

## An Exploration of Authors' Circle: A Scholarly Writing Peer Feedback Process

Jacqueline M. Swank  
*University of Missouri*, [jswank@missouri.edu](mailto:jswank@missouri.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/jcps>



Part of the [Counselor Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Swank, J. M. (2023). An Exploration of Authors' Circle: A Scholarly Writing Peer Feedback Process. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, 17(1). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/jcps/vol17/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@SHU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@SHU. For more information, please contact [lysobeyb@sacredheart.edu](mailto:lysobeyb@sacredheart.edu).

---

## An Exploration of Authors' Circle: A Scholarly Writing Peer Feedback Process

### Abstract

Doctoral students need to develop scholarly writing skills if they plan to work in academia. This study focused on the lived experiences of five counselor education doctoral students engaging in a peer feedback activity throughout a course designed to help them develop writing skills. The researcher identified five main themes from the data: (a) hesitancy and normalizing the experience; (b) development as a writer; (c) learning about, developing relationships with, and collaborating with peers; (d) self-confidence; and (e) areas to consider. The author discusses implications for teaching and research.

### Keywords

doctoral students, scholarly writing, peer feedback, qualitative, counselor education

Feedback contributes to growth and development. Within the learning environment, students may receive feedback from instructors, supervisor, and peers. In doctoral education, students need to develop scholarly writing skills, especially students pursuing a career in academia, as faculty have pressure to publish at high levels. Doctoral students may also strive for publications to strengthen their application for an academic position.

Receiving feedback through article peer review is a crucial step in publishing. Therefore, students may benefit from receiving feedback about their scholarly writing prior to this experience. Additionally, although a goal might be obtaining publications, researchers emphasize the importance of shifting the focus to the writing process required to achieve publications (Kolb et al., 2013).

### **Writing Process Framework**

Peer feedback, grounded in a constructivist paradigm, involves cognitive and social processes (Diab, 2011). Through peer feedback, students develop knowledge in recognizing good writing and using strong writing skills, and take ownership for their learning (Diab, 2011). Kolb et al. (2013) created a writing process model emphasizing three principles: (a) the writing process has various steps, (b) steps occur in a sequence but may also be repeated, and (c) new ideas might be developed at any stage. Kolb et al.'s model encompassed four domains: (a) planning, (b) pre-writing, (c) drafting, and (d) revising. In planning, students think about their topic and collect information. During pre-writing, students take notes, brainstorm, and engage in other writing tasks with the audience being themselves. Drafting involves writing a draft. Finally, revising encompasses editing. Thus, in Kolb et al.'s model, each domain is important, as well as the process of repeating domains. Giving feedback is also crucial.

### **Feedback within the Writing Process**

Although important, instructors may struggle with providing students feedback multiple times. Peer feedback may help address this (Baker, 2016). Peer feedback on early drafts also addresses students waiting until late in the semester to begin writing, providing more time for content, grammatical, and writing style revisions (Baker, 2016). Regarding scheduling, Baker (2016) found setting the peer review date four weeks before the assignment deadline was effective in getting undergraduate students ( $N = 91$ ) to start writing earlier. Baker also found most students offered meaningful feedback when the instructor provided feedback guidelines. However, Cho and MacArthur (2010) found undergraduate students ( $N = 28$ ) provided useful feedback without training. Nevertheless, instructors may provide training, due to yielding possible improvements in feedback quality and quantity (Dressler et al., 2019).

In comparing peer to instructor feedback among students ( $N = 61$ ), Cassidy and Bailey (2018) found 95% valued peer feedback, with 60% reporting it was as helpful as instructor feedback. Additionally, Dressler et al. (2019) found no significant difference in willingness to address instructor and peer feedback among nine graduate students. Huisman et al. (2019) also found similar levels of writing improvement with peer and instructor feedback. Furthermore, Cho and MacArthur (2010) reported students might understand peer feedback more than faculty comments because peers share problems and use common language.

