STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE INTEGRATION OF PEER FEEDBACK ON GRAMMATICAL ERRORS IN THE EFL WRITING CLASSROOM

ทัศนคติและมุมมองของนิสิตที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศเกี่ยวกับการใช้วิธีตรวจหาข้อผิดทางไวยากรณ์อังกฤษในงานเขียนโดยใช้เพื่อนนิสิตในชั้นเรียน

Dr. Phnita Kulsirisawad

Abstract

The shift away from teacher-fronted classrooms to learner-centered ones has brought up the issue of learner autonomy. In ESL/ EFL writing classrooms, peer feedback or peer correction has been considered as a teaching technique that promotes learner autonomy as well as a preparation for lifelong learning (Chatranonth. 2008). However, research on EFL students' perceptions of peer feedback has received relatively little attention. This study, therefore, seeks to investigate how Thai university students perceive the use of peer feedback on grammatical errors based on their regular experience and practice in a writing classroom over a semester (16 weeks). This article discusses the findings of a questionnaire and a face-to-face interview administered to 20 EFL English majors at a Thai university. The questionnaire, utilizing 5-point Likert-scales, investigated students' views toward peer feedback in terms of usefulness, acceptance, affect, willingness to improve, and fairness (Strijbos; Pat-El; & Narciss. 2010). The quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics and Chi-square tests while the qualitative data were analysed via content analysis method. The findings revealed that 95% of students had positive perceptions toward peer feedback activity. It was perceived by students

as very useful and enjoyable. They accepted and valued grammatical feedback from their peers and they were willing to improve their work based on their peers' suggestions. They believed that the feedback from their peers was fair. Furthermore, the students showed a strong preference for peer feedback activity and they supported the use of peer feedback in future writing classes.

Keywords *EFL writing, grammatical errors, peer feedback, students' perceptions*

บทคัดย่อ

การปรับเปลี่ยนจากการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษแบบเน้นอาจารย์ผู้สอนเป็นศูนย์กลางมาเป็นแบบเน้นผู้เรียนเป็นสำคัญ ได้นำไปสู่การเรียนรู้แบบพึ่งตนเอง   การใช้วิธีตรวจงานเขียนโดยใช้เพื่อนนิสิตในชั้นเรียนด้วยกันเอง ถือเป็นเทคนิคการสอนที่นอกจากส่งเสริมการเรียนรู้แบบพึ่งตนเอง แต่ยังเป็นการเตรียมผู้เรียนสู่การเรียนรู้อย่างยั่งยืนในชั้นเรียนวิชาการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษ (Chatranonth. 2008). อย่างไรก็ตาม งานวิจัยเกี่ยวกับทัศนคติของผู้เรียนที่มีต่อการใช้วิธีตรวจงานเขียนโดยใช้เพื่อนนิสิตในชั้นเรียนด้วยกันเองยังได้รับความสนใจค่อนข้างน้อย   ดังนั้นงานวิจัยครั้งนี้จึงมุ่งศึกษาความคิดเห็นและทัศนคติของนิสิตระดับปริญญาตรี ที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศที่มีต่อการใช้วิธีตรวจหาข้อผิดทางไวยากรณ์อังกฤษในงานเขียนโดยใช้เพื่อนนิสิตในชั้นเรียนด้วยกันหลังจากที่นิสิตได้ลองเรียนด้วยวิธีดังกล่าวเป็นเวลา16 สัปดาห์

