

Peer Feedback in Thai EFL Writing: Students' Perceptions, Accuracy, and Revisions

Mana Termjai¹

¹ Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Naresuan University, Thailand

Correspondence: Mana Termjai, Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Naresuan University, Thapo, Mueang, Phitsanulok, Thailand. E-mail: manatermjai@hotmail.com

Received: June 21, 2024

Accepted: July 7, 2024

Online Published: July 9, 2024

doi: 10.5539/elt.v17n8p10

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v17n8p10>

Abstract

While previous research has underscored the implications of peer feedback in general EFL contexts, there has been limited exploration of its specific implications within the context of Thailand. This study investigated the effectiveness of peer feedback in enhancing the writing skills and compositions of Thai students. It aimed to explore students' perceptions of its efficacy, identify the specific writing elements addressed and integrated by feedback givers and receivers, and assess the accuracy of the feedback and revisions. The participants included 35 English major students from a government university in Thailand enrolled in the English Reading and Writing course. The research instruments comprised a questionnaire, students' descriptive compositions, and interviews. The findings revealed unanimous agreement among students regarding the positive impact of peer feedback on their writing skills and quality, despite relatively lower levels of perceived confidence in both providing and receiving peer feedback. Coherence emerged as the primary focus of feedback, followed by other writing elements, collectively achieving a remarkable accuracy rate. Notably, despite coherence being the focus, students exhibited higher levels of integration for grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary in their subsequent drafts compared to coherence and unity. Discussions were included to provide insights into Thai students' perceptions, feedback provision and integration, and pedagogical implications for addressing challenges of peer feedback within the Thai EFL writing context, thereby improving students' writing proficiency and compositions.

Keywords: accuracy, EFL writing, peer feedback, perception, revision

1. Introduction

1.1 Rationale

Peer feedback is widely recognized as a crucial pedagogical tool in English as a foreign language (EFL) writing instruction. It offers substantial benefits to students in both receiving and giving feedback. As feedback receivers, students gain constructive insights and perspectives on their work (Nguyen, 2017). This feedback enables them to identify areas for improvement, including language, mechanics, content, organization, and formatting in their writing (Nguyen, 2018; Wu, Huang, Han, & Zhang, 2022). They can effectively integrate these suggestions into subsequent drafts to refine their writing (Ryoo & Wing, 2012).

In the role of feedback givers, students develop critical analytical skills by evaluating peers' writing across various elements, such as language usage, vocabulary, content, coherence, and organization (Hentasmaka & Cahyono, 2021; Yu & Lee, 2016). This process not only enhances their understanding of effective writing strategies but also deepens their grasp of writing conventions (Yu & Hu, 2017). Moreover, peer feedback fosters communication, collaboration, and interpersonal skills among students (Kunwongse, 2013), while promoting autonomy in their learning process (Kuyyogsuy, 2019).

Despite its benefits, peer feedback in educational settings raises several concerns. These include the accuracy of feedback (Kunwongse, 2013), students' confidence levels in both giving and receiving feedback (Kangni, 2015), and a tendency among students to prioritize addressing local errors, such as grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, over global ones, such as content and ideas (Bijami, Kashef, & Nejad, 2013).

In the Thai EFL context, peer feedback has been shown to enhance students' writing performance (Kuyyogsuy, 2019). However, it primarily emphasizes grammar and mechanics rather than broader content and organizational

elements (Nguyen, 2017; Nguyen, 2018). Students often struggle with addressing global errors, consequently providing unclear and inappropriate comments (Nguyen, 2019). Additionally, there is limited research on students' confidence in giving and receiving peer feedback in this setting. While prior studies have discussed the implications of peer feedback in general EFL contexts, there has been limited exploration of its specific implications within the context of Thailand.

Given these considerations, this study aims to explore how Thai students perceive and engage with peer feedback to improve writing proficiency and compositions. It focuses on examining how students provide and integrate peer feedback, emphasizing coherence and unity over grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, and evaluating the accuracy of the feedback and integration. By addressing these aspects, the research seeks to optimize peer feedback practices for Thai students. Ultimately, the findings will inform strategies to enhance the effectiveness of peer feedback in Thai EFL writing instruction. To achieve these goals, the study outlines its research objectives and questions as follows.

1.2 Research Objectives

- (1) To explore students' perceptions of the effectiveness of peer feedback in improving their writing skills and compositions.
- (2) To identify the elements of writing that feedback givers address and assess the feedback's accuracy in identifying areas for improvement.
- (3) To analyze the elements of writing that feedback receivers integrate into subsequent drafts and assess the accuracy of these revisions.

1.3 Research Questions

- (1) What are students' perceptions of the effectiveness of peer feedback in improving their writing skills and compositions?
- (2) What elements of writing do feedback givers provide feedback on, and how accurately does this feedback identify areas for improvement?
- (3) What elements of writing do feedback receivers integrate into subsequent drafts, and how accurate are these revisions in improving writing quality?

