English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 25, No. 3 Fall 2019
https://doi.org/10.35828/etak.2019.25.3.21

Peer Feedback in Business Email Writing Classes for EFL College Students

Seon-Yoo Hwang
(Seowon University)

Hwang, Seon-Yoo (2019). Peer feedback in business email writing classes for EFL college students. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 25*(3). 21-40.

The study investigated effects of peer feedback used in business email writing classes for EFL college students. To this end, the 18 students were asked to fill out a questionnaire on feedback two times before and after the course and six students from three different English proficiency levels were interviewed to take a close look at what was happening in classes. The findings demonstrated they generally had positive perception on peer feedback, but providing and receiving feedback itself made no significant differences in perception of peer feedback. However, the results could imply that students' perception was moving from teacher feedback toward peer feedback. With regard to types of feedback, feedback on the content was getting more frequent with students experiencing peer feedback whereas the students provided feedback about surface-level features in the first writing task, 'introduction' task. In revising the text, the numbers of the revision were almost same in each writing task, but the types of revision varied from task to task. In 'introduction' task, deletion was the most common, but in 'invitation' and 'complaints' tasks they used adding and rearranging types more to express the exact meaning.

[feedback/peer feedback/EFL English writing/business email writing]

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing in English as an EFL student is considered as one of the most challenging and complex tasks that they encounter. Compared to the three other skills, writing is believed to be the most difficult skill for EFL learners. This is because they have to consider various aspects such as the topic, the function of the text and the prospective reader. What is more, they have to manage a language with which most of them are not familiar,

including a suitable format in which to present it. Therefore, writing is a skill that needs to be learnt and taught to the students, especially those who learn English as a foreign language (Brown, 2007).

EFL learners need to be able to write well, especially in today's world in which writing is becoming more important means of communication (Harmer, 2007; Scrivener, 2011; Weigle, 2002). The importance of accuracy in EFL writing promoted writing teachers to consider providing feedback on language-related issues during the writing process. A variety of procedures are now used to support revision for better writing performance. Students want to know what's wrong and feel that the teacher is primarily responsible for improving the quality of students' written output. That is why teachers have spent much of class time finding what students don't do well in a writing class. However, the emphasis has been on students to play an important role in order to improve their writings. Peer review process, the integrated activities to guide students in responding to each other's writing, has been considered a useful method to show them how to extend their abilities and focus on students' communicative powers in their writing (Johnson & Roen, 1989). Providing and receiving feedback from peers is substantial in the process of writing as it can improve writing performance.

Nonetheless, how peer feedback is conducted in a real class has been overlooked and limited, so it needs to be examined about how EFL learners perceive the feedback from their peers. Also, we need to answer how learners provide and receive and how they react to the peer feedback in details. Therefore, this study aims to answer the following research questions.

1) How do EFL students perceive feedback from peers in their writing classes?
2) What types of feedback do EFL students provide in their writing classes?
3) How do EFL students respond to the peer feedback in their writing classes?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Process-Based Writing Approach

A piece of writing is the outcome of a set of activities, which involves setting goals, generating ideas, organizing information, selecting appropriate language, making a draft, reading and reviewing it, then revising and editing. Writers go through the course of generating ideas, organizing them coherently by using discourse markers and rhetorical conventions to put them cohesively into a written text, revising text for clearer meaning, and editing text for appropriate grammar in order to produce a final product. Research

findings demonstrate that writing is not a linear sequence of each course. While a writer's product-the finished essay, story or novel-is presented in lines, the process that produces it is not linear at all (Hedge, 2008; Raimes, 1985; Zamel, 1983). The writing process is recursive and generative, which means students re-read their work, assess it, react, and move on. Therefore, revising takes place throughout the whole process of writing and the writing generally undergoes considerable changes such as adding something new, deleting sentences, and shifting paragraphs around and sometimes eliminating them.

Written products are the result of thinking, drafting, and revising procedures that require specialized skills that not every speaker develops naturally. Therefore, writing cannot be acquired and it needs to be taught and leant, especially those who learn English as a foreign language (Brown, 2007). Writing teachers have been mostly concerned with the final product of writing even though they recognize the process of writing is a series of activities that writers take. They measure up students' final product against a list of criteria that include content, organization, vocabulary use, grammar, and mechanical considerations such as spelling and punctuation.