งานวิจัยนี้สรุปและอภิปรายผลจากแบบสอบถามวัดทัศนคติ และ การสัมภาษณ์รายบุคคล กลุ่มตัวอย่างในงานวิจัยนี้เป็นนิสิตระดับปริญญาตรีเอกภาษาอังกฤษ ซึ่งลงทะเบียนเรียนในวิชาการเขียน 2 จำนวน 20 คน แบบสอบถามใช้ตามวิธีของลิเคอร์ท Likert Scale โดยกำหนดคำตอบเป็น 5 ระดับ   เพื่อสำรวจทัศนคติของผู้เรียนที่มีต่อกิจกรรมการตรวจงานเขียนโดยใช้เพื่อนนิสิตในชั้นเรียนด้วยกันเองในด้านต่างๆ ได้แก่ 1.ประโยชน์ 2. การยอมรับ 3. ความรู้สึกชอบ 4. ความเต็มใจที่จะแก้ไขปรับปรุง และ 5. ความยุติธรรม (Strijbos; Pat-El; & Narciss. 2010).   วิเคราะห์ข้อมูลเชิงปริมาณ ใช้ค่าร้อยละ และ สถิติการทดสอบ Chi-square ส่วนการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลเชิงคุณภาพใช้วิธีการวิเคราะห์เนื้อหา   จากการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลข้างต้นพบว่านิสิตร้อยละ 95 มีทัศนคติในเชิงบวกต่อต่อกิจกรรมการตรวจงานเขียนโดยใช้เพื่อนนิสิตในชั้นเรียน นิสิตมีความเห็นว่ากิจกรรมมีประโยชน์และสนุก นิสิตยอมรับและเห็นคุณค่าของงานที่ตรวจโดยเพื่อนร่วมชั้นเรียน และเต็มใจที่จะปรับแก้งานเขียนของตนตามคำแนะนำที่ได้รับจากเพื่อนผู้ตรวจ นิสิตให้ความเห็นว่า เพื่อนตรวจงานด้วยความเท่าเทียมยุติธรรม นอกจากนี้ยังพบว่า นิสิตมีความชอบในตัวกิจกรรมอยู่ในระดับสูง รวมทั้งสนับสนุนให้มีการดำเนินกิจกรรมนี้ในรายวิชาการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษที่จะเรียนต่อไปอีกด้วย

คำสำคัญ การเขียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ   ข้อผิดทางไวยากรณ์อังกฤษ   วิธีตรวจงานเขียนโดยใช้เพื่อนนิสิตในชั้นเรียนด้วยกันเอง   ทัศนคติและมุมมองของผู้เรียน

Introduction

Students differ with regard to their learning preferences for pedagogical practices. Many researchers state that mismatches between teachers' instructional practices and learners' learning preferences could possibly result in unsatisfactory learning outcomes (Horwitz. 1988; Nunan. 1987; Schulz. 2001). According to Reid, cited in Ferris (2003), it is important to acknowledge the students' views and respect them, for it helps lead to a collegial classroom environment as well as boost students' motivation and confidence in their teachers. Hence, it is necessary for teachers to discover their students' perceptions and find out how they feel about "what and how they want to learn" (Nunan. 1995: 140).

With regard to foreign language classrooms, it has been generally accepted that writing is a complex process and it is a difficult skill for students to develop and learn (Kim; & Kim. 2005; Shen. 2007). In today's environment, the demand for a good command of English writing is perceived as necessary (Graddol. 2006) and writing, which is viewed as grammatically 'correct' is highly valued in both academic and professional contexts (Chatranonth. 2008). As emphasized by Scarcella and Oxford (1992), grammatical competence or the ability to handle the language system accurately is an integral part of communicative competence. Writing with a number of grammatical errors may hinder access to opportunities such as career advancement and raise the reader's suspicion of a writer's competence (Keynes. 2006).

There have been attempts to develop an understanding of how instructional practices may be advanced to help EFL students improve their writing proficiency. Peer feedback (also known as 'peer response' or 'peer correction') is one of the pedagogic approaches that has widely been practiced in many writing classrooms due to its multiple benefits. Peer feedback is an activity in which students receive feedback about their writing from their classmates (Hirose. 2008). It can be either feedback on form or on content, or both form and content. In this study, peer feedback refers to grammatical feedback that students provide for their partners on the use of the target language to improve their writing accuracy.

According to Storch (2005), peer feedback rests on a strong theoretical and pedagogical basis. It follows the model of social constructivist view of learning, and it involves the concept of a communicative approach to language learning. Peer feedback aims to foster a much greater sense

of learner independence and learner autonomy (Brown. 2004; Tamjid; & Birjandi. 2011). The learner has to become self-directed and self-reliant by locating and then solving problems on his/her own. According to Lundstrom and Baker (2009), peer feedback incorporates the notion of 'audience' into the minds of student writers. It provides students with a more realistic audience than their teacher, which in turn assists them in producing 'reader-oriented' texts (Hinkel. 2004; Storch. 2005). In addition, in reading their peer's writing, the students are aware of their role as error searcher and this awareness encourages them to carefully read their peer's work (Atay; & Kurt. 2007). Therefore, peer feedback not only gives students the opportunity to realize that other students experience similar difficulties to their own, but it also helps students develop their editing skills and enhance self-expression (Ferris; & Hedgcock. 2005; Saito; & Fujita. 2004; Storch. 2005). Studies have shown that furthermore, student writers are even able to develop and gain useful writing skills from their peers (Mendonça; & Johnson. 1994; Rollinson. 2005). In a similar vein, Ferris (2003) states that peer feedback helps learners become more self-aware since they notice the gap between how they and others perceive their writing, thus facilitating the development of analytical and critical reading and writing skills.

