English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 22, No. 2 Summer 2016

Korean English Writers' Noticing Peer Errors and Incorporation of Peer Feedback[*]

Seohyun Penn[**]
(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)
Hyun-Woo Lim
(Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Penn, Seohyun & Lim, Hyun-Woo (2016). Korean English writers' noticing peer errors and incorporation of peer feedback. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *22*(2), 65-86.

The present study explores the pedagogical effectiveness of peer feedback in an EFL setting. Little has been known about what kinds of feedback EFL students give to their peers' writing, what kinds of peer feedback they incorporate or ignore in their revision, and why they incorporate or discard particular feedback from their peers. Data obtained from 80 university students who enrolled in Introductory Business English were analyzed in this study. The participants' first drafts, peer feedback markings, revised drafts, the teacher's markings, and open-ended questionnaire responses were collected and analyzed. The results of the study showed that Korean college students could give various types of feedback on peers' writing. Compared to teachers' feedback, the students displayed similar patterns of noticing errors except in two categories (word choice and pronoun). The current research evidenced that these EFL students could give feedback confidently (87% of accuracy rate) and incorporate them successfully (79% revision rate) in their later drafts and that both giver and receiver could benefit from peer feedback activities. Further, based on the results obtained in this study, this study lends instructional insight for teachers and warrants the possibility of implementing peer feedback as a pedagogical writing activity in EFL classrooms.

[peer feedback/English writing/Korean English learners]

[*] This work was supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2015.
[**] First author: Seohyun Penn; Corresponding author: Hyun-Woo Lim

I. INTRODUCTION

The implementation of peer feedback in writing instruction has received heightened interest in the past two decades (e.g., Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, & Huang, 1998; Lin & Chien, 2009; Tsui & Ng, 2000; Zheng, 2012). Many studies have reported its positive impacts in L1 and L2 writing (Liu, Pysarchik, & Taylor, 2002; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Pianko & Radzik, 1980; Rollinson, 2005). The reported benefits of peer feedback were: (1) for encouraging collaborative learning (Carson & Nelson, 1994; Donato, 1994; Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Lockhart & Ng, 1995; Nelson & Murphy, 1993), (2) providing a sense of audience (Rollinson, 2005), (3) raising learners' awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses in their writing (Chaudron, 1984; Keh, 1990; Liu & Carless, 2006), and (4) for leading to meaningful revision of the text (DiPardo & Freeman, 1988; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Villamil & Guerrero, 1996).

However, the studies examining students' perceptions of peer feedback have suggested a quite different picture. These studies showed that students, particularly from Asian countries demonstrated clear preference toward teachers' feedback over peers' (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992; Tsui & Ng, 2000). The students' underlying assumption is that peer feedback is inferior to teacher feedback (Paulus, 1999; Zhang, 1995). The results from these studies raise a doubt about the pedagogical effects of peer feedback with Korean EFL learners as well.

The existing studies on students' perceptions of peer feedback mostly employed surveys (e.g., Jacobs et al., 1998; Lee, 2015; Sengupta, 1998; Zhang, 1995). To assess the pedagogical effectiveness of peer feedback more accurately, we further need to delve into what kinds of feedback students give to their peers' writing, among their peers' feedback what students incorporate or do not incorporate in their revision, and why they incorporate or ignore particular feedback from their peers. To our knowledge, no study has so far addressed this issue, particularly with Korean EFL learners. Thus, the present study examines how Korean college students give peer feedback and incorporate it in their next revisions. This study focuses on students' feedback on linguistic errors in particular, as it usually constitutes a large part of peer feedback (Cho & Sohn, 2007; Miao, Badger, & Zhen, 2006; Paulus, 1999). The following three research questions guided the study:

1. What linguistic errors do Korean college students notice in their peer feedback?
2. Among their peers' feedback, what do Korean college students incorporate or ignore in their revisions and why?
3. How accurately do Korean college students give peer feedback markings and incorporate them in their revisions?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Peer feedback is generally referred to as the activity of students' giving feedback to their peers on grammar, sentence structure, and contents (Liu & Hansen, 2002). Students share their drafts with other students to get direction and feedback on their writing. Peer feedback has been interchangeably used with *peer review, peer editing, peer collaboration, peer response* or *peer comments* in the literature and in different contexts depending on where the researchers focused. In many studies, peer feedback is used as an overarching term for any comments given by peers including linguistic errors and contents (e.g., Miao et al., 2006; Min, 2006; Paulus, 1999).