1.4 Literature Review

1.4.1 Forms and Modalities of Peer Feedback in EFL Writing

In EFL writing education, peer feedback is a collaborative process where students provide constructive insights into their peers' written assignments (Iswandari & Jiang, 2020). This approach fosters a learning environment in which students can highlight strengths and identify areas for improvement in their compositions (Nguyen, 2017). Peer feedback is also known by various terms, including peer response, peer review, peer editing, and peer evaluation (Bijami, Kashef, & Nejad, 2013).

Peer feedback can take diverse forms and be delivered through different mediums. It can be provided in written form (Wu, Huang, Han, & Zhang, 2022), spoken form, or a combination of both (Ryoo & Wing, 2012). Moreover, it can occur in pairs (Kamimura, 2006) or group settings (Yu & Hu, 2017; Yu & Lee, 2016), and through various mediums, such as face-to-face interactions (Wakabayashi, 2008), online platforms, or specialized program applications (Chen, 2016).

Feedback can be provided in two primary ways: direct and indirect (Ferris, 2006). Direct feedback involves specific comments or suggestions that address particular aspects of the written work, such as pointing out grammatical errors or suggesting alternative word choices. Indirect feedback, on the other hand, identifies errors in the written work without providing corrections or suggestions, encouraging feedback receivers to reflect on and address the issues themselves.

1.4.2 Benefits of Peer Feedback in EFL Writing

Research has consistently demonstrated the positive impact of peer feedback on EFL students' writing proficiency and compositions. Kusumaningrum, Cahyono, and Prayogo (2019) examined various forms of peer feedback provision among Indonesian EFL students. They conducted pre-test and post-test comparisons on writing scores, evaluating content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The results indicated that both in-class and small-group peer feedback significantly improved students' writing performance.

Additionally, research has explored peer feedback implementation among students with varying levels of English proficiency. Ryoo and Wing (2012) investigated peer feedback among Korean EFL students at beginning and

intermediate levels. The feedback predominantly focused on grammar, including verb tense, articles, prepositions, and sentence structure. While the beginner group least frequently integrated feedback on sentence structure into their revisions, the intermediate group was less likely to integrate feedback on articles, prepositions, and sentence structure. The analysis revealed that beginning-level students valued peer feedback more highly than their intermediate-level counterparts.

1.4.3 Concerns Surrounding Peer Feedback in EFL Writing

Despite its benefits, several concerns have been raised about implementing peer feedback in EFL writing instruction. One common issue is students' preference for teacher feedback over peer feedback, as teachers are perceived as more knowledgeable and experienced evaluators (Kunwongse, 2013; Nguyen, 2017). Additionally, peer feedback often focuses more on local errors, such as grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, rather than global errors, such as content and ideas (Bijami, Kashef, & Nejad, 2013). This limitation can diminish the effectiveness of peer feedback in fostering deeper revisions and improvements in writing. Moreover, students' lack of confidence in providing effective feedback and their limited proficiency in the target language can hinder the feedback process (Kangni, 2015; Ryoo & Wing, 2012).

1.4.4 Effectiveness and Challenges of Peer Feedback in the Thai EFL Context

Thai students, like their counterparts in other EFL settings, benefit from peer feedback in improving their writing proficiency. Kuyyogsuy (2019) investigated the influence of peer feedback on the writing proficiency and quality of 21 Thai students majoring in English. The study involved pre-test and post-test comparisons of writing scores, assessing mechanics, language use, vocabulary, organization, and content. The results showed that participating in peer feedback sessions within small groups significantly increased scores in narrative paragraph writing. Additionally, students reported that peer feedback fostered intellectual, social, and emotional development while promoting autonomy in their learning process.

Similarly, Nguyen (2019) explored the effect of peer feedback on the writing skills of 60 Thai students majoring in English. Throughout the semester, students wrote paragraphs on seven different topics. Initially, they wrote their first drafts at home and then provided peer feedback during class sessions. This feedback exchange occurred within small groups, where students offered individual feedback before collectively discussing and clarifying their suggestions under the teacher's guidance. The findings indicated that 45% of assignments received high average scores, with students expressing a preference for peer feedback on ideas and teacher feedback on language.

Nguyen (2017) also studied combined peer-teacher feedback among Thai university students, revealing highly positive perceptions of feedback. Students found it helpful for noticing their mistakes, learning from them, and improving their writing. However, the study also raised concerns. That is, most peer feedback focused on language and mechanics, with accuracy rates exceeding 95% and integration rates over 94%, compared to 100% for teacher feedback. Despite acknowledging the benefits of both peer and teacher feedback, students tended to value teacher feedback more highly.