Recently, teachers and researchers became better attuned to the advantage given to learners when they were seen as creators of language, when they were allowed to focus on content and message, and when their own individual intrinsic motives were put at the center of learning (Brown, 2007). The process view of writing focuses on the process of writing that leads to the final product. Writers can understand their own composing process and build repertoires of strategies for prewriting, drafting, and rewriting. The primary aim of the process approach is to help students to gain greater control over the cognitive strategies involved in composing because writing is the result of employing strategies to manage the composing process (Hedge, 2008). When writers' first draft goes through several steps of revision, their ideas become more and more close to what they want to write. Therefore, the process approach places central importance on the process of revision, which means that in process-based approach writers receive more feedback throughout the composing process not just on the final writing.

2. Peer Feedback

1) Benefits of Peer Feedback

Feedback plays an important role in the process approach to writing because revision is a recursive process that the writers experience to complete their writings. Feedback is defined as input that a reader gives a writer in a variety of forms, such as comments, questions, and suggestions, for a revision. Feedback helps writers figure out problematic

areas such as illogical organization and improper vocabulary choice which could lead the readers to confusion (Keh, 1990). A few decades ago, teachers were the only feedback providers thought to be perfect in grammar, vocabulary use, organization, spelling and punctuation. Students believe that teachers' feedback contribute to the development of their English writing skills because it helps them apprehend what to improve or avoid, acquire better English usage, and correct errors (Chin, 2007). Teachers have been found to apply uniform and inflexible standards to their students' writing and to respond according to the extent to which these texts conform to these standards (Moran, 1981).

A number of practical benefits of peer feedback have been suggested from the theoretical perspectives. The first benefit from peer interaction is that students get more feedback on their writing than they could from the teacher alone. Student writers receive feedback from multiple and mutually reinforcing perspectives (James, 1981; Lamberg, 1980). They get feedback from a more diverse audience bringing multiple perspectives. Students can receive a variety of feedback not only in quantity but quality, which leads to be approximate to what they want to put down on paper.

Second, Peer feedback may lead more often to revise their writing because they feel the peer reviewers are authentic readers. They become accountable in the way that writers are in real life, and this accountability is a strong incentive for clear and effective writing (Hedge, 2008). Peer feedback provides student writers with reactions, questions, and response from authentic readers who provide a stronger motivation for revision. They can take on more responsibility for improving their own work. From the viewpoint of an authentic reader, they can reorganize their thought after reviewing peer's work (Cazden, 1988). Collaborative writing provides students with readers and critics of their work in the classroom.

Third, students gain confidence from being able to read peers' writing text on similar tasks. Involving peers as a feedback provider in the revision process could be beneficial to not only improve writing product but also learn how to write. Through the process of peer feedback, they can get ideas about how to revise their own writing and they build confidence in writing.

Fourth, involving peers in the writing process harnesses the powerful educative force of peer influence that has been ignored and hence wasted by traditional forms of education (Bruffee, 1984). Students can be a source of information for each other so that they can take active roles in their own learning and they can review their ideas in light of peers' reaction (Hansen & Liu, 2005).

Finally, peer review activities build a sense of classroom community. All learning and knowledge including writing are socially constructed activities (Carson & Nelson, 1994), in which in turn follows from the Vygotsky's theory or Zone of Proximal Development that cognitive development of individual results from social interaction (Vygotsky, 1962).

As writing teachers, teachers gain a big advantage of peer feedback that they are aware of student's need in all modes of language-reading, writing, listening, speaking and thinking. They don't have to spend correcting grammar and checking spelling and punctuation any more. They have enough time to observe students peer discussion and read students' response on peer review sheets. As a result, they realize what students want to express in their writing. Moreover, teachers can figure out the source of writing difficulties when reviewing the peer feedback (Mittan, 1989)

On the other hand, researchers have identified potential and actual problems with peer feedback. The most prominent complaints are that students receive feedback from non-expert readers on ways in which their texts are unclear as to ideas and language. Student writers may not know what to look for in their peers' writing and not give specific and helpful feedback. Maybe, peer feedback is either too harsh or too complimentary in making comments, and these activities take up to much classroom time. Research has found that teachers appropriate their students' writing by establishing themselves as authorities. As a result, students are unlikely to make any effort to establish that their meaning has been misconstrued; the writer avoids or alters meaning rather than risk the teacher's disapproval (Schwartz, 1983). The serious problem is what students want to say is not as important as what their teachers want them to say when much of teachers' time is spent finding out and pointing out what students don't do well.