1. Reported Benefits of Peer Feedback

Peer feedback has been suggested as performing several social, cognitive, affective, linguistic, methodological, and pedagogical roles (Hansen & Liu, 2005, Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Villamil & Guerrero, 1996). Most of all, peer feedback could be seen as encouraging collaborative learning (Carson & Nelson, 1994; Donato, 1994; Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Lockhart & Ng, 1995; Nelson & Murphy, 1993). Villamil and Guerrero (1996) looked into this fairly abstract concept of collaborative learning via peer feedback in practice among 54 intermediate ESL college students. Data was collected from recording the interactions between pairs during two revision sessions. The results showed that peer feedback offered a unique opportunity for L2 students to discuss and formulate ideas about their writing as well as to assist each other in the development of writing skills and discourse strategies. During interaction through peer feedback, students extended and received help and eventually advanced their knowledge. Furthermore, peer feedback raises learners' sense of audience (Rollinson, 2005). Peer feedback provides a clear sense of audience, regarding whom to write to and how to communicate clearer with them. These responsive real audiences help the writer have clear goals to convey their communicative purposes and let the writer know if his or her messages are successfully delivered. In addition, peer feedback helps students develop confidence in writing by working together and seeing their own strengths and weaknesses in writing (Chaudron, 1984; Keh, 1990; Liu & Carless, 2006). Lundstrom and Baker (2009) investigated 91 ESL students at two proficiency levels to find out which is more beneficial to improving student writing: giving or receiving peer feedback. The results indicated that the givers, who focused only on reviewing peers' writing, made more significant gains in their own writing over the course of the semester than the receivers of feedback. Lastly, peer feedback helps to lead to meaningful revision of the text (DiPardo & Freeman, 1988; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Villamil & Guerrero, 1996). Mendonca and Johnson (1994) studied peer feedback of 12 advanced

ESL students. They found that students' peer feedback activity of negotiations and interaction generated meaningful questions, explanations, suggestions, and grammar correction.

2. Students' Perceptions and Incorporations of Peer Feedback

As stated above, the current findings of empirical research and practice in L1 and L2 writing have provided evidence in support of the use of peer feedback activities (e.g., Elbow, 1998; Rollinson, 2005; Sommers, 1982). However, the studies on students' perceptions about peer feedback activities, particularly with some ESL and EFL writers, have shown less positive and conflicting results (Carson & Nelson, 1994, 1996; Hudson-Ross & Dong, 1990; Mangelsdorf, 1992; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Nelson, Carson, Danison & Gajdusek, 1995; Sengupta, 1998). Several researchers argued that the most perceived reason why feedback has not been employed as a regular classroom practice in an EFL classroom, especially in Asian countries, is due to students' negative perceptions of peer feedback (Lee, 2015; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Sengupta, 1998). Asian students believe that knowledge comes from teachers, not from peers (Mangelsdorf, 1992; Paulus, 1999; Tsui & Ng, 2000; Zhang, 1995).

Mangelsdorf (1992) explored the perspectives of 40 advanced ESL students on peer feedback. They were asked about their experiences with peer feedback activities. These students answered that their overall experience was negative; they were reluctant to perform peer feedback activity and perceived the contents of the peer comments as lip-service. Mengelsdorf reported that peer reviews were rated negatively particularly by Asian students. She suspected that this was due to students from Asian countries being accustomed to a teacher-centered classroom, and, as a result, they might regard peer comments as not as important as teachers' comments or not as worthy of paying attention to. Carson and Nelson (1994, 1996; Nelson & Carson, 1998) noted that the negative perception toward peer feedback influenced their Chinese students. In their studies, the students were not comfortable with peer feedback since they viewed the activity as confrontational and disturbing the peaceful atmosphere and social relations.

To examine the effects of peer comments along with other types of comments on students' writing, Jacobs, Curtis, Braine and Huang (1998) collected questionnaire data on students' preference to receive peer feedback. Forty four university EFL learners from Hong Kong and 77 students from Taiwan rated peer feedback as the least preferred type of feedback. Similarly, Sengupta (1998) underscored the different attitudes and perceptions of Chinese students toward peer feedback. When she asked her students to complete peer evaluation sheets, they showed clear resistance to this activity stating that accuracy and revision were the territory of the teacher. They even noted that the whole peer review

exercise was useless and a waste of time. Sengupta concluded that students from this country were not able to benefit from this exercise. Furthermore, she questioned whether the notion of collaborative construction of knowledge in the classroom is a viable option for students from examination-driven, accuracy-oriented, curriculum-based cultures. Even though Korean students' reactions were not as blatantly negative or outspoken as those from other Asian countries, it still holds true that peer feedback is not as preferable as teacher feedback (Joo & Kim, 2010; Jung, 2015; Kang, 2008).

Apart from students' perception of peer feedback, researchers have investigated the revision rate on teacher and peer feedback. Many found that teacher feedback carried more weight and made a greater impact than peer feedback. Paulus (1999) conducted a comparative study among 11 ESL college students on the impact of both kinds of feedback. She found that while students utilized only 13.9% of peer feedback as is, they used 34.3% of teacher feedback in their revision. For partial changes, they made changes based on 87% of teacher comments whereas they employed changes based on only 51% of peer comments. Miao, Badger, and Zhen (2006) also found that the 12 Chinese university students in their study adopted teacher feedback over peers' and, further, teacher comments led to greater improvements in their writing. Similarly, Mendonca and Johnson (1994) discovered that student writers did not always trust and accept their peers' suggestions, while when the same comment was given from a teacher, they more willingly took it into account in their revision. Tsui and Ng (2000) also reported that EFL students in Hong Kong incorporated a higher percentage of teacher feedback in their revision than peer feedback.