Similarly, Nguyen (2018) found that combined peer-teacher feedback positively influenced the writing accuracy of Thai university students over a semester. Students perceived grammatical and lexical issues, such as capitalization, punctuation, prepositions, articles, spelling, and tenses, as relatively easy to address. However, they found revisions on content and organization more difficult. Consequently, they often sought guidance from teachers for these elements.

Although Thai students benefit from peer feedback to enhance their writing performance, the effectiveness of this feedback can vary due to their diverse levels of English language proficiency. Several studies underscore the challenges Thai students face in English writing. They recognize its importance for academic and professional purposes but often find it highly challenging (Sundrarajun, 2020). Padgate's (2008) survey of second-year English majors highlighted struggles in editing, vocabulary use, transitions, and content development.

Sermsook, Liamnimitr, and Pochakorn (2017) identified errors in punctuation, articles, subject-verb agreement, spelling, capitalization, and fragments among second-year English majors. Chuenchaichon (2022) found lexical, syntactic, and paragraph-level errors among non-English majors, including word choice, singular/plural usage, coherence, the provision of supporting details, and the use of cohesive devices.

Boonpattanaporn's (2008) study with fourth-year English majors revealed challenges in word choice, coherent organization, and verb tense accuracy. Ka-kan-dee and Kaur (2014) noted struggles with vocabulary, grammar, evidence provision, thesis development, and argument coherence among fourth-year English majors. To address these issues, they suggested prioritizing content and organization in initial drafts and focusing on grammar and

vocabulary in subsequent revisions (Ka-kan-dee & Kaur, 2015). Overall, the writing challenges among Thai students may impede their ability to effectively provide and integrate peer feedback in English writing contexts.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

Purposive sampling was employed to select 35 English major students from a government university in Thailand enrolled in the English Reading and Writing course during the second semester of the academic year 2023. This sample represented 24.3% of the total enrollment for the semester. Of the participants, 8 were male (23%) and 27 were female (77%), with an average age of 19.1. The majority comprised 31 first-year students (88.57%), with 3 second-year students (8.57%), and 1 third-year student (2.86%). Among them, 16 were majoring in English in the Faculty of Humanities (46%) and 19 in the Faculty of Education (54%). All participants were native Thai speakers, and none had previously taken this course.

2.2 Instruments

This study employed three research instruments: a questionnaire, students' written compositions, and semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire, developed by the researcher, was structured into three sections. The first section collected demographic information, including gender, age, year of study, major, and faculty. The second section assessed students' perceptions of peer feedback with 10 items, focusing equally on their roles as feedback givers and receivers. Responses were rated on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The final section explored students' reflections on the effectiveness of peer feedback through an open-ended question, inviting detailed insights.

Students' written compositions, part of their coursework in the English Reading and Writing course, involved writing a descriptive paragraph on the topic "Your Favorite Room in Your Home," with a word count between 150 and 200 words. The composition process included developing an outline, composing a first draft, refining it into a second draft, and creating a polished final draft. This study collected and analyzed the first draft, which included written peer feedback, and the second draft for analysis.

Semi-structured interviews gathered in-depth qualitative data on students' perceptions of peer feedback effectiveness. These interviews used open-ended questions to explore key themes, such as perceptions, feedback provision, and integration strategies, including students' experiences and attitudes toward peer feedback.

2.3 Data Collection

The data collection process involved two main phases: coursework and data gathering. During the coursework phase, students in the English Reading and Writing course dedicated four hours per week over seven weeks to their studies, using Savage and Shafiei's (2007) textbook, *Effective Academic Writing 1: The Paragraph*.

In the first four weeks, the coursework focused on paragraph organization, unity, coherence, sentence types, mechanics, and common sentence errors, such as fragments and run-ons. The subsequent three weeks emphasized descriptive paragraph writing, including organization, drafting, specific language usage, and the use of descriptive adjectives for describing people, places, and objects. Overall, the coursework covered essential elements for composing effective descriptive paragraphs: organization, unity, coherence, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.

In week 5, students were assigned to write a descriptive paragraph on the topic "Your Favorite Room in Your Home." The process began with students outlining their ideas and receiving teacher feedback on key elements of descriptive paragraphs: the title, topic sentence, supporting sentences, and concluding sentence. Following this, students drafted their paragraphs at home. The importance of descriptive writing is emphasized by several scholars. Langan (2011) highlights the reliance on rich, vivid details. Bauer, Boyle, and Stapleton (2016) stress the use of sensory and spatial details, emotional elements, and relevant background information. Clouse (2013) notes that descriptive writing serves various purposes, such as conveying emotions, capturing experiences, informing, entertaining, or persuading.