Regarding integration of peer feedback, researchers found most students revise their writing (Baker, 2016; Cassidy & Bailey, 2018), and make significant improvements (Crossman & Kite, 2012; Huisman et al., 2019). Researchers found writing improvement among graduate level business students ( $N = 208$ ; Crossman & Kite, 2012). Additionally, Huisman et al. (2019) found peer feedback contributed to greater improvement compared to self-review and no feedback. Simonsmeier et al. (2020) also found peer feedback increased academic self-concept in writing among undergraduate students ( $N = 52$ ).

Leighton et al. (2013) presented the Learning Errors and Formative Feedback (LEAFF) model focused on establishing a safe space where students are willing to be vulnerable, take risks in sharing, and open to feedback. Cho and MacArthur (2010) found those receiving feedback from multiple peers made more revisions than those receiving feedback from one peer or expert, with peers providing more nondirective feedback than an expert. The researchers concluded peer feedback might be easier for students to understand, and receiving feedback from multiple peers provides more comments.

Giving feedback may also improve the reviewer's writing. Inouye and McAlpine (2019) found a relationship between students' critique of others' writing and assessment of their own writing. Cassidy and Bailey (2018) found 89% of students reported that giving feedback helped them improve their own writing, and 60% reported revising their own papers based on feedback they gave to peers (Cassidy & Bailey, 2018). Ludemann and McMakin (2014) also found students ( $N = 32$ ) reported giving peer feedback was more helpful than receiving it. Furthermore, Cho and MacArthur (2011) assessed students' ( $N = 61$ ) writing skills, and found students that providing feedback on a peer's paper demonstrated stronger writing skills than those who read a peer's paper, or those that neither read nor provided feedback. The peer feedback process may also contribute to writing autonomy, confidence (Inouye & McAlpine, 2019), and improved skills in reflection, critical thinking, determination, and peer interactions (Crossman & Kite, 2012).

Scholars emphasize the importance of peer feedback; however, the author found limited research on doctoral students' experiences with peer feedback within a course to develop scholarly writing, and no studies focused on the use of peer feedback in fostering scholarly writing skills among doctoral students in counselor education. Thus, in the current study, the author explored doctoral students' experiences with a peer feedback process, known as author's

circle, in writing a manuscript. The research question was: What are the lived experiences of counselor education doctoral students participating in authors' circle, a peer feedback course activity?

## **Method**

### **Research Design**

The researcher used a qualitative, phenomenological research design. In phenomenology, the researcher attempts to explore the phenomenon without presumptions (Moustakas, 1994). This design was appropriate because the purpose was to explore the lived experiences of the population with the phenomenon (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Moustakas, 1994).

### **Researcher**

The researcher is a white, female counselor educator with 12 years of teaching experience. She has used authors' circle in teaching counselor education doctoral classes. Students have shared informally that authors' circle helped them develop writing skills. The researcher believes peer feedback is beneficial. Before beginning the study, the researcher met with a colleague to bracket her attitudes and beliefs about peer feedback and authors' circle.

### **Participants**

Participants included four doctoral students and one doctoral graduate in counselor education. Four participants were female and one was male, ranging in age from 27-33. Regarding race, four students identified as White, and one as Black. Two had published a manuscript they developed during authors' circle, one had her manuscript in review, and two reported they had not pursued manuscript publication.

### **Intervention**

Authors' circle involves students meeting in small groups multiple times to obtain feedback on manuscript development. All participants experienced authors' circle during a

seminar class in their first semester in the program, where they wrote a conceptual manuscript, with a goal to submit the manuscript for publication. Four participants engaged in authors' circle during one additional course. Authors' circle is a course activity the author adapted from a retired faculty member.

Students participated in authors' circle three to four times during the semester, during multiple stages in Kolb et al.'s (2013) writing process. This involved discussing manuscript ideas, reviewing concept maps, and providing feedback on multiple drafts. A week prior to authors' circle, students emailed their documents to their peers to review. Students shared areas they wanted feedback on, and peers also provided general feedback. In addition to verbal feedback, students completed a written feedback form, with the option also to provide tracked changes edits/comments in the documents. Each authors' circle lasted 45 to 90 minutes, where the same student groupings met together. The instructor, author of this manuscript, also rotated among the groups to model the feedback process. Additionally, the instructor allowed time at the end for processing.