However, studies give mixed results when it comes to students' perceptions of peer feedback or peer correction. There are studies which show that students still doubt the benefits of it and there are also studies that show otherwise (Farrah. 2012; Harmer. 2004; Hirose. 2009; Hong. 2006; Sengupta. 1998; Srichanyachon. 2011; Tsui; & Ng. 2000; Villamil; & DeGuerrero. 1998). According to Sengupta (1998), students prefer to be corrected by the teacher because they do not value their peers' knowledge. They do not regard their peers as authorities who could correct their errors (Sengupta. 1998). In a similar vein, Harmer (2004) states that it is possible that the student, after being corrected by a peer, feels that s/he is inferior to his peers; therefore, they show preference for teacher feedback over peer feedback. In contrast, Farrah (2012) claims that students have positive attitudes toward peer feedback and view peer feedback as a worthwhile experience. Moreover, Srichanyachon (2011) as well as Tsui and Ng (2000) indicate that students are more motivated to improve their writing as peer feedback gives them an opportunity to see new ideas and develop a sense of audience.

In light of such mixed findings, there remains controversy and disagreement amongst L2 writing researchers and teachers on whether to adopt peer feedback in a writing class. Thus, the issue of students' perceptions toward peer feedback remains to be further investigated particularly in a local

setting. This is consistent with the current movement towards the 'postmethod era' (Kumaravadivelu. 2003) which highlights the need to develop and understand teaching strategies as they are specifically used in their local context.

According to Hyland and Hyland (2006), students' attitudes and perceptions are beneficial in furthering our understanding of students' behaviors in writing courses and they will be of value in designing more effective writing courses in the future (Enginarlar. 1993). As mentioned previously, this study aims to take into account students' voice and focuses specifically on the Thai tertiary educational context particularly among English major students who are expected to be able to edit their own written work. The research findings will help develop an understanding of how peer feedback method may be advanced to help Thai students improve their writing proficiency which will in turn be of potential value to EFL writing pedagogy in Thailand.

The present study

This study attempted to explore how Thai university students perceive the use of peer feedback in the writing classroom based on their regular experience in the writing course over a semester or 16 weeks. The study has the following research questions:

1. What are the perceptions toward peer feedback in terms of usefulness, acceptance, affect, willingness to improve, and fairness among EFL students in a Thai university?

2. What are the students' reflections on peer feedback activity?

Method

1) Participants

The participants were 20 university students (all females) in the English composition II course. They were third year students whose major was English, in the Faculty of Humanities. It was a required English writing course for all English major students. Therefore, the participants were homogeneous in terms of academic major and motivation to take the course.

2) Course content

Weekly writing assignments

The class met once a week for 180 minutes throughout a semester. Each class started with 15-minute free writing. The next two hours were spent on textbook, "Writing Academic English". The rest of the class time was dedicated to working on vocabulary and grammar. For 16 weeks, before class, the

students were required to write a composition with a minimum length of 350 words on an assigned topic and have their peer comment on the grammar correctness of their writing. The total writing assignments were 12 (excluding the first day of the class and the midterm and final weeks) . This whole process took place outside the classroom. The students were allowed to choose the person they wanted to work with. However, they had to choose a new partner every week. After the students exchanged their writing assignments with their partners, they had to read their peer's work and give feedback on grammars. By doing so, they had to locate the errors and provide appropriate grammatical forms. The time allotment for peer feedback was two days. Then the students had to give the work back to their partners for further revision and then the students handed in their work to the teacher. Since the students had new partners to work with every week, they were paired up with almost all of their classmates throughout the semester.

Data

1) Questionnaire of students' perceptions

At the end of the course, the students answered the questionnaire which was in the form of statements answered on a 5-point scale with 1 representing strongly disagree; 2: disagree, 3: neither disagree nor agree; 4: agree; 5: strongly agree.

