

**Repository. Distribution of categorised feedback comments (e.g. class, sub-class, and features) by feedback exchange group and by group member.**

Please consult the following publication for explanation of content within this repository:

Yallop, R. M. A., Taremaa, P. & Leijen, D. A. J (forthcoming/2020). The affect and effect of asynchronous written feedback comments on the peer feedback process: an ethnographic case-study approach within one L2 English doctorate writing group. *Journal of Writing Research*.

Comparison group	Group to group (all segments)		Participant to Participant		Ann		Bob		Claire		Dave	
Total number of feedback exchanges (feedback letters)	60 exchanges		36 exchanges		9		9		9		9	
n = Number of segments % = relative percentage distribution in comparison group	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
		580	100	255	44.0	77	30.2	57	22.4	57	22.4	64
<b>Class</b>	580	100	255	100	77	100	57	100	57	100	64	100
Visible revision comments	331	57.1	151	59.2	34	44.2	39	68.4	34	59.6	44	68.8
Non-visible revision comments	129	22.2	46	18.0	17	22.1	7	12.3	9	15.8	13	20.3
Non-revision comments	71	12.2	24	9.4	17	22.1	2	3.5	5	8.8	0	0.0
Ambiguous	49	8.4	34	13.3	9	11.7	9	15.8	9	15.8	7	10.9
<b>Visible revision comments</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Contiguous comments</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>
No contiguous comments	114	34.4	68	45.0	9	26.5	21	53.8	11	32.4	27	61.4
Explicit justification	190	57.4	72	47.7	22	64.7	17	43.6	20	58.8	13	29.5
Other contiguous comments	27	8.2	11	7.3	3	8.8	1	2.6	3	8.8	4	9.1
<b>Sub-class</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>
Problem AND Solution	69	20.8	25	16.6	5	14.7	3	7.7	12	35.3	5	11.4
Problem identification	59	17.8	18	11.9	2	5.9	3	7.7	5	14.7	8	18.2
Problem identification AND Question	13	3.9	4	2.6	0	0	1	2.6	2	5.9	1	2.3
Question	56	16.9	22	14.6	2	5.9	8	20.5	5	14.7	7	15.9
General solution	85	25.7	57	37.7	18	52.9	13	33.3	7	20.6	19	43.2
Specific solution	49	14.8	25	16.6	7	20.6	11	28.2	3	8.8	4	9.1
<b>Scope</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>
Text-specific	331	100	151	100	34	100	39	100	34	100	44	100
Generic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Effect</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>
Global	299	90.3	143	94.7	33	97.1	36	92.3	31	91.2	43	97.7
Local	32	9.7	8	5.3	1	2.9	3	7.7	3	8.8	1	2.3
<b>Global revision comments</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>
Specific content knowledge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No specific content knowledge	331	100	151	100	34	100	39	100	34	100	44	100
<b>Cover letter response</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>
Yes	249	75.2	113	74.8	31	91.2	25	64.1	28	82.4	29	65.9
Indirectly	64	19.3	26	17.2	2	5.9	10	25.6	6	17.6	8	18.2
No	18	5.4	12	7.9	1	2.9	4	10.3	0	0.0	7	15.9
<b>Tone</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>
Hedging devices	110	33.2	66	43.7	11	32.4	13	33.3	17	50.0	25	56.8
Other politeness strategies	157	47.4	60	39.7	16	47.1	22	56.4	10	29.4	12	27.3
Absence of hedging devices and other politeness strategies	64	19.3	25	16.6	7	20.6	4	10.3	7	20.6	7	15.9