## **Procedure**

Following institutional review board approval, the researcher used purposive sampling by sending a recruitment email and the informed consent document to counselor education doctoral students and graduates who had participated in authors' circle during a three-year period, excluding students whose dissertation committees the researcher was currently serving on. Ten individuals were eligible and invited to participate. Contacting the researcher to schedule an interview constituted consent. The interviews lasted 30-50 minutes. The researcher conducted and transcribed the interviews using the online video conference platform Zoom. The researcher also sent the transcripts to the interviewees for member checking. All participants reviewed their transcripts, with two providing minimal edits. There was no compensation for participation.

## **Data Collection**

The interview questions focused on the participants' experiences engaging in authors' circle. This included the things they learned, and what they took away from it. Participants were also asked a few demographic questions.

## **Data Analysis and Verification Procedures**

For data analysis, the researcher used the method for analyzing phenomenological data described by Moustakas (1994). First, the researcher bracketed her assumptions, beliefs, and experiences related to peer feedback and authors' circle. She also engaged in this process throughout data collection through reflexive memos. After reviewing the transcripts, and revising them based on participants' feedback, the researcher analyzed them to identify significant statements. Next, she grouped these statements together, known as meaning units, and then identified themes. This process is known as horizontalization (Moustakas, 1994). Finally, the researcher selected participants' quotations that represented the themes.

## **Findings**

The researcher identified five themes. The themes were: (a) hesitancy and normalizing the experience; (b) development as a writer; (c) learning about, developing relationships with, and collaborating with peers; (d) self-confidence; and (e) areas to consider. Additionally, the development as a writer theme had four subthemes: (a) communication of ideas, (b) multiple perspectives, (c) skill development, and (d) reviewing others' work. The areas to consider also had four subthemes: (a) extension of use, (b) group selection, (c) timing, and (d) structure of feedback. The subthemes are also discussed below.

### **Hesitancy and Normalizing the Experience**

The first theme focused on initial hesitance about having others review their writing. Carrie shared, "I enjoyed it, but it wasn't something that I...have experienced before, so going in



I was a little unsure. It was nerve wracking, like, oh my gosh, other people are going to look at my work and critique it.” She further reported that she experienced, “imposter syndrome of like they're going to call me out. They're going to know I'm a fraud in my writing. Initial hesitation that my work was going to be judged was challenging to overcome.”

Participants also commented on realizing they were not alone in experiencing hesitancy, which provided comfort and reassurance. Sasha stated, “It makes it less intimidating going in. Although you're kind of fearful of judgment, it alleviates some of that. I think we need to get that support; they're going through the same processes. It normalized the experience.” Additionally, Andrew shared, “Sometimes it can be an overwhelming experience and...your peers are telling you the same thoughts that they're having. So it's comforting...it's reassuring...it was a way to grow together, lean on each other, have that camaraderie.”

## **Development as a Writer**

### ***Communication of Ideas***

Participants shared that authors' circle allowed them to clarify their manuscript ideas. Sasha reported, “I had an idea going in, but it wasn't as formulated as I thought...It was helpful to process it with other people out loud.... They were able to help me to talk through it, so that I could write. Additionally, Carrie commented, “If they [peers] said you didn't say what this was...[that] allowed me to take a step back...I didn't explain that. It's in my head, but it wasn't actually on paper. It allowed me to focus the writing...for larger conceptualization. Finally, Brittany shared, “It strengthens my idea being able to brainstorm and talk about it and talk through it, so I think it helped fine tune my idea...I felt really energized after I left authors' circle...connecting on that level.” Although most students reported authors' circle helped with clarifying ideas, Jessica stated, “I feel like maybe my expectations of what the authors' circle

experience would be were maybe higher than they should have been, and maybe that kind of resulted in me feeling like a little bit unnecessarily disappointed.”

### ***Multiple Perspectives***

Participants shared they obtained multiple perspectives regarding their writing. Sasha commented, “It was great to hear it from another lens, someone who's not specializing in my same areas of interest because sometimes we have our own blinders on...They were very helpful guiding me throughout the paper and keeping me motivated.” Additionally, Carrie discussed multiple perspectives being helpful in the publishing process. She stated, “Getting more perspectives on a manuscript that you're writing, it's only going to benefit it... If you submit a paper....it’s already gone through a couple hands, couple edits...I would submit better quality of work.”