In week 6, students exchanged drafts and provided direct written feedback to randomly assigned peers during class sessions. The feedback focused on paragraph organization, unity, and coherence. This approach aimed to address concerns from previous research, which found that peer feedback often emphasizes sentence-level issues rather than content and ideas (Bijami, Kashef, & Nejad, 2013). Feedback receivers could seek oral clarification from their peers. Following this, students revised their first drafts at home based on the feedback they received. In week 7, they submitted their second drafts for teacher feedback on vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Finally, they submitted their final drafts for grading.

During the data-gathering phase, on the announcement of their marks for the descriptive paragraph assignment, students were invited to participate in the research following established ethical guidelines for human research. The Institutional Review Board approved the research under the reference number P2-0008/2566. Participants' profiles were kept confidential, and the research findings were used exclusively for academic purposes.

Initially, participants completed a questionnaire on their perceptions of peer feedback, lasting about 10 minutes to complete. Upon completion, the questionnaires were collected for subsequent analysis. Following the questionnaire, participants' descriptive compositions were collected and preserved for further analysis. These compositions included initial drafts with incorporated peer feedback and subsequent drafts. Finally, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a subset of participants to gain deeper insights into their perspectives on peer feedback effectiveness, feedback provision, and integration strategies. Five students were randomly selected for these interviews, each lasting about 10 minutes. The participants' responses were transcribed into written summaries and subsequently provided to them for verification.

2.4 Data Analysis

The data analysis process began with examining students' responses to the questionnaire, addressing Research Question 1. The 10-item questionnaires were quantitatively analyzed using mean and standard deviation. Mean scores were interpreted based on predefined criteria: 4.51-5.00 as "strongly agree," 3.51-4.50 as "agree," 2.51-3.50 as "neutral," 1.51-2.50 as "disagree," and 1.00-1.50 as "strongly disagree." Additionally, thematic analysis was employed to explore students' qualitative reflections on the efficacy of peer feedback from the open-ended questionnaire responses, considering its advantages and challenges.

Next, descriptive compositions were analyzed for writing elements using Savage and Shafiei's (2007) analytical framework. Frequency and percentage were employed to determine feedback frequency and accuracy. This analysis involved examining the initial drafts and the accompanying peer feedback to identify targeted writing elements and assess feedback accuracy, in line with Research Question 2.

The second drafts were subsequently analyzed to identify the writing elements that feedback receivers integrated into their revisions and to evaluate the accuracy of these revisions, aligning with Research Question 3. Frequency and percentage were used to determine the integration frequency and the revisions' accuracy.

The transcribed responses from the semi-structured interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify key themes related to students' perspectives on peer feedback effectiveness, feedback provision, and integration strategies. This analysis provided deeper insights into the qualitative data collected from the interviews.

3. Findings and Discussion

The findings and discussion of this study are structured according to the three research questions outlined below.

3.1 Students' Perceptions of Peer Feedback

Research Question 1 explores students' perceptions of how peer feedback enhances their writing skills and compositions. The analysis of the questionnaires revealed unanimous agreement among students regarding the positive impact of peer feedback on their writing skills and quality ($M = 4.47$, $SD = 0.35$), as illustrated in Table 1. Notably, the scores of feedback receivers ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.31$) were slightly higher than those of feedback givers ($M = 4.39$, $SD = 0.41$).

Looking closely at students' perceptions as feedback receivers, the analysis showed strong agreement levels. Specifically, students strongly agreed that peer feedback helps them identify areas for improvement ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.41$), improve the quality of their written work ($M = 4.71$, $SD = 0.46$), and improve their ability to revise subsequent drafts ($M = 4.66$, $SD = 0.48$). Additionally, they expressed strong agreement in incorporating peer feedback into their draft revisions ($M = 4.57$, $SD = 0.56$). However, their confidence in the feedback received from peers achieved a slightly lower level of agreement ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 0.62$).

Transitioning to students' perceptions as feedback givers, the analysis revealed varied levels of agreement. Students strongly agreed that peer feedback helps refine their English language skills ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.47$) and motivates them to analyze their peer's written work ($M = 4.66$, $SD = 0.54$). However, other aspects received slightly lower levels of agreement. Specifically, students applied writing strategies in their draft revisions after giving feedback to peers ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.69$) and acknowledged that peer feedback helps deepen their understanding of writing conventions ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 0.69$). Nevertheless, their confidence in the feedback they provide to peers received the lowest level of agreement ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 0.66$).

Furthermore, students expressed varied perceptions regarding the benefits and challenges of giving and receiving feedback in response to the open-ended question. Feedback receivers highlighted the opportunity to identify

personal weaknesses, facilitating more effective revisions of subsequent drafts. They also valued learning from peers, particularly in vocabulary and grammar. For instance, one student noted, “Peer feedback helps me learn from peers who analyze my written work, enabling me to revise subsequent drafts accordingly.” However, a few expressed concerns about the reliability and accuracy of feedback received from peers.