2) Previous Research

Some previous researchers provided the evidence that peer feedback is substantial to enhance the students' writing performance (Berggren, 2013; Hansen & Liu, 2005; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009). The students may be able to learn from their peers' writing as well. Comments from peers assist the learners to make revision on the individual writing. Through peer feedback EFL learners can learn from each other, especially from the more proficient ones (Berggren, 2013; Cho & Macarthur, 2011; Hu, 2005). Moon's study (2000) showed that Korean college students generally exchanged high-quality feedback and incorporated it in their revisions selectively by deciding for themselves what to revise in their own texts

In looking at revisions, the researchers (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Schmid, 1999) classified all changes in the student's texts as revised and discussed in the peer review, not revised and discussed in the peer review, and revised but not discussed in the peer review. Their studies showed the percentage of cases that students revised and discussed in the peer review was the highest. Most notable, however, is the fact that the percentage of cases that students revised but not discussed in the peer review. These studies demonstrated that undergraduate students were far more likely to incorporate peer

feedback suggestions (70%) in revision that were the graduate students (53%) and that the changes made by Schmid's (1999) subjects after receiving peer feedback were more helpful to essay quality than those made by the students in Ferris's study (2003) who got feedback from their teacher. As peer feedback providers, the learners who provided peer feedback performed better and outperformed than those who were receivers of the feedback (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009). Students' peer feedback can build the critical skills that are needed to analyze and revise their own writing. These provide strong evidence that peer feedback can have a substantial impact on revision.

III. METHOD

1. Participants

The participants for the study were 18 Korean EFL college students who were taking a business writing course designed to focus on writing business emails. The study included the students in a variety of majors including English, trades, management, food engineering, and environmental engineering. Their age ranged from 20 to 27. They took two 50-minute-long writing class per week. In terms of gender, male students were predominant in that they are 13 males and five females. According to the self-rated level of English writing proficiency, three students answered low level, eight students were intermediate, and seven students were high level of writing proficiency.

2. Email Writing Tasks

Ten writing tasks during the semester were completed, but three tasks were analyzed for the study because they are long enough to analyze and more likely to contain writers' ideas compared to the others. Of ten topics three topics, introducing yourself, inviting, and complaints, were selected for analysis.

In the first task, it was a brief and introductory email to a business acquaintance to introduce themselves, with writing about their academic career and work experience. The second task was to write an invitation in a different situation including opening and concluding an invitation. Then, they replied to an invitation choosing from two options: accepting or refusing an invitation. In case of accepting email, they can respond about likes and preferences. In general, a refusing email contains why it is not acceptable and it is better to say when is available. At the final task, the students had to write a complaint email explaining a problem and suggesting a solution and respond to the complaint.

Writing task 1

Imagine that you want to quit your present job and write an introductory email to responding job posting.

Writing task 2

Work with a partner. You, a Chinese business woman, is visiting your country to do business with your company. You have met only once before, in china last year. She took you to an excellent restaurant in Beijing. You invite her to dinner at a restaurant in your city. Think of a restaurant you know and choose a day and date.

Exchange the invitations you and your partner. One of you should accept the invitation and the other should refuse.

Writing task 3

Look at the photo below and write a complaint email using your own ideas.



3. Research Instrument

The research instrument used in the study was a questionnaire survey. The questionnaire items were developed especially on the basis of literature on writing feedback. Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the reliability of the questionnaire. Cronbach's alpha is close to .08, which indicates acceptable reliability. The figure means high internal consistency between the items meant to evaluate the same construct.

The questionnaire was divided into three parts. The first part contains demographic information including gender, major, self-rated level of proficiency, experience of feedback, and performance of writing tasks. The second part of the questionnaire was designed to answer the research questions about how they perceive the feedback from peers and teachers. In addition, the questionnaire also included open-ended questions for

the students to answer freely about their perception other than those provided in the questionnaire.