In sum, the findings from the studies on students' perception of peer feedback activities and students' incorporation rates of teacher feedback and peer feedback, have suggested that teacher feedback is perceived - at least by Asian EFL writers - as more effective than peer feedback. However, given the reported benefits of peer feedback and teachers' burdens, we still need to promote students' abilities to engage in constructive peer feedback activities in order for them to take the full benefits available from it. To do that, we first need to understand how students give feedback to their peers' writing, and among their peers' feedback what students take in or discard in their writing, and what motivations lead to their taking and discarding.

III. METHOD

1. Participants and Settings

Ninety students, enrolled in three classes of the same course in Introductory Business English at a private university, participated in the study. The course was designed to equip

students with low to intermediate levels of English proficiency, for job preparation including writing a self-introduction, resume, and cover letter in English. The 3-hour class met once per week for 16 weeks. Students in three classes were taught by the same instructor (the first author of the study) and used the same textbook. As they majored in Hotel Tourism Management or Business and Hospitality Management, most of them aspired to be an office worker or work for the tourism, hospital, or aviation industry after graduation.

Upon completion of the data collection, we analyzed the data from 80 students because the rest 10 students failed to submit either their questionnaire responses or revised drafts, which constituted the main part of the data of the study. Among those 80 participants, 61 were females (76 %) and 19 males (24 %). Their mean age was 22.1 years, ranging from 20 to 25 years old (SD = 1.17). Participants' overall English proficiency at the time of participation, measured by TOEIC, was 468.63 (SD = 171.44) ranging from 205 to 865. According to Trew (2007), scores under 470 in TOEIC are considered as low-level, scores between 470 and 730 as intermediate-level, and scores over 730 as high-level proficiency. Among our participants, 50% (N = 40) were low-level, 41.25% (N = 33) intermediate-level, and the rest high-level. None of these students have taken an English writing course or have had prior experience with peer response activity in any language classrooms.

2. Procedure

On the first week of the course, the instructor had her students from all three classes write self-introductions and take TOEIC to measure their English proficiency level. From the 2nd week through 10th week in the semester, regular weekly lessons started with a quiz to review the previous class content. Then students previewed the vocabulary for that day's lesson and read the textbook. The instructor explained and summarized the textbook content for an hour. Lessons consisted of how to successfully conduct a job campaign: how to find a prospective job from various sources, how to fill out applications, how to introduce oneself at a business setting, how to have a job interview, and how to write solicited and prospecting cover letter, chronological, functional and targeted resumes in English. During the last stage of the instruction, students were engaged in group work to research a project or solve a task from the textbook to integrate what they learn. Students were able to use the textbook as a reference at any time since it offered contents to which students could refer back whenever they had questions regarding writing different styles of self-introduction, cover letters, and resumes. At the end of the 10th week class, students were given an assignment of writing cover letters and resumes using the knowledge gained from the previous weeks.

On week 11, students submitted the two copies of their cover letters and resumes, one

to the instructor and the other to their peer. Prior to the peer feedback activity, the students received training of how to give various types of feedback including corrective and content feedback. The training was the integral part of this research since the previous literature emphasized that the success of a peer feedback activity essentially depends on the proper training (Kim, 2009; Liu & Hansen, 2002; Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger, 1992; Min, 2006; Rollinson, 2005; Stanley, 1992). Training was given to establish proper procedures and to set up boundaries for students when they engage in peer feedback activity. The instructor modeled how to give feedback on linguistic errors using actual students' writing samples of the same genre from the previous semester. They were asked to give feedback as specific as possible. Most importantly, students were instructed and encouraged to be supportive, courteous, respectful and helpful to their peers throughout the whole activity.

After the training session, the students worked together in groups of three to five, which were formed at the beginning and were kept the same throughout the semester. With the first copy of the resume and cover letter, students from the same group passed the duplicate around and read it in turns. Each student in the group gave feedback on the other members' writings. Approximately ten minutes were allowed to give feedback to each student's writing. The papers were given back to the original writers after they discussed about each other's writing and wrote down the suggestions and ideas to improve the quality of the paper.

The students were given another week to revise their own writing based upon their peers' feedback. When they submitted the second draft, students were asked to respond to a questionnaire regarding the peer feedback activity (See Appendix A) – how and why students incorporated their peers' feedback in revision. Independent from the peer feedback activity, the instructor read the original submitted copy of each student's writing and marked the linguistic errors in it. The instructor's marked linguistic errors were used as a reference to examine the error types and numbers marked through the peer feedback activity.

3. Data Analysis

To answer the first research question (What linguistic errors do Korean college students notice in their peer feedback?), all the linguistic errors in students' papers marked by peers were totaled. To analyze the linguistic errors into categories, Ferris' (2012) Error Categories were adopted. It consists of 16 categories: word choice, verb tense, verb form, word form, articles, singular-plural, pronouns, run-on, fragment, punctuation, spelling, sentence structure, informal, idiom, subject-verb agreement, and

miscellaneous. The first 15 categories were used as is. But given that the students were allowed to provide a few comments along with corrective feedback, the last miscellaneous category was used for genre-specific content related errors that could not be otherwise classified as conventional linguistic errors. Two independent coders coded the students' feedback. One coder was a native English speaker with a master's degree in English and the other rater was a Korean-English bilingual doctoral student in TESOL. They both have taught English over 10 years at various levels and settings. They first studied each category carefully and coded ten response samples independently; then they compared their initial coding and discussed the reasons in reference to the criteria until they arrived at a reasonable level of agreement. The inter-coder reliabilities for total error types were .83, as calculated by Cohen's kappa. Any disagreement was resolved through further discussion.