### ***Skill Development***

Students described the peer feedback process as contributing to their skills development in multiple ways. Brittany shared, “[It helped my] research skills...things to add to literature reviews...honing in on a research design...poking holes into your research and methodology...broadened my lens... It helped me to be a more concise writer, go into less flowery language.” She also stated, “I learned how to receive feedback and how to give feedback in a better way...become more open to feedback and listening to it...also learn how to provide feedback to others in a way that could be digestible.” Moreover, she reported, “Getting feedback from peers is a lot less intimidating than faculty at the beginning...As we all became more confident in our feedback and in our opinions, we all grew...I began to value peers’ feedback just as much as faculty.”

Regarding writing experiences following authors’ circle, Carrie commented, “Even writing my dissertation, I’m taking the ideas that I remember from authors’ circle and applying

them. I don't see my cohort anymore....So it's more like hearing their voice in the back of my head...It's helped my writing tremendously.” Sasha also reported, “I'm realizing how it launched a lot of different things for us like as far as writing...I think it was something that was vital to the program for us to move forward.” Finally, Brittany shared, “It's such an invaluable tool to develop that critical thinking...It really helped me to be a reviewer for a journal.”

### ***Reviewing Others' Work***

Participants also described reviewing their peers' writing. Sasha reported, “It was a good frame of reference to refer to another person's paper and see what corrections I need to make...I think it strengthened me to see several other writings styles in addition to my own.” Additionally, Carrie shared, “I also got to review my peers' work...being able to see how other people write...and reflect on my own work...[It was] an opportunity to grow academically.”

### **Learning About, Developing Relationships with, and Collaborating with Peers**

Students described learning about their peers personally and professionally, and developing relationships. Carrie shared, “The topics they chose allowed me to have more insight [about them]....learning how they would edit...It helped me relate better with them. It helped us form together as a cohort...learn about their writing preferences, and preferred research style.” Additionally, Sasha commented, “It was a great way to launch my doctoral experience...We learned about one another's interest. It was a great way to build rapport and to connect with our peers... It gives that affirmation, support....and keeps you accountable.” Brittany also stated, “[It was] an opportunity to learn about each other, our experiences, and what's meaningful to us, a space where we can be open and honest...Over time we built strong working relationships... our feedback got richer...We can voice our opinions freely.” Finally, Jessica commented, “Something that I took away was the personal characteristics of peers and colleagues that I want

to work with, what I'm looking for. I want other people to be invested in the projects as much as myself.”

The participants also discussed their experiences leading to future collaborations. Carrie shared, “[It] led to collaborations later on, a lot of presentations together both me joining their topics, but as well as them joining in my topic.” Additionally, Sasha stated, “It encouraged me to write with other people, collaborate with others, and process ideas in the same way...It helped to instill a team ethic in me that I think helped translate to me joining other writing teams.”

### **Self-Confidence**

Participants shared they developed self-confidence, which provided encouragement for writing. Carrie shared, “I'm a better writer than I was giving myself credit for...I learned to trust the skills that I did have. Even early on if they were shaky doesn't mean that they were bad.” Additionally, Sasha commented, “I learned to find my voice...Getting that reassurance that my voice matters and that the research needs to be done. It reaffirms my interest in wanting to write more and continue to collaborate with others.” She also stated, “Having compassionate peer feedback...allowed me to be gentle with myself. In my writing now, I'm more encouraged, more motivated by having that reference of what my peers said...I'm telling myself, you got this.”

### **Areas to Consider**

#### ***Extension of Use***

Discussion of authors' circle focused on participation beyond one semester. In experiencing it within a second class, Carrie stated, “It was more of an expectation of, here's what we're doing. ...I have more awareness of my weaknesses in writing and then seeking out my peers who would help strengthen that area. It definitely got better.” Additionally, Andrew commented, “We got into the groove of it more since we already practiced it once. We understand what this process is and how it can be...I'm used to it now; therefore, you can gain

more out of it.” Participants also reported wanting more opportunities for authors’ circle throughout the program. Andrew stated, “I think it’s a really valuable system that could be placed into any class that has a paper.” Brittany shared, “I wish that it was something that we could have continued doing throughout our time, even through the dissertation stage...I love that feeling of collaboration and sense of community.” She also commented, “I feel like authors’ circle was kind of an ideal way to collaborate and work with others. I wish actual collaboration outside the classroom was done in that way. You’re in a research team sort of model.”