4. Procedures

The questionnaire survey was administered during the 2019 spring semester. The first part of the questionnaire is the background knowledge that contains self-rated English proficiency level, interest of writing class, extent of completing writing tasks in every class time in addition to gender, major, and college year. The other part mainly includes whether or not peer feedback is effective and what makes peer feedback effective. After the instructor gave clear and detailed explanation for the purpose of the questionnaire, students were asked to answer the questionnaire at the 2nd and 13th week of the class to compare before and after the feedback experiences. They were asked to choose one of five options on a five-point Likert scale, which measures the degree of the participants' agreement or disagreement on individual statements regarding feedback from peers and teachers. The Cronbach's alpha for the questionnaire is .816, suggesting that items have relatively a high internal consistency. Also interview was conducted at the 13th week. Six students were interviewed from three different levels of English proficiency based on their self-rated level.

Peer feedback was done during every other class time. In the first writing phase, the students wrote their first drafts for 30 minutes and reviewed their peers' writing in pairs. Then, they were asked to complete a separate feedback table sheet, where students marked what they didn't understand and which part was not clear in meaning as well as what's wrong. After they exchanged their feedback comment, they had an opportunity to review and check the peer's comments. Then, the students were given time to revise their writing based on the received feedback.

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS. Statistical methods employed for the perception about peer feedback included a t-test and the level of statistical significance was set at .05. The data regarding effectiveness of peer feedback, the types of the feedback and responses to the feedback were calculated and presented in percentage.

IV. RESULTS

For each research question, research findings are presented followed by analysis and interpretation.

1. How Do Students Perceive Peer Feedback in Writing Classes?

As mentioned, a questionnaire was conducted to know their perception about peer feedback when students received and provided peer feedback during their writing class.

TABLE 1

Perception of Peer Feedback

Item	pre/post	*N*	*M*	*p*
Peer feedback is helpful in performing writing task.	pre	17	4.28	.77
	post	18	4.33	
I am interest in writing.	pre	17	3.53	.55
	post	18	3.72	
Peer feedback is helpful in improving writing ability.	pre	17	4.05	.99
	post	18	4.06	
Peer feedback is effective in writing skills.	pre	17	3.38	.39
	post	18	3.72	

*p<.05

As shown in Table 1, the results showed that performing writing tasks and improving writing ability had high average points, so students perceived peer feedback was effective in completing a writing task and developing their writing abilities. However, there is no meaningful difference in perception about peer feedback, including performance in a writing task, interest in writing, improvement in writing ability, and effectiveness in writing skills, between before and after the peer feedback activities. In the response to the question regarding effectiveness in writing skills, they showed more positive answer than before feedback activities, but it failed to reach a high degree to be statistically meaningful.

The next questions were about what makes students think peer feedback is effective or ineffective in their writing and the answers showed interesting results in Table 2. In pre survey, the most frequent response was that peer feedback made them nervous about showing their writings to their peers, so they paid more attention to the writing. This resulted in better performance in writings. However, in post survey after they had experience in receiving and providing peer feedback, they commented quality of peer feedback was the cause of effectiveness of peer feedback, because peers provided specific and detailed feedback. They realized specific and detailed feedback actually contributed to revising and developing their writings as they had chances to receive feedback from peers. They have known what kinds of feedback are workable for improving their writings. It is interpreted they were getting more concentrated on the

nature of feedback itself, which indicates a positive sign for peer feedback. In addition, they answered peer feedback is helpful by correcting their mistake and providing different point of view. In other words, peer feedback made it possible to review their writing and know what writers didn't think about, which leads to improvement of their writing.

TABLE 2

Effectiveness of Peer Feedback

Question	Response	Pre	Post
		N(%)	*N*(%)
What makes they think peer feedback is effective?	to show their peers their writings	7(50%)	6(37.5%)
	to contribute to better writing	4(28.6%)	3(18.5%)
	to provide detailed and specific feedback	3(21.4%)	7(43.8%)
What makes they think peer feedback is ineffective?	not sure it is correct	5(41.7%)	3(33.3%)
	not enough English abilities	4(33.3%)	3(33.3%)
	not faithful to provide feedback	2(16.7%)	3(33.3%)
	different point of view	1(8.3%)	0(0%)

The main reason that the students considered teachers' feedback useful was correctness of feedback in comparison with the peer feedback (Table 3). This is connected with the reasons of ineffectiveness of peer feedback (Table 2). They believe teachers' feedback is a valued and reliable source that they are able to depend on, while peer feedback couldn't offer this benefit because they are unsure peer feedback is appropriate in accordance with the situations.