To answer the second research question (Among their peers' feedback, what do Korean college students incorporate or ignore in their revisions and why?), the students' first drafts with peer feedback and revised drafts were examined to calculate the numbers of used-in-revision and not-used-in-revision feedback. Further the students' responses to the questionnaire items 4 (Write the reasons why you used peer feedback in revision) and 7 (Write the reasons why you did not used peer feedback in revision) were analyzed. The students' 122 responses were read carefully and analyzed using Structured Coding Method (Saldana, 2009).

Lastly, to answer the third research question (How accurately do Korean college students give peer feedback markings and incorporate them in revision?), the numbers of wrongly-given and wrongly-incorporated feedback in each student's papers were also calculated. The same independent coders, who coded the students' feedback in relation to the first research question, also coded the wrongly-given and wrongly-incorporated feedback. The inter-coder reliabilities which were confirmed by Cohen's kappa were .95 for the wrongly-given feedback and .98 for the latter feedback.

IV. RESULT

1. Linguistic Errors Noticed by Korean Students in Peer Feedback

A total of 984 peer feedback markings were given to students' first drafts. The types and numbers of errors noticed by the teachers' markings and peer feedback are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Total Count of Error Types

Error Types	By Teachers	By Peers	Example in the students' writing (peer feedback)
1. word choice	342	86	**Entrance into** XX University (enter)
2. verb tense	60	14	I **can learn** a lot of things by working… (learned)
3. verb form	60	42	I **was join to** military (joined)
4. word form	59	52	Please, consider **select** me… (selecting)
5. article	24	5	I am **not typical** student (not a typical)
6. singular-plural	52	15	I would gladly accept an opportunity of **an interviews**… (an interview)
7. pronoun	26	0	… for the company (your company)
8. run-on	36	19	I have dropped out of high school **and** I prepared a replacement GED **and** the assignment was for… (get rid of ands and add periods)
9. fragment	21	8	My professor suggested contact you. (suggested that I contact)
10. punctuation	92	100	To whom it may concern (a colon is missing)
11. spelling	146	93	I have worked as a part timer at a **caffee.** (café)
12. sentence structure	321	320	Although not a graduate, (a subject and a verb missing)
13. informal	19	6	**Hello**, my name is… (do not start with *Hello*)
14. idiom	75	47	**Dear** whom it may concern: (To)
15. subject-verb agreement	17	7	There **is** many... (are)
16. miscellaneous	206	170	2012-2013, 2013-2014 (Write in reverse chronological order)
Total	1556	984	

As shown in Table 1, the students noticed at least 14 categories of linguistic errors along with comments. When compared to the results from the teachers' markings, the students found 36.76% less errors. While the teachers found word choice (342 counts), sentence structure (321 counts), spelling (146 counts), punctuation (92 counts), idiom (75 counts), verb tense (60 counts) and verb form (60 counts) in order of the most frequently noticed linguistic errors, the students' ranks were sentence structure (310 counts), punctuation (100 counts), spelling (93 counts), word choice (86 counts), word form (52 counts), idiom (47 counts), and verb form (42 counts). Except the first most frequently ranked error (word choice) for the teachers, the rest of the most frequently noticed error order patterns from the teachers are very similar to the students'.

2. Peer Feedback Incorporated or Ignored in Revision

As Table 2 shows, among the total of 984 peer responses, 781 (79%) feedback points were incorporated in the next revision.

TABLE 2

Incorporated and Ignored Feedback

Error Types	Total	Incorporated	Ignored
1. word choice	86	71 (83%)	15 (17%)
2. verb tense	14	13 (93%)	1 (7%)
3. verb form	42	26 (62%)	16 (38%)
4. word form	52	45 (87%)	7 (13%)
5. article	5	5 (100%)	0
6. singular-plural	15	12 (80%)	3 (20%)
7. pronoun	0	0	0
8. run-on	19	9 (47%)	10 (53%)
9. fragment	8	7 (87.5%)	1 (12.5%)
10. punctuation	100	82 (82%)	18 (18%)
11. spelling	93	79 (85%)	14 (15%)
12. sentence structure	320	261 (82%)	59 (18%)
13. informal	6	4 (67%)	2 (33%)
14. idiom	47	44 (94%)	3 (6%)
15. subject-verb agreement	7	2 (29%)	5 (71%)
16. miscellaneous	170	121 (71%)	49 (29%)
Total	984	781 (79%)	203 (21%)

The top three most incorporated errors were article (100%), idiom (94%), and verb tense (93%). As shown in the examples below, these types of errors had straightforward answers compared to the other error types. Hence, students were easily able to utilize the feedback in their next draft.