Comparison group	Group to group (all segments)		Participant to Participant		Ann		Bob		Claire		Dave	
Total number of feedback exchanges (feedback letters)	60 exchanges		36 exchanges		9		9		9		9	
n = Number of segments % = relative percentage distribution in comparison group	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	580	100	255	44.0	77	30.2	57	22.4	57	22.4	64	25.1
<b>Non-visible revision comment</b>	129	100	46	100	17	100	7	100	9	100	13	100
<b>Sub-class</b>	129	100	46	100	17	100	7	100	9	100	13	100
Reference	45	34.9	8	17.4	6	35.3	0	0.0	1	11.1	1	7.7
Explicit praise	37	28.7	16	34.8	3	17.6	1	14.3	4	44.4	8	61.5
Answer to cover letter (excluding explicit praise)	47	36.4	22	47.8	8	47.1	6	85.7	4	44.4	4	30.8
<b>Sub-class (excluding sub-class of reference)</b>	84	100	38	100	9	53	7	100	8	89	12	100
Unjustified	25	29.8	13	34.2	5	29.4	2	28.6	1	11.1	5	41.7
Explicit justification	55	65.5	22	57.9	4	23.5	5	71.4	6	66.7	7	58.3
Other contiguous comments	4	4.8	3	7.9	2	11.8	0	0.0	1	11.1	0	0
<b>Cover letter response (explicit praise)</b>	37	37	16	100	3	100	1	100	4	100	8	100
Yes	32	86.5	15	93.8	3	100	1	100	4	100	7	87.5
Indirectly	3	8.1	0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No	2	5.4	1	6.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12.5
<b>Ambiguous comment</b>	49	100	34	100	9	100	9	100	9	100	7	100
<b>Sub Class/ Class</b>	49	100	34	100	9	100	9	100	9	100	7	100
Neutral summarisation	11	22.4	6	17.6	4	44.4	1	11.1	1	11.1	0	0.0
Hedged response (affective)	38	77.6	28	82.4	5	55.6	8	88.9	8	88.9	7	100
<b>Non-revision comment</b>	71	100	24	100	17	100	2	100	5	100	0	0
<b>Sub Class/ Class</b>	71	100	24	100	17	100	2	100	5	100	0	0
Group cohesion (societal norms)	51	71.8	16	66.7	16	94.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Affective (building rapport)	12	16.9	4	16.7	1	5.9	1	50	2	40	0	0
Open communication (motivational)	8	11.3	4	16.7	0	0.0	1	50	3	60	0	0
<b>Affective AND Open communication</b>	20	100	8	100	1	100	2	100	5	100	0	0
Unjustified	11	55	2	25	0	0	1	50	1	20	0	0
Explicit justification	5	25	4	50	1	100	0	0	3	60	0	0
Other contiguous comments	4	20	2	25	0	0	1	50	1	20	0	0

Comparison group	Participant to Researcher		Ann		Bob		Claire		Dave	
Total number of feedback exchanges (feedback letters)	12 exchanges		3		3		3		3	
n = Number of segments % = relative percentage distribution in comparison group	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	111	19.1	27	22.6	22	19.8	31	27.9	31	27.9
<b>Class</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100</b>
Visible revision comments	69	62.2	17	63.0	14	63.6	15	48.4	23	100.0
Non-visible revision comments	32	28.8	7	25.9	6	27.3	13	41.9	6	74.2
Non-revision comments	3	2.7	2	7.4	0	0.0	1	3.2	0	19.4
Ambiguous	7	6.3	1	3.7	2	9.1	2	6.5	2	0.0
<b>Visible revision comments</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Contiguous comments</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>74</b>
No contiguous comments	19	27.5	5	29.4	4	28.6	4	26.7	6	26.1
Explicit justification	43	62.3	11	64.7	7	50.0	10	66.7	15	65.2
Other contiguous comments	7	10.1	1	5.9	3	21.4	1	6.7	2	8.7
<b>Sub-class</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>
Problem AND Solution	9	13.0	1	5.9	5	35.7	2	13.3	1	4.3
Problem identification	28	40.6	9	52.9	6	42.9	4	26.7	6	26.1
Problem identification AND Question	7	10.1	0	0	1	7.1	2	13.3	4	17.4
Question	18	26.1	7	41.2	1	7.1	3	20.0	3	13.0
General solution	4	5.8	0	0	1	7.1	1	6.7	7	30.4
Specific solution	3	4.3	0	0	0	0	3	20.0	2	8.7
<b>Scope</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>
Text-specific	69	100	17	100	14	100	15	100	23	100
Generic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Effect</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>65</b>
Global	63	91.3	17	100.0	11	78.6	13	86.7	14	60.9
Local	6	8.7	0	0.0	3	21.4	2	13.3	1	4.3
<b>Global revision comments</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>
Specific content knowledge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No specific content knowledge	69	100	17	100	14	100	15	100	23	100
<b>Cover letter response</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>
Yes	38	55.1	11	64.7	8	57.1	11	73.3	8	34.8
Indirectly	31	44.9	6	35.3	6	42.9	4	26.7	15	65.2
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Tone</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>
Hedging devices	19	27.5	3	17.6	6	42.9	3	20.0	7	30.4
Other politeness strategies	32	46.4	8	47.1	5	35.7	7	46.7	12	52.2
Absence of hedging devices and other politeness strategies	18	26.1	6	35.3	3	21.4	5	33.3	4	17.4