TABLE 3

Effectiveness of Teachers' Feedback

Question	Response	Pre	Post
		N(%)	*N*(%)
What makes they think teachers' feedback is effective?	It is correct.	10(55.6%)	12(70.6%)
	It is helpful in improving writings.	5(27.8%)	3(17.6%)
	It motivates writing.	2(11.1%)	2(11.8%)
	It is learnable.	1(5.6%)	0(0%)
What makes they think teachers' feedback is ineffective?	It is different from writers' ideas.	3(50%)	4(80%)
	It is ambiguous.	1(16.7%)	1(20%)

Regarding types of feedback, they answered correcting grammatical errors was very useful at the pre-survey, but at the post-survey, indicating what is wrong was considered as their favorite and useful feedback (Table 4). One of the interviewees said he was concerned with how to make a sentence and combine sentences by using correct grammar at the earlier part of the course. As the course continued and he repeated the process of writing, correcting and editing, he has had some knowledge of grammar and a little confidence in controlling grammar rules in order to make a sentence and combine sentences. Therefore, indicating incorrect or ambiguous points is more likely to correct the errors and edit the text to enhance the writings.

TABLE 4

Effective Feedback

Question	Response	Pre	Post
		N(%)	*N*(%)
Types of effective feedback	Correcting grammatical errors	6(33.3%)	4(22.2%)
	Indicating what is wrong	4(22.2%)	7(38.9%)
	Suggesting ideas about content of the text	4(22.2%)	2(11.1%)
	Highlighting what is good	2(11.1%)	4(22.2%)
	Pointing out positive aspects about content of the text	2(11.1%)	1(5.6%)
Persons for feedback	Teachers	11(61.1%)	7(38.9%)
	Peers	1(5.6%)	2(11.1%)
	Teachers and peers	6(33.3%)	9(50%)
Language in which you want to receive feedback	Korean and English	10(55.6%)	10(55.6%)
	Korean	3(16.7%)	3(16.7%)
	English	1(5.6%)	2(11.1%)

In response to the question about the person suitable to provide feedback, more students answered teachers and peers were reliable for useful feedback at the post-survey while the person was teachers only at the pre-survey. From this result, focus seems to change from teachers to peers who can provide constructive feedback for their writings after their feedback experiences. Also, they want to receive feedback in Korean and English. It could be explained that the native language makes up for their poor English to fully express their ideas and the target language is easy to directly use in their writing.

2. What Types of Feedback Do Students Provide?

The next issue is what kinds of feedback the students provide for peers in actual class. In Table 5, word count indicates how many words students use to express their ideas or thought. The longer writing is, the more feedback students might give. For the analysis this study used five categories: punctuation, grammar, outline, word choice, and content of the text. The analysis demonstrated that punctuation feedback was the most frequent in the 'introduction' task. The feedback was mainly about capital letters, period, comma, and colon. In particular, the students were not familiar with when to use capital letters and comma, so that's why punctuation feedback was the most common in the first writing task.

However, the result of the 'invitation' and 'complaint' tasks that they completed almost at the end of the course were different from that of the 'introduction' task. It is quite interesting that content feedback was most frequent in both tasks. That is, they commented 'it's ambiguous', 'it's irrelevant' 'it's incomprehensible'. Because they were allowed to provide feedback in Korean, they seem to have no difficulties in giving feedback about content. After they were able to use correct punctuation and they understood most of peers' writing, they were likely to pay attention to context of passage. The result of interview demonstrated they had no problem to understand peer's writing and suggest ideas even though they have poor English skills. They were willing to talk about and say their ideas because they had common sense to deal with the given situation.