(1) Student 12's first draft: I had great experience… (article error)
Peer feedback: *Add an article 'a'*
Revision: I had a great experience

(2) Student 5's first draft: Dear whom it may concern: (idiom error)
Peer feedback: *Change Dear to To*
Revision: To whom it may concern:

(3) Student 67's first draft: … study and traveling in Philippines (verb tense error)
Peer feedback: *Change study and traveling to past tense*
Revision: … studied and traveled in Philippines

On the other hand, the top three least incorporated errors were subject-verb agreement (29%), run-on (47%), and verb form (62%). The possible reasons why the students could not use the feedback were speculated to be that students either (1) did not know how to utilize the feedback due to their low linguistic level or (2) did not understand what peers' feedback meant.

(4) Student 36's first draft: there was many challenges (subject-verb error)
Peer feedback: *was* (underlined)

(5) Student 28's first draft: I was born in Seoul I was raised in Seoul I was educated (run-on error)
Peer feedback: *Use a period at the end of each sentence.*

(6) Student 52's first draft: Please consider hire… (verb form error)
Peer feedback: *You have two verbs!*

Analyses of students' questionnaire responses further revealed the students' reasons for incorporating and ignoring peer feedback, as summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Students' Own Reasons for Incorporating and Ignoring Peer Feedback

Reasons for incorporating peer feedback	Number of response
1. Feedback seemed right or necessary	34
2. From peer's explicit comments, I realized my mistakes	35
3. I noticed my errors while comparing my writing with peers'.	4
4. Through discussion with peers, I found my mistakes.	3
Reasons for ignoring peer feedback	**Number of response**
1. Did not agree on peer feedback	29
… didn't seem right 7	
… I didn't think my peers knew for sure 5	
… did not seem necessary 11	
… I knew what I wrote is right! 6	
2. Did not know how to incorporate them	12
3. Forgot to use the feedback by accident	4
4. Replaced the feedback for a totally different word	1

As suggested by Table 3, the students incorporated peer feedback when they agreed on

the feedback points (76 responses). Specifically, as the reasons for incorporating, 69 students answered that they were able to notice their mistakes from peers' feedback. The following examples are from students' own words in their questionnaire responses.

(7) *My friends pointed out the parts where I totally missed.* (Student 44)

(8) *Via my friends' specific comments, I was able to understand what I didn't know before.* (Student 60)

The other seven students reached agreement on peers' feedback through comparing their own writing with peers' and discussion with peers.

(9) *When I read peers' feedback, I remembered what we discussed during the class so I corrected my errors.* (Student 62)

(10) *I used friends' feedback because their comments reminded me those new ideas and information which I got from comparing my writing with their writings.* (Student 39)

By the same token, when they were uncertain about peer feedback they just disregarded the remarks (29 responses). This suggests that the students are capable of doubting and discerning right and wrong feedback from the peers and make their own decision not to incorporate them. In addition, when some students felt the feedback did not seem accurate, they often looked up information about it in the textbook or the Internet.

As another reason for ignoring feedback, 12 students answered that they failed to utilize peer feedback because they did not know how to incorporate them. The follow-up analysis indicated that the problem for these 12 students occurred due to 'less kind' feedback. The feedback was written as abbreviated, simply underlined, or question-marked. The feedback did not offer much information for these low level students to work with. The examples below are from students' own words in their questionnaire responses.

(11) *I have no idea how to correct my mistakes because they did not write down how I can fix them.* (Student 52)

(12) *I couldn't correct them because they just underlined my errors without any specific explanations.* (Student 58)

3. Accuracies in Peer Feedback and Incorporation

Among the linguistic errors marked by peers, the percentage of wrongly (or unnecessarily) given feedback for each error category is presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Wrongly Given Feedback

Error Types	Total	Wrongly given	Examples from the students' feedback
1. word choice	86	17 (20%)	Yours~~s~~ sincerely,
2. verb tense	14	2 (14%)	develop~~ed~~ school facilities → developing
3. verb form	42	5 (12%)	~~give~~ sb a hand → giveing
4. word form	52	13 (25%)	~~YOUNGHEE KIM~~ → Younghee Kim
5. articles	5	0	
6. singular-plural	15	3 (20%)	Marketing and public relation~~s~~ departments.
7. pronouns	0	0	
8. run-on	19	3 (16%)	…where ~~I~~ worked as Distribution of helicopter's parts and ~~I~~had experienced…
9. fragment	8	1 (12.5%)	~~My~~ six months of studying abroad
10. punctuation	100	16 (16%)	Younghee Kim. → adding a period after the name
11. spelling	93	10 (11%)	If you have any questions regarding my application, ~~p~~lease… → Please
12. sentence structure	320	28 (9%)	Cover letter → Add "Subject:"
13. informal	6	3 (50%)	I am → I'm
14. idiom	47	3 (6%)	~~To~~ whom it may concern → Dear whom it may concern
15. subject-verb agreement	7	3 (43%)	There was many… → There is many…
16. miscellaneous	170	20 (12%)	Omitting all 'I's
Total	984	127 (13%)	