The original questionnaire was constructed in English and then translated into Thai. It contained 30 item statements measuring students' peer feedback perception in terms of usefulness, acceptance, affect, willingness to improve, and fairness. Each aspect was assessed by six items each, totally 30 items (See Appendix A). Items 1-6 measured 'usefulness', items 7-12 measured 'acceptance', items 13-18 measured 'affect', items 19-24 measured 'willingness to improve', and items 25-30 measured 'fairness' aspect. The five aspects were adapted from the study of Strijbos, Pat-El, and Narciss in 2010 on *Validation of a (Peer) Feedback Perceptions Questionnaire.* It was piloted to increase the reliability, validity, and practicality of the questionnaire. Then the revised questionnaire was used to obtain data for the study.

The distribution of responses was analyzed with descriptive statistics. Chi-square goodness-of-fit test was used to perform hypothesis tests concerning a probability distribution. The hypotheses of the study were:

Ho: *The proportions of students who have positive and negative perceptions towards peer feedback activity equal 95:5.*

Ha: *The proportions of students who have positive and negative perceptions towards peer feedback activity do not equal 95:5.*

2)   **Interviews**

While the questionnaires would provide quantitative information of the study, in-depth interviews were conducted to obtain qualitative data. Every subject in this study was interviewed and the interviews took place after the questionnaires were completed. The purpose of the interviews was to look into issues that could not be clearly addressed from the findings of the questionnaires. The interviews were conducted in Thai and aimed to find out what students thought of peer feedback activity and what they did with the feedback that they received from their peers. The core dimensions explored were as follows:

1)   Do you think peer feedback activity is useful for your learning? Why or why not?

2)   Do you support the use of peer feedback in future writing classes? Why or why not?

3)   What did you do after receiving grammatical feedback from your peers?

4)   Do you like peer feedback activity? Why or why not?

5)   What was the problem (s) that you had when receiving or giving feedback to your peers?

6)   What are your suggestions in improving peer feedback activity?

7)   If you could choose between the two methods: 1) teacher feedback alone and 2) peer feedback followed by teacher feedback, which one would you choose? Why?

The interviews were transcribed and coded for themes and patterns.

Results

Research question 1: *What are the perceptions toward peer feedback in terms of usefulness, acceptance, affect, willingness to improve, and fairness among EFL students in a Thai university?*
Overall, the students had positive perceptions to every aspect of peer feedback. As shown in Table 1, none of the students chose the 'strongly disagree' or 'disagree' categories. They believed that peer feedback activity was useful and they benefited from reading and giving feedback to their friends (55.83% agree and 39.17% strongly agree). In addition, they accepted grammatical feedback from

their peers and valued their peers' knowledge (54.17% agree and 41.67% strongly agree). In terms of 'affect', the students especially enjoyed participating in the peer feedback activity and they hoped that the teacher would continue to use peer feedback activity in the future writing classes (45.83% agree and 47.50% strongly agree). The findings also revealed that the students showed high degree of 'willingness to improve'. They spent time and effort revising their work according to their peer's comments and they believed that the students should take part in and contribute to their own learning process (47.50% agree and 45.83% strongly agree). With regard to 'fairness', the students believed that grammatical feedback from their peers was fair and they themselves also did their best when giving grammatical feedback on their friends' writing (48.33% agree and 43.33% strongly agree).

Table 1

Students' Perceptions on Peer Feedback Activities in Five Aspects

Aspects	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neither agree nor disagree(%)	Agree (%)	Strongly agree (%)
Usefulness	0	0	5	55.83	39.17
Acceptance	0	0	4.17	54.17	41.67
Affect	0	0	6.67	45.83	47.50
Willingness to improve	0	0	6.67	47.50	45.83
Fairness	0	0	8.33	48.33	43.33

When we take into account only the 'strongly agree' and 'agree' categories, Table 2 reveals a highest percentage in the 'acceptance' aspect (95.83%). It is followed by the 'usefulness' aspect with 95%. The high percentage in these two categories could probably explain why the students strongly supported the use of peer feedback activity in future writing classes. With regard to 'affect' and 'willingness to improve' aspects, the findings revealed that 93.33% of students expressed favorable responses. The students liked participating in the activity and they were willing to improve their essays based on the grammatical feedback that they received from their partners. As far as 'fairness' is concerned, a total of 91.67% perceived that the feedback they received from their peers was fair.