TABLE 5

Types of Peer Feedback

Task	Word count	Punctuation	Grammar	Organization	Content	Word choice
Introduction	110	29	11	9	23	0
Invitation	216.7	30	3	20	36	6
Complaint	73.6	12	8	5	16	4
Total	133.4	71	22	34	75	10

3. How Do They React about Peer Feedback?

On an underlying assumption that students become engaged in composing process, how they respond to feedback from peers needs to be investigated. The study analyzed

their responses using the same five categories as types of feedback. TABLE 6 showed they corrected or changed a very high percentage of punctuation, grammar, outline, and word on which their peer provided feedback. Actually, an interviewee who has a moderate-level of English proficiency explained he got used to outline and punctuation as the course continued. It is surprising they changed all the words that their peers found incorrect or inappropriate. In case of grammar feedback, one interviewee said he searched the grammar point to provide grammar feedback not to lose his face. His comment is highly impressive in that students studied by themselves and tried hard to find a right grammar form in order to provide the corrective feedback. It showed how learning was taking place in the writing class and that students play an active role in learning.

On the other hands, the students reacted to content feedback relatively poorly in percentage terms. It is interpreted that they might not know what or how to do so as to convey the exact meaning with their limited English proficiency. Therefore, content feedback is a difficult feedback to be responded for most students in comparison with the other feedback.

TABLE 6

Response to Peer Feedback

Task	Word count	Punctuation	Grammar	Outline	Content	Word choice
Introduction	110	23(79.3%)	8(72.7%)	8(88.9%)	6(26.1%)	0(0%)
Invitation	216.7	27(90%)	3(100%)	19(95%)	20(55.6%)	6(100%)
Complaint	73.6	12(100%)	8(100%)	4(80%)	10(62.5%)	4(100%)

The study investigated how they responded to content feedback in details. Table 6 demonstrated how much the students responded to the feedback that their peer provided. They showed high degree of reaction in punctuation, grammar, outline and word choice, but not in content. The interviewee explained that was because they didn't know exactly what was wrong in content or how they improved their writing.

After writing part of the draft, students may review the text and ask themselves questions such as 'Are any sections repetitious and can they be missed out?' and 'Do I need to rearrange any sentences?' In this way, additions, deletions, and rearrangement can be made in order to improve the writing. It is noteworthy that all of these questions are to do with meaning and organization (Hedge, 2008). Types of revision used in the study are classified into deleting, adding and rearranging the sentences in the process of developing their writing. The results show that the number of revision was almost same,

but it varied from task to task (Table 7). In 'introduction' task, the revision type that they used the most frequently was deletion, but in 'invitation' and 'complaints' tasks they used adding and rearranging types more to express the exact meaning. It is because removing unnecessary or repetitive sentences are thought to be easier than the other g types considering 'introduction' task that were asked as an earlier task. By contrast, the students didn't use any deleting type in complaint email. That is, drafts of the complaint email didn't contained enough content and their peers commented they need more specific description of complaining about things or services in most cases, so they added more sentences according to their peer feedback

TABLE 7

Response to Peer Feedback on Content

Task	Deletion	Addition	Rearrangement
introduction	4	1	0
invitation	6	3	10
complaint	0	7	1
Total	10	11	11

V. CONCLUSION

The study was to investigate how students perceive their peer feedback and how they provide and respond to the feedback from peers. The findings of this study support the previous studies that suggest positive perception of peer feedback. What is more, students are more likely to regard peer feedback's role as helpful to improve their own writings with students experiencing peer feedback. The effects could be caused by reviewing other students' writing regardless of the types of revision. Also, the students provided feedback that was mainly about surface-level features such as capital letters, period, and comma. All of the writers paid attention to surface-level features but the better writers dealt with these at the end of the process. It was the poorer writers who spent time changing words and phrases throughout the process. Once ideas had been written down and developed, the writers began to edit for surface-level features such as accuracy in grammar, word-choice, spelling and punctuation (Zamel, 1983). Studies by Perl (1979) and Sommers (1980) showed that less experienced writers were constantly concerned with grammar and correctness and this distracted them from thinking about clarity of ideas and organization.