The total of 13% of the students' markings were incorrect or unnecessary. The top three categories in which inaccurate markings were found most frequently included informal (50%), subject-verb agreement (43%), and word form (25%). The following examples are from the students' wrongly given error feedback:

(13) Student 13's first draft: I am pleased to submit… (informal error)
Peer feedback*: Change to I'm…*

(14) Student 14's first draft: I am familiar with your hotel's reputation and am very eager to… (subject-verb agreement error)
Peer feedback: *Add I between and and am*

(15) Student 56's first draft: Woomirin Apt. (word form error)
Peer feedback: *Get rid of the period at the end of the word Apt.*

The top three categories in which inaccurate markings were found least frequently consisted of idiom (6%), sentence structure (9%), and spelling (11%). These are from the students' actual erroneous feedback:

(16) Student 78's first draft: expected to graduate (idiom error)
Peer feedback: *expectation date*

(17) Student 66's first draft: emailaddress.com (sentence structure error)
Peer feedback: *Add email in front of your email address*

(18) Student 50's first draft: YOUNGHEE KIM (for emphasis) (spelling error)
Peer feedback: *Younghee Kim*

Among the linguistic errors marked by peers, the percentage of wrongly revised ones for each error category is presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Wrongly Revised Peers' Feedback

Error Types	Total	Wrongly revised	Examples from the students' revisions
1. word choice	86	13 (15%)	Objective: Hotel's casino dealer (Use "To… for the objective) → To Hotel's casino dealer (intended feedback: To become a casino dealer)
2. verb tense	14	2 (14%)	I handle..., greeted⋯, plan⋯→ I handled⋯, greeted⋯, planning⋯
3. verb form	42	5 (12%)	I can changed by them → I changed can by them
4. word form	52	8 (15%)	Young-Hee Kim → Kim Younghee
5. articles	5	0	
6. singular-plural	15	3 (20%)	I learned a sociable and services → I learned a sociable and service (intended feedback: sociable services)
7. pronouns	0	0	
8. run-on	19	1 (5%)	Because I am ready, because it is …→ Because I am ready. Because it is…
9. fragment	8	0	
10. punctuation	100	17 (17%)	After I was a council… → After, I was a council…
11. spelling	93	9 (10%)	beijing union university → Beijing union university
12. sentence structure	320	21 (7%)	Omitting 'Sincerely,'
13. informal	6	2 (33%)	Adding 'Hello' as a salutation to the cover letter
14. idiom	47	9 (19%)	To whom it may concern → Dear whom it may concern

15. subject-verb agreement	7	1 (14%)	Having worked at different places make…→ Having worked at different places are making
16. miscellaneous	170	12 (7%)	Omitting all the subject in the resume
Total	984	103 (10.46%)	

A total of 10.46 % of the students' revisions were incorrect. The top three categories in which inaccurate revisions were found most frequently included informal (50%), singular-plural (43%), and idiom (9%). Informal errors were ranked high both in wrongly given and wrongly revised feedback counts, which may suggest that the students in this study needed more instructional assistance in the formal language use. The students' actual erroneous revisions for these categories were:

(19) Student 13's first draft: I am… (informal error)
Peer feedback: *Add a salutation*.
Revision: Hello, I'm

(20) Student 42's first draft: certificate (singular-plural error)
Peer feedback: *certificate* √ (A tick mark was put next to the singular form)
Revision: skills (the correct revision should be 'certificates')

(21) Student 10's first draft: Dear sir, (idiom error)
Peer feedback: ***sir*** (Underlined)
Revision: Dear whom it may concern (the correct revision should be 'To whom it may concern')

The top three categories in which inaccurate revisions were found least frequently consisted of run-on (5%), sentence structure (7%), and spelling (10%). Sentence structure and spelling errors were ranked low both in wrongly given and wrongly revised feedback counts, which may indicate that the students in this study had a relatively substantial level of knowledge about these two linguistic features. Still, some of the students made wrong revisions for these categories as follows:

(22) Student 58's first draft: Because I am ready, because it is … (run-on error)
Peer feedback: *I am ready, **because** it is* (Underlined)
Revision: Because I am ready. Because it is…

(23) Student 26's first draft: a person of passion (sentence structure error)
Peer feedback: *of passion ?* (Question marked over the passion)
Revision: a passionately person

(24) Student 56's first draft: the ROK (spelling error)
Peer feedback: ROK (Underlined)
Revision: The republic of south korea

As a follow-up analysis, how many students were able to handle their peers' incorrect feedback was examined. A total of 28 students (35%) from all three proficiency levels (12 low level students, ten intermediate level students, and six high level students) could utilize them in their revised drafts with 100% accuracy even when their peers' feedback points were wrong. One student from advanced level and 51 students (64%) from low and intermediate levels failed to either correct some of the erroneous responses or incorporate the right ones in the next drafts. Some students gave feedback abbreviated since they discussed it during the peer feedback session. However, some low level students did not remember the specific feedback orally received and simply used the written shortened feedback as it was marked; this often led to improper revision.