Table 2

Distribution of Responses 'Agree & Strongly Agree' plus Chi-square Test of Significance

Aspects	Percent	P-value
Usefulness	95	1.000
Acceptance	95.83	0.675
Affect	93.33	0.402
Willingness to improve	93.33	0.402
Fairness	91.67	0.093

Since the probability is higher than the pre-determined alpha level of 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, it can be concluded that 95% of students have positive perceptions toward the use of peer feedback activity.

Research question 2: *What are the students' reflections on peer feedback activity?*

When asked if peer feedback was useful, every student stated that it was. Thirteen of the subjects (out of 20) responded that it was very useful. They liked sharing their work with their classmates and felt it valuable to their development as writers. They indicated that reading their classmates' work benefited them, for it helped them learn more and they also got new ideas with regards to writing style, word choice, and content. Six of them similarly pointed out that peer feedback activity helped them interact with their friends and they felt that they became more active and responsible. *"I enjoyed working with my classmates. They were supportive and it was a welcoming learning atmosphere. I think this activity was really useful. I felt that I became more active as I shared responsibility for my own learning".*

Findings from the interviews revealed that every student supported the use of peer feedback in future writing classes mainly for its several benefits. For instance, it gave them a chance to make another revision before handing their work to the teacher. Moreover, it gave them opportunities to participate more in the learning process. The students pointed out that it helped them learn to accept and be more open to other people's opinions. *"I wish you continued using peer feedback in the future. I found it really helpful. I learned to be more open and listen to other people's opinions. Participating*

in this kind of activity not only helped me improve my writing but I could also help out a peer. I felt like I accomplished something and I felt more confident".

When asked what they did after receiving grammatical feedback from their peers, the majority of the subjects (13 students) reported that before they corrected their work based on their peers' suggestions, they consulted grammar handbooks. They stated that they did not want to incorporate their friends' corrections right away. Some of them (9 students) stated that they always discussed with their partners when they had any questions regarding the corrections that their friends made before taking up the suggestions. All of the students unanimously agreed that they would revise their work according to the feedback from their partners. Furthermore, they seemed to recognize that their partners worked hard in correcting grammatical errors. *"My friend's comments added accuracy to my writing. I realized that my friend spent a lot time correcting my grammars. I don't mind seeing red ink everywhere. In fact, I appreciated it and I found it very helpful".*

When asked if they liked participating in peer feedback activity, findings from the interviews indicated that every student enjoyed participating in the activity. The reasons that they gave were similar. Most of them said having another pair of eyes look at their work before they handed it in to the teacher was really helpful. They also expressed that their experience in collaborating with their classmates had been stimulating and fun simultaneously. Another student stated that she liked peer correction because she believed that a classroom should be about not only learning from the teacher, but fellow students and herself. In addition, she indicated that by using peer feedback, students were getting practice in revising and editing, and getting to know the writer as a person.

Regarding the problems that they had when receiving or giving feedback to their partners, the interviewees expressed that certain grammatical and mechanical features such as pronoun references, run-on sentences, spelling, fragments, and plurals were not difficult to identify. However, it was not easy to correct their friends' grammatical errors especially when it came to complex grammatical features, i.e. verb tenses. They reported that what they normally did was to either write a note asking the writer to check again or put a question mark next to what they had corrected. *"English verb tenses are very difficult. In Thai, we don't have that many tenses. I have to invest a lot more time and effort on them. However, when I'm not very certain, I will always put a question mark next to the correction that I made. So, my friend will have an idea that she may probably need to check again".*

When asked if they had any suggestions for improving peer feedback activity, the majority of students (14 students) stated that they liked the way the activity was done. They liked it that they had a new partner every week and that they were able to choose the person that they wanted to work with. However, six students similarly stated that it would have been great if the teacher had allowed group feedback. They mentioned that using more than one student commenting on the work would be very interesting and useful.

Finally, when the students were given a choice between two feedback options, i.e. 1) teacher feedback alone, and 2) peer feedback followed by teacher feedback, the findings from the interviews did mirror evidence in our quantitative data about the students' positive impressions of peer feedback activity, the students unanimously chose the latter. According to the interviews, the students were very positive about using peer feedback in the writing class. Their positive responses about peer feedback are echoed in their reasons for their choice. One of them stated, *"My writing improved through revisions made in response to grammatical feedback from my peers. It really helped increase my writing quality"*. Another student indicated, *"I liked working with my friends because it was relaxing. Also, I felt like I had another chance to make my writing as grammatically accurate as possible before submitting to the teacher"*.