However, in 'invitation' and 'complaint' tasks, they made comments on content of the text. They had no difficulties providing content feedback because they were allowed to provide feedback in Korean. Rather than a concern with whether or not a particular form was applied to the text, the concern is with the communicative effectiveness of the text (Brannon & Knoblaunch, 1982; Siegel, 1982). Offering text-specific comments and feedback means that a flexible standard should be take into account. Teachers' responses reflect the application of a single ideal standard. Furthermore, teachers' marks and comments usually take the form of abstract and vague prescriptions and directives that students find difficult to interpret. Peer feedback can provide multiple standards to review writings.

Also, types of revision including deletion, addition, and rearrangement, varied from task to task In earlier task, deletion was the most frequent revision type, but in 'invitation' and 'complaints' tasks, addition and rearrangement was used more to detail and elaborate content of the text. During providing peer feedback, they become more fluent in what to check to be a good writer. Students can review their ideas in light of peer's reaction (Hansen & Liu, 2005) and they can get source of information for each other so that they can take active roles in their own writing in the process of peer feedback,

The study results suggest some implications. For better understanding of effects of peer feedback, future research should necessarily include peers' oral comments on the writing that they can exchange ideas in addition to written comments, referring to and further elaborating on their written peer reviews. This combination of writing, reading, speaking, listening, and thinking activities assures that students use and practice all their communicative powers. Using real language in real situations makes them gain the ability to work in the context of the whole (Morrow, 1981). Peer review process is found to be a useful method to focus on students' existing communicative powers and to show them how to extend those abilities in their writing (Mittan, 1989).

Furthermore, it is necessary to establish priorities in response to drafts and subsequent revisions and encourage students to address certain concerns before others. As Purves (1984) suggests, we need to play a whole range of roles as readers of student writing and adopt those appropriate for the various stages of a developing text. By probing, challenging, raising questions, and pinpointing ambiguities, students can understand that meaning-level issues are to be addressed first with giving priority to meaning. This understanding is especially crucial in the EFL writing classroom, where students may be convinced that accuracy and corrections are of primary importance and they may be trying to attend to all of the various demands of composing simultaneously. Also, peer-review training is also important in that the research (Yang, Badger, & Zhen, 2006) shows peer feedback led to higher rate of meaning-change revisions after training how to

provide peer feedback based on a structured peer-response sheet. It is required that teachers help students understand the role of peer feedback in the revision stage, and systematic practice in pre-training including proper procedures of the activity in writing classes (Yoon & Lee, 2018).

To generalize what was found from the present study, the research should be expanded by carrying out a larger number of participants varied in proficiency level. Systematic research on EFL student's detailed engagement in providing and receiving peer feedback is expected to further explain the effectiveness of peer feedback in facilitating students' interaction as well as improving EFL learners' writing performance.

REFERENCES

Berggren, J. (2013). Learning from giving feedback: A study of secondary-level students. *ELT Journal, 69*(1), 58-70.

Brannon, L., & Knoblaunch, C. (1982). On students' rights to their own texts: a model of teacher response. *College Composition and Communication, 33*(2), 157-166.

Brown, D. (2007). *Teaching by principles, an interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). New York NY: Longman.

Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative learning and the conversation of mankind. *College English, 46*, 635-652.

Carson, J. P., & Nelson, G. L. (1994). Writing groups: Cross-cultural issues. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*(1), 17-30.

Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Chin, Cheongsook. (2007). EFL learners' perception on English writing tasks and teacher feedback. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 13*(1), 1-26.

Cho, K., & Macarthur, C. (2011). Learning by reviewing. *Journal of Education Psychology, 103*(1), 73-84.

Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles of effective peer response. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 31-38.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Essex: Pearson Education.

Hedge, T. (2008). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL students' writers. *Language Teaching Research, 9*(3), 321-342.

James, D. R. (1981). Peer teaching in the writing classroom. *English Journal, 70*(7), 48-50.

Johnson, D., & Roen, D (Eds.)(1989) *Richness in writing*: *Empowering ESL students*. New York NY: Longman.

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal, 44*, 294-303.

Lamberg, W. (1980). Self-provided and peer-provided feedback. *College Composition and Communication, 31*, 63-69.

Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *18*, 30-43.

Mendonca, C. O., & Johnson, D. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*, 745-769.

Mittan, R. (1989). The peer review process: Harnessing students' communicative power. In D. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.). *Richness in writing*: *Empowering ESL students* (pp. 207-291). New York NY: Longman.

