Introduction

According to statistics compiled by the College Entrance Examination Center (CEEC, 2014) in Taiwan, only 28.53% (10777) of all examinees (147478) passed the English Composition Test, implying that most Taiwanese university students' English writings lack the characteristics of good writing. As the writing rubrics of the CEEC (2015) suggest, a good piece of writing should have fully-developed content, coherent organization, accurate sentence constructions and grammatical usage, appropriate word choice, and correct mechanics. Unfortunately, Taiwanese student writings are often replete with short sentences, inadequate connection of ideas, and incorrect language use (Chen, 2002; Su, 1997). According to scholars, the unsatisfactory quality of Taiwanese students' English writings is probably caused by the factors such as insufficient reading input, lack of writing practice, and lack of instant human feedback (Tsai, 2010; Yang, 2008).

As research studies have pointed out, there is a relevant connection between reading and writing, and better readers tend to write better than poorer readers (Leki, 1993; Spivey & King, 1989; Stotsky, 1983). However, Taiwanese university students often lack practice in writing and they seldom read inspiring English books (Tsai, 2010). Consequently, their vocabulary is limited, and they have little background knowledge. If students want to improve their writing skills, they must first read extensively and write constantly.

Moreover, they also need someone to help them edit and revise their writing. Such an approach has been suggested by many scholars (e.g., Elbow, 1973; Zamel, 1982), who believe that only through continuous revisions can a good writing eventually be produced. Taiwanese English teachers consequently face a dilemma over who is the most suitable person to do the editing. When student writings are revised by just one instructor, students usually cannot benefit from instant feedback because of the large class sizes. To resolve this problem, some Taiwanese teachers have incorporated peer feedback to their writing classrooms as it is recommended by writing scholars (e.g., Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Lee & Wang, 2011; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994). These scholars believe that peer response can facilitate student learning interest and social interaction; it also helps students improve writing qualities.

However, the effects of peer feedback still seem inconclusive. Other scholars have pointed out some disadvantages of peer feedback, such as the decreased confidence in

student writing abilities, especially for those with inadequate English competence. It is also noted that peer feedback may damage relationships among peers, probably caused by peers' caustic criticisms about the writing (Amros, 1997; Carson & Nelson, 1996). Or, particularly for some Asian students, their cultural backgrounds may prevent them from criticizing other people's writings in order to maintain group harmony (Bender, 1989; Leki, 1990). Fortunately, this problem might be overcome with the help of the computer technology. Using online peer feedback to review student writings has been recommended by scholars (Liang, 2010; Tuzi, 2004; Ware & Warschauer, 2006). According to scholars (e.g., Liu & Sadler, 2003), one big advantage of online peer feedback is that the audience might be more comfortable with the idea of pointing out the writer's mistakes when they do not see the writer's face. Another advantage of online feedback is that the online interaction generates more activity because cyberspace allows learners to meet people beyond time and space limits.

Inspired by the previous studies, the researchers of the present study believe that effective writing instruction in the Taiwanese university context should include appropriate and sufficient reading input, constant writing practice, and corrective feedback. Accordingly, the researchers conducted this reading-to-write peer-learning project in our writing classrooms. The researchers firstly adopted literary texts as reading materials, and then the researchers requested each student to write summaries of the literary texts as the writing practices. The rationale of using summary writing is that such genre has been commonly tested on both college graduation requirement exams in Taiwan and the new TOEFL test in recent years (Chen & Su, 2012), Also, a summary writing task requires learners to completely understand the reading text, select the main ideas, combine similar ideas into categories, and write in his/her own words. To avoid the problem of plagiarism, learners often have to use strategies such as replacing words with synonyms and changing sentence structures (McDonough, Crawford, & Vleeschauwer, 2014). Therefore, the use of summary writing could assess not only reading comprehension, but also check vocabulary use and understanding of restructuring of sentences, which are crucial skills in a good writing and most Taiwanese students still lack.

After students posted their summaries in the website, their group members would give online responses. Although research (e.g., Liou & Peng, 2009; Yang & Meng, 2013) has suggested online peer revision may prove to be valuable in a learning environment such as Taiwan, where the students are likely to be intimated to correct their peers'