Feedback givers noted several advantages, including improvement in writing skills, such as word choice, grammar, and mechanics. They found that analyzing peers’ work and then revising their own writing based on this analysis positively influenced their revisions. Additionally, giving feedback helps them understand writing conventions, identify their weaknesses, and refine their analytical skills. For example, one student expressed, “Peer feedback allows me to practice identifying peers’ writing weaknesses, which I then use to revise my subsequent drafts.”

Table 1. Students’ Ratings of Peer Feedback

Statements	M	SD	Level
In the role of feedback receiver			
1. Peer feedback helps me identify areas for improvement.	4.80	0.41	SA
2. Peer feedback helps improve my ability to revise drafts.	4.66	0.48	SA
3. Peer feedback helps improve the quality of my written work.	4.71	0.46	SA
4. I incorporate peer feedback into my draft revisions.	4.57	0.56	SA
5. I have confidence in the feedback I receive from peers.	4.03	0.62	A
Subtotal	4.55	0.31	SA
In the role of feedback giver			
6. I have confidence in the feedback I offer to my peers.	3.74	0.66	A
7. Peer feedback motivates me to analyze my peer’s written work.	4.66	0.54	SA
8. Peer feedback helps refine my English language skills.	4.80	0.47	SA
9. Peer feedback helps deepen my understanding of writing conventions.	4.37	0.69	A
10. After giving feedback to peers, I apply the strategies in my draft revisions.	4.40	0.69	A
Subtotal	4.39	0.41	A
Total	4.47	0.35	A

Note. SA = strongly agree; A = agree.

Overall, students viewed peer feedback positively, recognizing its role in enhancing writing skills, reinforcing writing conventions, and promoting collaborative learning. They emphasized its importance in providing opportunities to apply English skills in authentic writing contexts.

These perceptions align with previous research, which indicates that peer feedback significantly enhances students’ writing skills and compositions (Kusumaningrum, Cahyono, & Prayogo, 2019). Feedback receivers benefit from peers’ insights and integrate them into subsequent drafts to improve language, mechanics, content, organization, and formatting (Nguyen, 2018; Ryoo & Wing, 2012; Wu, Huang, Han, & Zhang, 2022).

For feedback givers, participation in peer feedback encourages them to assess various writing elements of their peers’ writing, including vocabulary, grammar, and organization (Hentasmaka & Cahyono, 2021; Yu & Lee, 2016). It also deepens their grasp of effective writing strategies and conventions (Yu & Hu, 2017). Moreover, it enhances students’ communicative and collaborative skills (Kunwongse, 2013).

However, the lower average scores in students’ confidence for both receiving ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 0.62$) and giving ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 0.66$) feedback indicate diminished confidence in these areas. This finding aligns with Kangni (2015) and Ryoo and Wing (2012). A contributing factor to this lack of confidence may be students’ preference for teacher feedback over peer feedback, as noted by Kunwongse (2013) and Nguyen (2017). The interview analysis revealed that students perceived themselves as having similar writing proficiency and English language competence as their peers. Some students expressed reluctance to provide comprehensive feedback to peers.

3.2 Feedback Elements and Accuracy

Research Question 2 identifies the writing elements that feedback givers address and evaluates the accuracy of this feedback in identifying areas for improvement. The cohort of 35 students collectively provided 135 instances of peer feedback, averaging 3.86 instances of feedback per composition ($SD = 1.54$). The feedback most frequently addressed supporting sentences (100 instances, 74.07%), followed by the concluding sentence (17 instances, 12.59%) and the topic sentence (15 instances, 11.11%), while the title received the least frequent feedback (3 instances, 2.22%).

The findings, summarized in Table 2, revealed five key elements of writing addressed by feedback givers, with an overall accuracy rate of 94.07%. Coherence received the highest frequency of feedback (69 instances, 51.11%), with a high accuracy rate of 95.65%. Grammar was the second most frequently addressed element (25 instances, 18.52%), with a similarly high accuracy rate of 96%. Vocabulary also received a high frequency of feedback (24 instances, 17.78%), with an accuracy rate of 95.83%. Although mechanics and unity received fewer instances of feedback, they still achieved relatively high accuracy rates of 90% and 71.43%, respectively.

Table 2. Feedback Frequency and Accuracy

Elements of Writing	Frequency of Feedback	Percentage of Feedback	Frequency of Accuracy	Percentage of Accuracy
Unity	7	5.19	5	71.43
Coherence	69	51.11	66	95.65
Vocabulary	24	17.78	23	95.83
Grammar	25	18.52	24	96
Mechanics	10	7.41	9	90
Total	135	100	127	94.07

The total instances of feedback reflect the influence of instructions given to students. Although directed to provide three instances of feedback on peers' writing, the actual number ranged from three to nine per composition. Notably, feedback predominantly focused on supporting sentences, which aligns with descriptive paragraph conventions, where supporting sentences comprise the largest section, covering background information, descriptive details, and the writer's feelings or viewpoints on the topic (Bauer, Boyle, & Stapleton, 2016; Langan, 2011; Savage & Shafiei, 2007).

