haynie, Devon. "Number of International College Students Continues to Climb," *USNEWS.com*, November 17, 2014. https://finance.yahoo.com/news/number-international-college-students-continues-climb-120000668.html.

Heron, Gavin. "Examining Principles of Formative and Summative Feedback Source," *The British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 41, no. 2, Mar. 2011, pp. 276-95.

Jesnek, Lindsey M. "Peer Editing in the 21st Century College Classroom: Do Beginning Composition Students Truly Reap the Benefits?" *Journal of College Teaching and Learning,* vol. 8, no. 5, 2011, pp. 17-24.

Koenig, Sarah. *Serial*. WBEZ Chicago, 2015-2016. https://www.serialpodcast.org.

Li, Guofang, and Patricia A. Edwards. *Best Practices in ELL Instruction*. Guilford Press, 2010.

Liu, Ngar-Fun, and David Carless. "Peer Feedback: The Learning Element of Peer Assessment." *Teaching in Higher Education,* vol. 11, no. 3, 2006, pp. 279-90.

Mamiseishvili, Ketevan. "International Student Persistence in U.S. Postsecondary Institutions." *Higher Education*, vol. 64, no. 1, 2012, pp. 1–17. *JSTOR,* https://www.jstor.org/stable/41477916.

Pyle, Daniel, et al. "Academic Effects of Peer-Mediated Interventions with English Language Learners: A Research Synthesis." *Review of Educational Research,* vol. 87, no. 1, 2017, pp. 103-33.

Silva, Pedro. "Scaffolding Assignments: Analysis of AssignMentor as a Tool to Support First Year Students' Academic Writing Skills." *E-Learning and Digital Media*, vol. 14, no. 1-2, 2017, pp. 86–97.

Sukumaran, Kavitha, and Rozita Dass. "Students' Perspectives on the Use of Peer Feedback in an English as a Second Language Writing Class." *Journal for Interdisciplinary Research in Education (JIRE),* vol. 4, no. 1, 2014, pp. 1-14.

Xu, Yi. "Re-Examining the Effects and Affects of Electronic Peer Reviews in a First-Year Composition Class." *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal,* vol. 7, no. 2, 2007, pp. 1-21.

Witherell, Sharon. *Open Doors 2017 Executive Summary*. US Department of State, https://www.iie.org/news/2017-11-13-open-doors-2017-executive-summary/.