To sum up the interview data, it can be said that the students had a strong preference for peer feedback activity and they recognized its usefulness. Furthermore, they had a relatively enjoyable experience participating in the activity. They were willing to edit their work based on their peers' grammatical feedback. However, they did not simply copy their peers' corrections into their revisions. In fact, they either checked with grammar handbooks or discussed with their partners before they made a correction. In addition, they suggested that it would have been more useful if they could have had more than one person look at their work.

Discussion

By inspecting the descriptive results of the questionnaire, it is clear that the students have very strong views in favor of peer feedback activity. In terms of affect, the overwhelming majority of students were highly satisfied with it. They perceived peer feedback activity as both beneficial and fair. In addition, they showed a high degree of acceptance and willingness to improve. Not a single student rejected peer feedback, and from the interview, they were all supportive of the use of peer feedback in future writing classes. The students valued peer feedback for its benefits. Being a reader

of their friends' work, they felt that they learned how to revise and edit. They even learned from their friends' mistakes. In addition, they were exposed to new ideas, different choices of words, and writing styles. They further indicated that participating in peer feedback activity helped them become more active and responsible for their own learning. More encouraging is the finding that they prefer having peer feedback followed by teacher feedback to receiving teacher feedback alone. This finding runs counter to previous research that L2 students had negative impressions toward peer feedback and questioned the purposes and advantages of peer feedback and trusted only feedback that comes from their teacher or "the expert" (Hinkel. 2004; Hong. 2006; Min. 2008; Nelson; & Carson. 1998; Saito; & Fujita. 2004).

To consider a potential explanation, I would argue that the students' positive perception toward peer feedback could be due to two factors; 1) the match between the students' learning preference and the nature of the peer feedback itself, and 2) the fact that the students were all English majors. With regard to the first factor, it is probable that the students have developed beliefs and expectations about education. The orientation to the 'new' roles of a learner which is not one of a receiver but of an active participant explains why the students accepted and were willing to participate in peer feedback activity. The findings from both the questionnaire and the interview suggested that the students have learned to become less dependent on the teacher and to adopt a more participatory role in their own learning process and move toward a more agentive position. As I have previously discussed, peer feedback required self-reliance and a high level of learner independence and was designed to encourage students to utilize their own resources (Muncie. 2000; Saito; & Fujita. 2004; Villamil; & De Guerrero. 1998). As far as the second factor is concerned, this research was conducted in a context where the subjects were all English majors; hence, it can be assumed that English majors' grammar and mechanics knowledge as well as their writing proficiency were comparatively higher than non- English majors who received relatively little practice in English writing. This probably explains why the students in this study appeared to be more motivated and had positive views toward peer feedback activity and felt comfortable when they gave and received feedback from their peers.

Building on the evidence of these results, it can be argued with a high level of certainty that the students are ready for peer feedback. They valued criticism from their peers and were willing to improve their work based on their peers' grammatical comments. However, the students did not simply copy the correct forms as suggested by their friends. They did question its validity, weighed

it against their knowledge and consulted grammar books and then decided whether any changes should be made. This finding is contradictory to the studies of Hong (2006), Sengupta (1998) and Zhang (1995, 1999) which found that L2 students who came from a teacher-fronted classroom did not seem to welcome peer feedback. These students had very negative response toward peer feedback activity. They did not accept peer feedback and thought it was a "waste of time" (Sengupta. 1998: 22). Furthermore, they believed that there was no value in peer correction, that giving feedback is the teacher's job, and they mistrusted their peers' feedback in terms of language proficiency (Bitchener. 2008; Jacobs; Curtis; Briane; & Huang. 1998).

From the findings of this study, the students' strong support for the use of peer feedback in future writing classes makes it possible to assume with confidence that the students were willing to be more responsible for their own learning and learn from their peers. The students did not find grammatical feedback from their classmates discouraging or disrespectful. In fact, the activity helped them establish a social context for writing.