The emphasis on coherence in the feedback was a direct result of instructions prioritizing paragraph organization, unity, and coherence over language aspects. This approach aligns with recommendations by Ka-kan-dee and Kaur (2015) to focus on content and organization in initial drafts and address vocabulary and grammar in subsequent revisions.

However, feedback on vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics was also noted. The interview analysis showed that students readily noticed language errors and consequently provided feedback to improve their peers' writing quality. Their proficiency in grammar and mechanics, gained from a previous English grammar course, allowed them to easily identify and correct these errors. Moreover, lessons in descriptive writing further developed their ability to provide feedback on word choices. Nguyen (2018) suggests that students prioritize vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics due to the relative ease of identifying and correcting these elements.

The students' ability to provide feedback on all writing elements with a remarkable accuracy rate of 94.07% challenges previous concerns. It contradicts the notion that peer feedback typically focuses more on local errors, such as grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, rather than on global ones, such as content and ideas (Bijami, Kashef, & Nejad, 2013). It also counters the belief that students' limited proficiency in the target language can hinder the feedback process (Kangni, 2015; Ryoo & Wing, 2012). This high accuracy rate aligns with Nguyen's (2017) research, which found that Thai students achieved accuracy rates exceeding 95% when providing feedback on language and mechanics.

Moreover, the feedback covered all writing elements under examination, indicating that Thai students face challenges across various writing elements. These difficulties can hinder their revisions in subsequent drafts, which aligns with prior research highlighting common issues among Thai students in English writing (Boonpattanaporn, 2008; Chuenchaichon, 2022; Ka-kan-dee & Kaur, 2014; Ka-kan-dee & Kaur, 2015; Padgate, 2008; Sermsook, Liamnimit, & Pochakorn, 2017).

3.3 Feedback Integration and Revision Accuracy

Research Question 3 examines the integration of writing elements into subsequent drafts by feedback receivers and assesses the accuracy of these revisions in enhancing overall writing quality. The analysis revealed 90 instances of peer feedback integration, comprising 66.67% of the total received feedback, with an overall accuracy rate of 87.78%.

Table 3 illustrates the frequency and accuracy of integration for various writing elements. Grammar demonstrated the highest percentage of integration (88%) with a high accuracy rate (95.45%), followed by mechanics with 80% integration and 100% accuracy. Vocabulary also showed notable integration (70.83%) and a high accuracy rate (88.24%). Conversely, coherence had a lower integration percentage (60.87%) and 80.95% accuracy. Unity had the lowest integration percentage (14.29%) but achieved 100% accuracy. Essentially, while students integrated feedback into their subsequent drafts across various writing elements, the integration and accuracy of these revisions varied, with grammar and mechanics showing particularly high levels.

Table 3. Feedback Integration Frequency and Revision Accuracy

Elements of Writing	Frequency of Integration	Percentage of Integration	Frequency of Accuracy	Percentage of Accuracy
Unity	1	14.29	1	100
Coherence	42	60.87	34	80.95
Vocabulary	17	70.83	15	88.24
Grammar	22	88	21	95.45
Mechanics	8	80	8	100
Total	90	66.67	79	87.78

The interview analysis revealed several reasons behind students' integration strategies. Some students felt confident in the content and organization of their initial drafts and thus chose not to integrate feedback on these elements. Others indicated that revising content requires a comprehensive understanding of the overall compositions to make appropriate adjustments. Students unanimously agreed that revising language elements is easier and more straightforward than revising content and organization.

The relatively low integration rate aligns with the students' perceived lower confidence in peer feedback observed in this study. This finding is consistent with previous research by Kangni (2015), Kunwongse (2013), and Ryoo and Wing (2012). This lower confidence may be attributed to their preference for teacher feedback over peer feedback, as indicated by Kunwongse (2013) and Nguyen (2017).

Although feedback primarily focused on coherence, the integration rate for this element was lower compared to grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary. This discrepancy in integration rates may be attributed to students perceiving revisions in content and organization as more difficult than addressing grammatical and lexical issues. This finding aligns with Nguyen (2018), who noted that students often seek teacher guidance for content and organizational revisions.

Below are examples illustrating students' peer feedback on various writing elements in initial drafts and their integration into subsequent revisions.

3.3.1 Unity

In the initial draft excerpt, peer feedback highlighted a lack of unity, noting disconnected elements, such as "my bedroom," "my younger brother talk," and "my mom cooking." To enhance coherence, transitions like "From there" and "also" were integrated, while "Even though" was removed.