Participants also discussed possible integration in the master’s program within classes, and other experiences. Carrie stated, “I think it could help with...bigger master’s assignments. I think that would give master’s students an opportunity to see others’ interests, again, make those connections. Additionally, Jessica commented, “I think maybe being able to have a conversation with each other in the theories class. Meet every so often in writing and developing their theory paper.” Finally, Brittany reported, “It would be appropriate for those thinking about doing a thesis, and more classroom focused papers on how do we strengthen writing our ideas.”

### ***Group Selection***

The participants discussed the value of the instructor grouping students. Sasha shared, “I like that it was random...I can see that if I had a choice that we would have gravitated to [certain] people... I don’t think it would have been beneficial for us to have chosen [our groups] ourselves.” Additionally, Brittany stated, “If you’re kind of new to one another, you gravitate towards people that you feel comfortable with...[instead of] challenging each other to be with people they wouldn’t pair themselves with.” Finally, Carrie mentioned the possibility of anonymous feedback in commenting, “My initial thought would be to make it more anonymous, but I’m not really sure how that could work, especially because we were broken off into groups.”

In selecting groups when using authors' circle multiple times in the program, Jessica commented, "In the beginning of the program it was helpful, almost forcing us to connect with each other, but I feel like once we're in the middle and later on, it would be helpful to pick our own groups." Brittany also shared, "It can be beneficial to stay in one group for a whole semester, but then mixing up the formation the next semester...It is great to have continuous feedback throughout the semester, but also the value of others' perspectives." Finally, participants discussed group membership challenges. Andrew reported, "If I had to get stuck with somebody for the whole semester, and I didn't get along with them, that might be hard to give feedback and be real about it, and take their feedback without criticism."

### ***Timing***

Timing of authors' circle included time between submission and discussion, and length and number of sessions. Regarding timing, Carrie stated, "I felt like the timing between when I would have to submit it to my peers to when we were to discuss it in class was appropriate." Additionally, Sasha commented, "[Regarding] the due date to get it back to the person, I can see how that could have been a detriment to our circle if someone wasn't given the feedback; being strict with deadlines helped." Regarding the length of authors' circle, Jessica shared, "I would have really liked if the experience, like each individual authors' circle was longer." Regarding the number of sessions, she also stated, "A few more meetings would have been helpful, and even that could account for giving more time to get into deeper, more meaningful conversations around each other's papers and each other's ideas and feedback." Finally, Andrew discussed the challenges with reviewing other students' writing in preparation for authors' circle. He stated, "Sometimes when you are swamped with your own papers, it seems like geez I have to read these 20 page papers...It seems like a lot of work....But we're there to help each other...it's a trade off." Jessica also commented on this challenge reporting, "For others it seemed like it was

an extra task and they didn't seem fully invested in other people's work or giving other people feedback.”

### ***Structure of Feedback***

Finally, participants discussed the level of structure the instructor provided regarding giving feedback. Some discussed the importance of the directions (i.e., feedback form) for the feedback process and role modeling how to give feedback. Carrie stated, “I think that [feedback form] can definitely help guide early authors’ circles, especially like that first one of, like, here's the type of feedback to give your peers, just have like more of an understanding.” Additionally, Brittany commented, “Modeling as a faculty member how to provide feedback is important...watching a faculty member provide feedback to each individual person...[Then], processing how the feedback sounded compared to the feedback you [students] provided each other.” Participants also discussed the importance of sharing the areas they wanted feedback. Andrew stated, “We each have our own individual idea of what feedback we want to give, having the time to say this is what I want feedback on... Encouraging the students before authors’ circle starts to say what they’re looking for.” Finally, Brittany shared difficulty with structuring feedback when peers were not receptive to it. She stated, “The harder times for me were when members were not quite as receptive to feedback....when people would get more defensive and kind of closed off to feedback. Those were the only times that I felt discouraged, or felt frustrated.”