Comparison group	Researcher to Participant		Ann		Bob		Claire		Dave	
Total number of feedback exchanges (feedback letters)	12 exchanges		3		3		3		3	
n = Number of segments % = relative percentage distribution in comparison group	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	214	36.9	45	21.0	47	22.0	61	28.5	61	28.5
<b>Class</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100</b>
Visible revision comments	111	51.9	20	44.4	24	51.1	29	47.5	38	62.3
Non-visible revision comments	51	23.8	10	22.2	13	27.7	18	29.5	10	16.4
Non-revision comments	44	20.6	13	28.9	7	14.9	11	18.0	13	21.3
Ambiguous	8	3.7	2	4.4	3	6.4	3	4.9	0	0
<b>Visible revision comments</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Contiguous comments</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>71</b>
No contiguous comments	27	24.3	4	20.0	9	37.5	3	10.3	11	28.9
Explicit justification	75	67.6	15	75.0	14	58.3	24	82.8	22	57.9
Other contiguous comments	9	8.1	1	5.0	1	4.2	2	6.9	5	13.2
<b>Sub-class</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>
Problem AND Solution	35	31.5	7	35.0	8	33.3	8	27.6	12	31.6
Problem identification	13	11.7	3	15.0	7	29.2	0	0.0	3	7.9
Problem identification AND Question	2	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.9	0	0.0
Question	16	14.4	4	20.0	4	16.7	4	13.8	4	10.5
General solution	24	21.6	5	25.0	3	12.5	8	27.6	8	21.1
Specific solution	21	18.9	1	5.0	2	8.3	7	24.1	11	28.9
<b>Scope</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>
Text-specific	111	100	20	100	24	100	29	100	38	100
Generic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Effect</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>
Global	93	83.8	18	90.0	15	62.5	26	89.7	34	89.5
Local	18	16.2	2	10.0	9	37.5	3	10.3	4	10.5
<b>Global revision comments</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>
Specific content knowledge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No specific content knowledge	111	100	20	100	24	100	29	100	38	100
<b>Cover letter response</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>
Yes	98	88.3	20	100.0	23	95.8	28	96.6	27	71.1
Indirectly	7	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	18.4
No	6	5.4	0	0.0	1	4.2	1	3.4	4	10.5
<b>Tone</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>
Hedging devices	25	22.5	3	15.0	5	20.8	8	27.6	9	23.7
Other politeness strategies	65	58.6	14	70.0	12	50.0	14	48.3	25	65.8
Absence of hedging devices and other politeness strategies	21	18.9	3	15.0	7	29.2	7	24.1	4	10.5

Comparison group	Researcher to Participant		Ann		Bob		Claire		Dave	
Total number of feedback exchanges (feedback letters)	12 exchanges		3		3		3		3	
n = Number of segments % = relative percentage distribution in comparison group	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	214	36.9	45	21.0	47	22.0	61	28.5	61	28.5
<b>Non-visible revision comment</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Sub-class</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>
Reference	29	56.9	7	70.0	4	30.8	12	66.7	6	60.0
Explicit praise	9	17.6	1	10.0	4	30.8	2	11.1	2	20.0
Answer to cover letter (excluding explicit praise)	13	25.5	2	20.0	5	38.5	4	22.2	2	20.0
<b>Sub-class (excluding sub-class of reference)</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>
Unjustified	5	22.7	2	66.7	1	11.1	2	33.3	0	0.0
Explicit justification	16	72.7	1	33.3	8	88.9	3	50.0	4	100.0
Other contiguous comments	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0
<b>Cover letter response (explicit praise)</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>
Yes	8	88.9	1	100	4	100	2	100	1	50
Indirectly	0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No	1	11.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
<b>Ambiguous comment</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Sub Class/ Class</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Neutral summarisation	3	37.5	1	50	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0.0
Hedged response (affective)	5	62.5	1	50	2	66.7	2	66.7	0	0.0
<b>Non-revision comment</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Sub Class/ Class</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100</b>
Group cohesion (societal norms)	33	75.0	10	76.9	6	85.7	8	72.7	9	69.2
Affective (building rapport)	8	18.2	2	15.4	1	14.3	2	18.2	3	23.1
Open communication (motivational)	3	6.8	1	7.7	0	0.0	1	9.1	1	7.7
<b>Affective AND Open communication</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>
Unjustified	8	72.7	3	100	1	100	1	33.3	3	75
Explicit justification	1	9.1	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0
Other contiguous comments	2	18.2	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	1	25