In sum, I would like to argue for the continual practice of the peer feedback since it is an invaluable way of encouraging learner autonomy in Thai classrooms. However, it should be noted that the promotion of peer feedback should persist not as the cure for students' problems with grammar alone but as problem solving activities designed to support students in becoming more agentive learners. Since English language teaching in Thailand is moving toward a learner-centered classroom where a high degree of learner autonomy is encouraged (Chatranonth. 2008), peer feedback activity is one of the teaching techniques that Thai EFL writing teachers may need to consider integrating into their classes. As Tamjid and Birjandi (2011) emphasize, good conditions for learning can be best achieved if the students are encouraged to be actively involved in their learning process. The peer feedback activity helps not only reduce the teacher's workload but also contribute to the students' editing and revising skill development, greater autonomous learning, and the ability to work with other learners.

Reference

Atay, D.; & Kurt, G. (2007). The Effects of Peer Feedback on the Writing Anxiety of Prospective Turkish Teachers of EFL. **Journal of Theory and Practice in Education.** 3(1): 12-23.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in Support of Written Corrective Feedback. **Journal of Second Language Writing.** 17: 101-118.

Brown, Douglas. H. (2004). **Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices.** New York: Longman.

Chatranonth, Phnita. (2008). **The Impact of Teacher Feedback on Students' Grammatical Writing Accuracy: A Case Study in Thailand.** Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Manchester: The University of Manchester.

Enginarlar, H. (1993). Student Response to Teacher Feedback in EFL Writing. **System.** 21: 193-204.

Farrah, M. (2012). The impact of peer feedback on improving the writing skills among Hebron University students. **An - Najah Univ. J. Res. (Humanities).** 26(1): 179-210.

Ferris, Dana. R. (2003). **Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students.** New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ferris, Dana. R.; & Hedgcock, John. S. (2005). **Teaching ESL Composition: Purpose, Process, & Practice.** 2nd ed. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Graddol, David. (2006). **English Next: Why Global English may Mean the End of 'English as a Foreign Language'.** London: British Council.

Harmer, Jeremy. (2004). **How to Teach English.** London: Longman.

Hinkel, Eli. (2004). **Teaching Academic ESL Writing: Practical Techniques in Vocabulary and Grammar.** New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hirose, Keiko. (2008). Peer feedback in L2 Writing Instruction. In K. Bradford Watts, T.; & M. Swanson (Eds.), **JALT2007 Conference Proceedings.** Tokyo: JALT.

_____. (2009). **Cooperative Learning in English Writing Instruction through Peer Feedback.** Unpublished Research. Aichi: Aichi Prefectural University.

Hong, F. (2006). Students' Perception of Peer Response Activity in English Writing Instruction. **CELEA.** 29(4).

Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The Beliefs about Language Learning of Beginning University Foreign Language Students. **The Modern Language Journal.** 72(3): 283-294.

Hyland, K.; & Hyland, F. (2006). State-of-the-Art Article: Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing. **Language Teaching.** 39: 83-101.

Jacobs, G.; Curtis, A.; Briane, G.; & Huang, S. (1998). Feedback on Student Writing: Taking the Middle Path. **Journal of Second Language Writing.** 7(3): 307-317.

Keynes, T. (2006). **It's Important for Writers to Use Correct Grammar.** Retrieved December 15, 2011, from http://www.useless-knowledge.com/

Kim, Y.; & Kim, J. (2005). Teaching Korean University Writing Class: Balancing the Process and the Genre Approach. **Asian-EFL-Journal.** 7(2): 68-89.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). **Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching.** New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Lundstrom, K.; & Baker, W. (2009). To Give is Better than to Receive: The Benefits of Peer review to the Peviewer's Own Writing. **Journal of Second Language Writing.** 18(1): 30-43.

Mendonça, C. O.; & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer Review Negotiations: Revision Activities in ESL Writing Instruction. **TESOL Quarterly.** 28: 745-769.

Min, H.T. (2008). Reviewer Stances and Writer Perceptions in EFL Peer Review Training. **English for Specific Purposes.** 27: 285-305.

Muncie, J. (2000). Using Written Teacher Feedback in EFL Composition Classes. **ELT Journal.** 54(1): 47-53.

Nelson, G.; & Carson, J. (1998). ESL Students' Perceptions of Effectiveness in Peer Response Groups. **Journal of Second Language Writing.** 7(2): 113-131.

Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative Language Teaching: Making it Work. **ELT Journal.** 41(2): 136-145.

_____. (1995). Closing the Gap between Learning and Instruction. **TESOL Quarterly.** 29(1): 133-158.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class. **ELT Journal.** 59(1): 23-30.