Moon, Young-in. (2000). The nature of peer revision in an EFL writing class of a Korean university. *English Teaching, 55*(1), 119-140.

Moran, C. (1981). A model for teacher training programs in the field of writing. *Journal of Basic Writing, 3*(2), 64-78.

Morrow, K. (1981). Principles of communicative methodology. In K, Johnson & K, Morrow (Eds.), *Communication in the classroom: Applications and methods for a communicative approach* (pp. 59-66). Essex, Longman.

Perl, S. (1979). The composing processes of unskilled college writers. *Research in the Teaching of English, 13*, 317-336.

Purves, A. (1984). The teacher as a reader: an anatomy. *College Composition and Communication, 46*(3), 259-265.

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do when they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(2), 229-255.

Schmid, L., M. (1999). *The effects of peer response on essay drafts*. Unpublished master's thesis. California State University. Sacramento.

Schwartz, M. (1983). Revision profiles: Patterns and implications. *College English, 45(*6), 549-558.

Scrivener, J. (2011). *Learning teaching: The essential guide to English language teaching.* Longman: Macmillan.

Siegel, M. (1982). Response to student writing from new composition faculty. *College Composition and Communication, 33*(3), 302-309.

Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers.

College Composition and Communication, 31, 378-388.

Vygotsky, Y. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, UK MA: MIT Press.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Yang, M., Badger, R., & Zhen, Y., (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15,* 179-200.

Yoon, Kyeong-ok., & Lee, Jeong-Won. (2018). Features and perception of EFL students' feedback on their peers' writing. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 24*(3), 69-87.

Zamel, (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*(2), 165-187.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire

(The questionnaire answered by the students was written in Korean.)

major_____
gender_____
college year _____

1.	How good are your English writing abilities?	1 2 3 4 5
2.	How hard did you do your writing in class?	1 2 3 4 5
3.	How difficult were your writing tasks in class?	1 2 3 4 5
4.	How much were you interested in business email writing?	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Did you ever receive any peer feedback before this course?	1 2 3 4 5
6.	How much was peer feedback helpful in your writing?	1 2 3 4 5

6-1 What do you think made peer feedback effective?

① I made every effort to write more accurately and precisely to show them my writing.
② Peers were a better writer, so their feedback was right.
③ Peers gave me feedback in details.
④ Etc._____

6-2. What do you think made peer feedback ineffective?

① Peers did not provide useful feedback because they were not perfect in English.
② Peers were not sincere and reliable.
③ I wonder whether peer feedback was right or not.
④ Etc._____

7.	Did you ever receive teachers' feedback?	1 2 3 4 5
7-1.	How much was teachers' feedback helpful in your writing?	1 2 3 4 5

7-2.	What do you think made teachers' feedback effective?
①	Teachers' feedback indicated errors in grammar, punctuation and style.
②	I did my best to write well to get a good comment from teachers.
③	I made every effort to correct my errors after getting feedback from teachers.
④	Etc._____
7-3.	What do you think teachers' feedback ineffective?
①	What teachers understand was different from what I want to write.
②	I didn't know how to respond to teachers' feedback.
③	Teachers are not native English speakers.
④	Etc._____
8.	Who do you think is the most appropriate person that provides feedback?
①	teachers
②	peers
③	teachers and peers
9.	In what language do you think feedback is helpful in revising the writing?
①	English
②	Korean
③	English and Korean
④	any language
10.	What kinds of feedback do you think was helpful in improving your writing?
①	Feedback to encourage and highlight good points
②	Feedback to offer correct answers to grammatical errors
③	Feedback to mark what is wrong or ambiguous in content and English use
④	Feedback to make positive comments in content
⑤	Feedback to suggest feedback provider's ideas
11.	Do you believe peer feedback causes writers to correct and develop their writings? 1 2 3 4 5

Examples in: English

Applicable Language: English

Applicable Levels: Secondary, and Tertiary

Seon-Yoo Hwang
College of Liberal Arts
Seowon University
377-3 Musimseoro. Heungduk-gu
Cheongju, Chungbuk, 28674, Korea
Email:syoohw@seowon.ac.kr

Received: July 13, 2019
Reviewed: August 24, 2019
Revised version received: September 5, 2019