### **Discussion**

The study focused on understanding doctoral students’ experiences with a peer feedback model. The first theme focused on uncertainty about the feedback process and discovering everyone felt some hesitancy. Students recognizing their peers felt similarly may have

contributed to developing a safe space, which is crucial for taking risks and sharing (Leighton et al., 2013).

The second theme focused on writer development. The first subtheme pertained to students talking through their ideas and get feedback about communicating them. Students shared that peer feedback helped them determine if they were clearly articulating their ideas and ways to improve their writing. This finding is consistent with previous research showing peer feedback improved writing (Crossman & Kite, 2012; Huisman et al., 2019). One student acknowledged frustration because her expectations were higher than what she experienced, with some being unprepared, and therefore, not able to provide quality feedback. This emphasizes the importance of the instructor and students both communicating their expectations. Providing feedback training, as suggested by Dressler et al. (2019), may help ensure everyone understands the expectations.

Regarding the second subtheme, students shared that having multiple perspectives helped address blind spots. Cho and MacArthur (2010) found that feedback from multiple peers was beneficial. Discussing information from a different lens may help clarify ideas, and hearing similar feedback may help recognize blind spots.

In the third subtheme, students reported the feedback process helped with developing writing and research skills (e.g., improving their review of literature, designing studies, articulating ideas, writing style). This was useful for their manuscript and future writing. Students shared they improved in giving and receiving feedback. They also noticed that their peers improved in giving feedback, and they valued peer feedback as much as instructor feedback. Previous researchers also found peer feedback improved students' writing (Crossman & Kite, 2012; Husiman et al., 2019) and academic self-concept (Simonsmeier et al., 2020). Scholars also found students valued peer, as much as faculty, feedback (Cassidy & Bailey, 2018;



Dressler et al., 2019), and they improved their writing as much with peer feedback (Huisman et al., 2019).

The fourth subtheme focused on the benefits of reviewing others' work. Students reported that reviewing their peers' writing helped them develop their own writing, which is consistent with previous research (Cassidy & Bailey, 2018; Cho & MacArthur, 2011; Inouye & McAlpine, 2019). Thus, giving feedback may also improve writing.

Students discussed learning about their peers and developing relationships and collaborations (third theme). The experience was within a cohort model, and the students were in their first semester. They valued connecting with their peers, and the connections they formed may have enriched the environment for taking risks and being open and honest with feedback, as Leighton et al. (2013) emphasize the importance of a safe environment.

Self-confidence, the fourth theme, focused on participants sharing that the experience facilitated the development of their confidence and motivation for continuing to write. Inouye and McAlpine (2019) found peer feedback contributed to writer autonomy and confidence. Thus, authors' circle may have helped foster positive perspectives about writing early in the program.

The final theme focused on areas to consider with implementing authors' circle. Students shared how authors' circle could be useful in master's and doctoral programs. Researchers have examined peer feedback used in undergraduate (Baker, 2016; Simonsmeier et al., 2020) and graduate training (e.g., Dressler et al., 2019; Inouye & McAlpine, 2019). Students also valued the instructor determining group assignments initially, while one participant valued selecting who she worked with in subsequent experiences. Timing was also discussed related to reviewing writing and providing feedback, and length and number of feedback sessions. Baker (2016) found providing feedback four weeks prior to an assignment deadline was an effective strategy. However, authors' circle involved feedback provided multiple times. Participants valued some

structure, while also asking peers what they wanted feedback on. While some researchers have emphasized feedback training (Baker, 2016; Dressler et al., 2019), others have reported positive results without it (Cho & MacArthur, 2010). Thus, feedback training may vary by student group.

### **Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research**

There are limitations to consider for this study. First, the researcher was also the instructor. Although the researcher was not currently teaching any of the participants, nor was she in an evaluative role, their previous relationship may have influenced what they shared. Additionally, the participants may have experienced authors' circle differently than those that chose not to participate. Furthermore, some participants were involved in authors' circle a few years ago, which may have influenced their ability to remember the experience.