Saito, H.; & Fujita, T. (2004). Characteristics and user acceptance of peer rating in EFL writing classrooms. **Language Teaching Research.** 8(1): 31-54.

Scarcella, Robin. C.; & Oxford, Rebecca. L. (1992). **The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual in the Communicative Classroom.** Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Schulz, R. (2001). Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction. **The Modern Language Journal.** 85: 244-58.

Sengupta, S. (1998). Peer Evaluation: "I am Not the Teacher." **ELT Journal.** 52(1): 19-28.

Shen, M. (2007). **Investigating Students' Utilization of Teacher's Written Feedback at Senior High School in Taiwan.** Unpublished MA dissertation. Manchester : The University of Manchester.

Srichanyachon, N. (2011). Comparative Study of Three Revision Methods in EFL Writing. **Journal of College Teaching & Learning.** 8(9): 1-8.

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative Writing: Product, Process, and Students' Reflections. **Journal of Second Language Writing.** 14(3): 153-173.

Strijbos, J. W.; Pat-El, R. J.; & Narciss, S. (2010, September). **Structural Validation of a Multidimensional (Peer) Feedback Perceptions Questionnaire.** Paper presented at the EARLI- Northumbria Assessment Conference (ENAC), Hexham, Northumberland, UK.

Tamjid, N. H.; & Birjandi, P. (2011). Fostering Learner Autonomy through Self- and-Peer Assessment. **International Journal of Academic Research.** 3(5): 245-254.

Tsui, A.B.M.; & Ng, M. (2000). Do Secondary L2 Writers Benefit from Peer Comments? **Journal of Second Language Writing.** 9: 147-170.

Villamil, O.S.; & De Guerrero, M. (1998). Assessing the Impact of Peer Revision on L2 Writing. **Applied Linguistics.** 19(4): 491-514.

Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the Affective Advantage of Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class. **Journal of Second Language Writing.** 4(3): 209-222.

_____. (1999). Thoughts on Some Recent Evidence Concerning the Effective Advantage of Peer Feedback. **Journal of Second Language Writing.** 8(3): 321-326.

QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is a part of a research project funded by Faculty of Humanities, SWU. Your cooperation in completing this questionnaire will be highly appreciated. The information you provide will be kept in strict confidentiality.

Instructions: Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements by placing a check mark in the appropriate box.

	Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1	Peer feedback is a very useful activity.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Giving feedback on my friend's work helps me improve the grammar of my writing.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Reading my friends' writings also helps me enrich the content and organization of my writing.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I benefit from reading and giving feedback to my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Peer feedback activity helps me be more responsible for my own learning.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Peer feedback activity facilitates my English writing process.	1	2	3	4	5
7	When I revise my draft, I take my peer's comments into consideration.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I do not mind sharing my writings with my peers.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I revise my draft based on my peer's feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I always value my peer's knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I accept feedback from peers and I do not mind that my friends know about my grammatical mistakes.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I trust my peer's grammatical feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I am happy having my peers comment on my work.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I enjoy participating in peer feedback activity because it makes me learn more in a relaxing way.	1	2	3	4	5

	Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
15	I like peer feedback activity because it helps the learning more fun.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I do not feel offended when my friends comment on my work.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I do not feel frustrated when my friends comment on my work.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I hope that my teacher will continue to use peer feedback activity in the future writing classes.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I carefully revise my work after cooperating comments from my peer.	1	2	3	4	5
20	I believe that students should be active and contribute to the learning process.	1	2	3	4	5
21	I am willing to revise my writing according to my peer's comments.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I am willing to improve and learn from peer's comments.	1	2	3	4	5
23	I do spend time and effort in revising my work after receiving comments from peers.	1	2	3	4	5
24	I discuss with my peers when I have a question about their comments.	1	2	3	4	5
25	My peers give clear, correct, and sufficient suggestions to me.	1	2	3	4	5
26	I always give feedback to my peers fairly.	1	2	3	4	5
27	My peers make good judgments about the strengths and weaknesses of my draft.	1	2	3	4	5
28	I always do my best when commenting on my friends' drafts.	1	2	3	4	5
29	My peers comment on my work in a straightforward and fair manner.	1	2	3	4	5
30	I think it is fair to change the person who gives feedback every week.	1	2	3	4	5

Thank you very much for your cooperation.