V. DISCUSSION

The present study explored how Korean college students give feedback to their peers and incorporate their peers' feedback in their revisions. The results of the study showed that Korean college students could notice various types of linguistic feedback on peers' writing. Overall, the students in this study made errors in sentence structure, punctuation, and spelling most frequently. Compared to the teachers' markings, the students displayed compatible patterns of noticing, which offers the possibility of implementing peer feedback as a positive pedagogical writing activity in EFL classrooms. There were only two types of errors (word choice and pronoun errors) in which the students differed greatly from the teachers. For both types, the students found fewer errors than the teachers. The students' frequent errors in these two features and limited knowledge of noticing them were suspected to be due to the influence of their first language (or L1 interference). For example, they showed a mixed understanding of intransitive and transitive verbs. Instead of using a transitive verb with an object (e.g., discuss the matter), the students more often than not used a transitive word with preposition and an object as if it were an intransitive verb (e.g., discuss *about* the matter). In addition, some students did not feel comfortable using a second-person pronoun, you, in their writing as in "your company." As Koreans do not use a second-person pronoun, you, for honorific form, they might have felt that "your company" sounds impolite.

The study results also indicated that Korean college students could successfully utilize their peers' feedback in their later drafts up to 79%. Compared to the incorporation rates of peer feedback reported by previous studies ranging from 5% (Connor & Asenavage, 1994) to 53% (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994) to 90% (Min, 2006), the students from this study utilized their peers' feedback to a high degree. This high revision rate might be due to the oral discussions in which they explained their feedback and compared their own writing

with peers'. It seemed to offer a chance for the students to examine their peers' work and apply general or genre-specific knowledge to their own writing.

The results from the students' reasons for incorporating and ignoring their peers' feedback showed that they incorporated their peers' feedback when they agreed on the points of feedback. One possible interpretation of this is that among their peers' feedback, the students only accepted what they already knew; they had made the initial error because of carelessness, not ignorance. In this case, peer feedback only helps students more carefully edit but does not promote their learning of new grammar knowledge. Yet an alternative interpretation is also possible. The students incorporated the feedback when they came to agree on it by learning new grammar items through an active revision process of looking up information in the dictionary or the Internet. In fact, some students in this study were observed to look up information about it in the textbook or the Internet when they felt unsure about their peers' feedback. In this case, it can be said that peer feedback leads students to acquire new knowledge through self-study.

In addition, among the students' feedback markings, 87% were correct and necessary. This is quite remarkable given Ferris (2006) found that 89.4% of teachers' markings were correct and the rest was incorrect or unnecessary. Both 'wrongly given' feedback and 'wrongly revised' feedback could indicate the troubled areas in the students' linguistic knowledge. Teachers can take advantage of peer feedback data to find out where their students need the help most. It is worthy of noting that 'unkind' feedback, such as a simple question mark, underlining, or abbreviated form, rarely help students particularly from low level of linguistic proficiency. This suggests that peer feedback training is necessary not only on what feedback they give but also how specific they give feedback.

This study has some limitations. First, the current study utilized a questionnaire to inquire the students' reasons for incorporating and ignoring peer feedback. Interviews with students based upon their given peer feedback and revised papers would provide richer information. Second, the types and frequencies of linguistic errors noticed by students as well as the accuracies of their feedback and incorporation of it may differ across learners' English proficiencies. Investigation of how peer feedback activity works among different proficiency groups needs further research.

VI. CONCLUSION

The results of the study suggest that Korean college students could benefit from peer feedback activity. They evidenced that these students can give feedback confidently and incorporate it successfully in their later revisions. Given its various benefits, the implementation of peer feedback should be seriously considered in Korean EFL

classrooms as a regular activity. Some pedagogical suggestions for improving peer review process can be drawn from the study results. First of all, peer feedback training should be given to raise students' skill in giving specific and explanatory peer feedback. Oral conferences accompanied by peer feedback activities could further increase students' understanding of their peers' feedback and subsequent revision effort (Sim & Heo, 2014). In addition, encouraging students to keep a log or a record of the feedback that they chose not to incorporate in their revision and the reasons behind their decisions would stimulate students' metacognitive reflections on English language and writing.

The results of the current study may expand to other EFL learners from East Asian countries (e.g., China, Japan, Taiwan, and Thailand) on the basis of their collectivistic cultural values (e.g., striving harmony and avoiding conflicts) and putting focus on English grammar and reading. Yet, further investigations are warranted in various levels, subjects, and learning contexts as Ferris (2003) succinctly summarized peer feedback is "a complex process affected by a wide variety of interpersonal and contextual factors" (p.131). The interplay between teacher feedback and peer feedback as well as individual differences in receptivity also warrant further investigation.

REFERENCES

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

Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1996). Chinese students' perception of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*(1), 1-19.

Chaudron, C. (1984). The effect of feedback on students' composition revision. *RELC Journal, 15*(2), 1-14.

Cho, Y., & Sohn, T. (2007). Complementarity of peer and teacher feedback in Korean high school English classes. *English Teaching, 62*(3), 307-329.

Connor, U., & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*(3), 257-276.