Excerpt from Student's Initial Draft:

My bedroom is near the living room and the kitchen. I can hear what my younger brother talk with. Even though I can smell the food when my mom cooking.

Excerpt from Student's Revision:

My bedroom is near the living room and the kitchen. From there, I can hear my younger brother talking. I can also smell the food my mom is cooking.

3.3.2 Coherence

In the initial draft excerpt, peer feedback identified a lack of coherence due to redundant ideas, specifically the repetition of “singing” and “my bathroom” in consecutive sentences. The writer addressed this by removing the redundancy and reordering the sentence for clarity.

Excerpt from Student’s Initial Draft:

My bathroom is the best place for me. It can relieve my stress by singing. I love singing so much especially in my bathroom.

Excerpt from Student’s Revision:

My bathroom is the best place for me. It can relieve my stress, especially when I am singing.

3.3.3 Vocabulary

In the initial draft excerpt, peer feedback indicated the use of vague vocabulary, specifically “things.” The writer responded by replacing “things” with a more specific term, “activities.”

Excerpt from Student’s Initial Draft:

Before he moved to his room, we did great things together.

Excerpt from Student’s Revision:

Before he moved to his room, we did many great activities together.

3.3.4 Grammar

In the initial draft excerpt, peer feedback highlighted a grammar error involving subject-verb agreement. The writer responded by adding the inflection “-s” to the word “smell” to agree with the singular subject “The bedroom.”

Excerpt from Student’s Initial Draft:

The bedroom always smell good and fresh.

Excerpt from Student’s Revision:

The bedroom always smells good and fresh.

3.3.5 Mechanics

In the initial draft excerpt, peer feedback indicated a capitalization error regarding the proper noun “Netflix.” The writer addressed this feedback by capitalizing “Netflix.”

Excerpt from Student’s Initial Draft:

The four of us lay down side by side, watching netflix movies.

Excerpt from Student’s Revision:

The four of us lay down side by side, watching Netflix movies.

As demonstrated in the examples above, revising coherence and unity presents greater challenges compared to revising vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. It demands critical analytical skills and a thorough understanding of the composition’s overall structure. It involves ensuring logical relationships between sentences and maintaining the central idea of the paragraph (Savage & Shafiei, 2007). This includes organizing sentences logically, eliminating redundancies, and using transitional words for smooth connections.

Thai students face particular difficulties in these areas, as indicated in previous research. Padgate (2008) noted their struggles with editing, integrating transitional words, and developing content. Boonpattanaporn (2008) found students had difficulties in organizing ideas coherently. Ka-kan-dee and Kaur (2015) identified issues with thesis statement clarity, argument coherence, and supporting evidence. Addressing these challenges effectively may require additional instruction and guidance from teachers.

4. Conclusion

This study revealed unanimous agreement among Thai students regarding the positive impact of peer feedback on their writing skills and quality, despite their lower confidence levels in both giving and receiving feedback. Coherence emerged as the primary focus of feedback, followed by other writing elements, collectively achieving a notable accuracy rate. However, while coherence received emphasis, students showed higher levels of integration for grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary in their subsequent drafts compared to coherence and unity.

This indicates that their revision process may be influenced by their lower confidence in peer feedback, alongside their proficiency in revising coherence and unity.

5. Limitations and Recommendations for Further Research

To enhance students' confidence in giving and receiving peer feedback, instructors can provide additional guidance and exercises focused on revising diverse writing elements, particularly coherence and unity. Demonstrating effective revision strategies with practical examples can increase students' confidence in peer feedback, enhancing their writing proficiency and the efficacy of peer feedback in Thai EFL writing instruction.

While this study sheds light on the effectiveness of peer feedback in improving writing proficiency and compositions among Thai students, it also identifies several limitations that need to be addressed for a more comprehensive understanding.

Firstly, the study's relatively small sample size of 35 English major participants may restrict the generalizability of the findings to the broader population of Thai students. The limited number of participants might not adequately represent the diverse proficiency levels observed in a larger population.

Secondly, the study's reliance on self-reported data through questionnaires and interviews introduces potential response biases, such as inaccuracies in self-assessment. Participants' perceptions and experiences may be overestimated or underestimated, impacting the validity of the findings.

Lastly, the study's focus on descriptive compositions may not capture the full range of writing challenges and skills relevant to other genres. The effectiveness of peer feedback could vary across different types of writing, such as narrative, expository, and persuasive compositions.

Future research could address these limitations by increasing the sample size of Thai students, thereby enhancing the generalizability of the results. Additionally, triangulating self-reported data with other data sources, such as observational data, could improve the validity of the findings. Furthermore, investigating the perceptions of peer feedback and its impact on writing quality across various genres of English academic writing could provide deeper insights into effective peer feedback strategies within the Thai EFL writing context.