Future research may focus on examining the areas to consider identified in the last theme. Additionally, researchers may further explore the integration of authors' circle across a doctoral program, as well as the integration within the dissertation process, and use with master's and undergraduate students, as well as faculty. Furthermore, researchers may examine the relationship between authors' circle and writing productivity.

### **Implications for Counselor Education**

When implementing authors' circle within a class, it is important for the instructor and students to discuss their expectations. This promotes understanding the purpose and helps ensure everyone has similar expectations. This may also foster motivation and investment in the process. Students must also meet deadlines for having drafts ready for review and providing feedback. Additionally, it is essential for the instructor to create a safe space where students are willing to take risks and be vulnerable with each other.

Instructors may also consider assessing students' understanding of the feedback process and their skills in giving and receiving feedback to determine the need for feedback training.

Training may include the instructor demonstrating giving feedback. Additionally, instructors may integrate a feedback form for the receiver to identify what they want feedback on, and for the reviewer to record feedback. This may include specific areas to guide the reviewer in what to look for, such as content areas (e.g., research to support ideas), and grammar and writing style. Students may benefit from the instructor scaffolding the feedback process to provide more structure initially, with greater autonomy with continued use.

In this study, students discussed their experiences with a peer feedback process designed to help foster scholarly writing skills. Students revealed that authors' circle contributed to their personal and professional growth and development both within the classroom and beyond during other writing experiences. Thus, instructors may consider integrating authors' circle throughout the doctoral training experience to promote the development of scholarly writing skills and collaborations.

## References

- Baker, K. M. (2016). Peer review as a strategy for improving students' writing process. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17(3), 179-192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787416654794>
- Cassidy, R., & Bailey, D. (2018). L2 students' perceptions and practices of both giving and receiving online peer-feedback. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 21(1), 11-34. <https://doi.org/10.15702/mall.2018.21.1.11>
- Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2010). Student revision with peer and expert reviewing. *Learning and Instruction*, 20, 328-338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.006>
- Cho, K. & MacArthur, C. (2011). Learning by reviewing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(1), 73-84. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021950>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018) *Qualitative inquiry and research design choosing among five approaches*. (4th ed.). Sage.
- Crossman, J. M., & Kite, S. L. (2012). Facilitating improved writing among students through directed peer review. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 13(3), 219-229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787412452980>
- Diab, N. M. (2011). Assessing the relationship between different types of student feedback and the quality of revised writing. *Assessing Writing*, 16, 274-292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2011.08.001>
- Dressler, R., Chu, Man-Wai, Crossman, K., & Hilman, B. (2019). Quantity and quality of uptake: Examining surface and meaning-level feedback provided by peers and an instructor in a graduate research course. *Assessing Writing*, 39, 14-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.11.001>
- Huisman, B., Saab, N., van den Broek, P., & van Driel, J. (2019). The impact of formative peer feedback on higher education students' academic writing: A meta-analysis. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(6), 863-880. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1545896>
- Inouye, K., & McAlpine, L. (2019). Developing academic identity: A review of the literature on doctoral writing and feedback. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 14, 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4168>
- Kolb, K. H., Longest, K. C., & Jensen, M. J. (2013). Assessing the writing process: Do writing-intensive first-year seminars change how students write? *Teaching Sociology*, 4(1), 20-31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092055X12448777>
- Leighton, J. P., Chu, M.-W., & Seitz, P. (2013). Cognitive diagnostic assessment and the learning errors and formative feedback (LEAFF) model. In R. Lissitz (Ed.), *Informing the practice of teaching using formative and interim assessment: A systems approach* (pp. 183-207). Information Age Publishing.
- Ludemann, P. M., & McMakin, D. (2014). Perceived helpfulness of peer editing activities: First-

year students' views and writing performance outcomes. *Psychology Learning & Teaching*, 13(2), 129-136. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/plat.2014.13.2.129>

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Sage Publications.

Simonsmeier, B. A., Peiffer, H., Flaig, M., & Schneider, M. (2020). Peer feedback improves students' academic self-concept in higher education. *Research in Higher Education*, 61, 706-724. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-020-09591-y>