DiPardo, A., & Freedman, S. W. (1988). Peer response groups in the writing classroom: Theoretic foundations and new directions. *System, 58*(2), 119-149.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf, & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second research* (pp. 33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing without teachers*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ferris, D. (2003). Responding to writing. In B. Kroll, *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 119-140). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland, & F. Hyland, *Feedback in second language writing* (pp. 123-139). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. (2012). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Guerrero, M., & Villamil, O. S. (1994). Social-cognitive dimensions of interaction in L2 peer revision. *Modern Language Journal, 78*(4), 484-496.

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

Hedgcock. J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*(3), 141-163.

Hudson-Ross, S., & Dong, Y. R. (1990). Literacy learning as a reflection in the teaching of writing: Chinese elementary school education. *The Reading Teacher, 44*(2), 110-123.

Jacobs, G. M, Curtis, A., Braine, G., & Huang, S. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(3), 307-317.

Joo, M., & Kim, Y. (2010). Teacher and peer feedback: Learner perceptions and the efficacy for improvement in L2 writing. *English Language Teaching, 22*(3), 1-21.

Jung, Y. S. (2015). A survey on pre-service elementary English teachers' perceptions about teacher feedback and peer feedback. *Primary English Education, 21*(4), 199-222.

Kang, D. (2008). Feedback on EFL writing: Teacher, peer, and self-review. *Foreign Languages Education, 15*(1), 1-22.

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 294-304.

Kim, B. (2009). Examining the effects of trained peer feedback on EFL students' writing. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 15*(2), 151-168.

Lee, M. (2015). Peer feedback in second language writing: Investigating junior secondary students' perspectives on inter-feedback and intra-feedback. *System, 55*, 1-10.

Lin, G., & Chien, P. (2009). An investigation into effectiveness of peer feedback. *Journal of Applied Foreign Language Fortune Institute of Technology, 3*, 79-87.

Liu, J., & Hansen, J. G. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Liu, J., Pysarchik, D. T., & Taylor, W. W. (2002). Peer review in the classroom. *BioScience, 52*(9), 824-829.

Liu, N., & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: The learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education, 11*(3), 279-290.

Lockhart, C., & Ng, P. (1995). Analyzing talk in ESL peer response groups: Stances, functions, and contents. *Language Learning, 45*(4), 605-655.

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*(1), 30-43.

Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer revise in the ESL composition classrooms: What do the students think? *ELT Journal, 46*(3), 274-284.

Mangelsdorf, K., & Schlumberger, A. (1992). ESL student response stances in a peer-review task. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*(3), 235-254.

Mendonca, C., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(4), 745-769.

Miao, Y., 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*(3), 179-200.

Min, H. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*(2), 118-141.

Nelson, G. L., & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(2), 113-131.

Nelson, G. L., Carson, J. G., Danison, N., & Gajdusek, L. (1995). Social dimensions of second-language writing instruction: Peer response groups as cultural context. In D. L. Rubin, *Composing social identity in written language* (pp. 89-109). New York, NY: Routledge.

Nelson, G. L., & Murphy, J. M. (1993). Peer response groups: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts? *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 135-141.

Paulus, T. M (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3), 265-289.

Pianko, S., & Radzik, A. (1980). The student editing method. *Theory into Practice, 19*(3), 220-224.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 23-30.

Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Sengupta, S. (1998). Peer evaluation: 'I am not the teacher'. *ELT Journal, 52*(1), 19-28.

Sim, J., & Heo, J. (2014). Writing feedback: The benefits of conferences. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 20*(3), 165-189.

Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to student writing. *College Composition and Communication, 33*(2), 148-156.

Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*(3), 217-233.

Trew, G. (2007). *A teacher's guide to the TOEIC listening and reading test: Preparing your students for success.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Tsui, A., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(2), 147-170.

Villamil, O. S., & Guerrero, M. (1996). Peer revisions in the L2 classroom: Social cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*(1), 51-75.

Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 4*(3), 209-222.

Zheng, C. (2012). Understanding the learning process of peer feedback activity: An ethnographic study of exploratory practice. *Language Teaching Research, 16*(1), 109-126.

APPENDIX A

Reflective Questionnaire about Peer Feedback Activity

1. Write each member's name of your group.
2. How many feedback points did you receive from your peers?
3. What kinds of feedback did you receive from your peers?
4. Among peer feedback, what kinds of feedback did you use in your revision? Please be specific.
5. Write the reasons why you used the feedback. Please be specific.
6. How many feedback points did you use in your revision?
7. Among peer feedback, what kinds of feedback did you not use in your revision? Please be specific.
8. Write the reasons why you did not use the feedback. Please be specific.
9. How many feedback points did you not use in your revision?

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Seohyun Penn (first author)
TESOL Department, Graduate School
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
107 Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu
Seoul 130-791, Korea
Email: jshsunny@naver.com

Hyun-Woo Lim (corresponding author)
English Education Major, Graduate School of Education
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
107, Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu
Seoul 130-791, Korea
Email: hlim@hufs.ac.kr

Received in April 15th, 2016
Reviewed in May 26th, 2016
Revised version received in June 7th, 2016