References

- Bauer, J., Boyle, S. M., & Stapleton, S. (2016). *Final Draft 2*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bijami, M., Kashef, S. H., & Nejad, M. S. (2013). Peer feedback in learning English writing: Advantages and disadvantages. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 3(4), 91-97. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v3i4.4314>
- Boonpattanaporn, P. (2008). Comparative study of English essay writing strategies and difficulties as perceived by English major students: A case study of students in the School of Humanities, the University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce. *University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce Journal*, 28(2), 75-90.
- Chen, T. (2016). Technology-supported peer feedback in ESL/EFL writing classes: A research synthesis. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(2), 365-397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2014.960942>
- Chuenchaichon, Y. (2022). An error analysis of written English paragraphs at lexical, syntactic, and paragraph levels made by Thai EFL non-English major students. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 28(2), 96-108. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2022-2802-07>
- Clouse, B. F. (2013). *The student writer* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- 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 (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing* (pp. 81-104). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524742.007>
- Hentasmaka, D., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2021). Peer feedback uptakes and outcomes across EFL students' proficiency levels: A study at tertiary education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(3), 271-286. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14316a>
- Iswandari, Y. A., & Jiang, Y. (2020). Peer feedback in college EFL writing: A review of empirical research. *LLT Journal*, 23(2), 399-413. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v23i2.2799>
- Ka-kan-dee, M., & Kaur, S. (2014). *Argumentative writing difficulties of Thai English major students* [Paper presentation]. The 2014 WEI International Academic Conference Proceedings, Bali, Indonesia.
- Ka-kan-dee, M., & Kaur, S. (2015). Teaching strategies used by Thai EFL lecturers to teach argumentative writing. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 208, 143-156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.191>

- Kamimura, T. (2006). Effects of peer feedback on EFL student writers at different levels of English proficiency: A Japanese context. *TESL Canada Journal*, 23(2), 12-39. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v23i2.53>
- Kangni, W. (2015). Problems and tactics in peer feedback in EFL writing teaching. *2nd International Conference on Education, Management, and Information Technology (ICEMIT 2015)* (pp. 480-483). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icemit-15.2015.101>
- Kunwongse, S. (2013). Peer feedback, benefits, and drawbacks. *Thammasat Review*, 16(3), 277-288.
- Kusumaningrum, S. R., Cahyono, B. Y., & Prayogo, J. A. (2019). The effect of different types of peer feedback provision on EFL students' writing performance. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 213-224. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12114a>
- Kuyyogsuy, S. (2019). Promoting peer feedback in developing students' English writing ability in L2 writing class. *International Education Studies*, 12(9), 76-90. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n9p76>
- Langan, J. (2011). *College writing skills with readings* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Nguyen, T. T. L. (2017). A case study of combined peer-teacher feedback on paragraph writing at a university in Thailand. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 15-24. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8345>
- Nguyen, T. T. L. (2018). The effect of combined peer-teacher feedback on Thai students' writing accuracy. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 6(2), 117-132.
- Nguyen, T. T. L. (2019). Implementing peer-feedback in paragraph-writing classes at a Thai university. In S. M. Anwaruddin (Ed.), *Knowledge mobilization in TESOL: Connecting research and practice* (pp. 30-42). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004392472_003
- Padgate, W. (2008). Beliefs and opinions about English writing of students at a Thai university. *PASAA*, 42, 31-53. <https://doi.org/10.58837/CHULA.PASAA.42.1.2>
- Ryoo, M., & Wing, M. L. (2012). Skill level based cooperative peer feedback in EFL writing students. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 9(1), 95-131.
- Savage, A., & Shafiei, M. (2007). *Effective Academic Writing 1: The Paragraph*. Oxford University Press.
- Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). An analysis of errors in written English sentences: A case study of Thai EFL students. *English Language Teaching*, 10(3), 101-110. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n3p101>
- Sundrarajun, C. (2020). Voices from EFL Thai learners towards English writing. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*, 15(6), 1495-1507. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v15i6.5293>
- Wakabayashi, R. (2008). The effect of peer feedback on EFL writing: Focusing on Japanese university students. *OnCUE Journal*, 2(2), 92-110.
- Wu, W., Huang, J., Han, C., & Zhang, J. (2022). Evaluating peer feedback as a reliable and valid complementary aid to teacher feedback in EFL writing classrooms: A feedback giver perspective. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 73, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2022.101140>
- Yu, S., & Hu, G. (2017). Can higher-proficiency L2 learners benefit from working with lower-proficiency partners in peer feedback? *Teaching in Higher Education*, 22(2), 178-192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2016.1221806>
- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Understanding the role of learners with low English language proficiency in peer feedback of second language writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(2), 483-494. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.301>
- Zaman, M., & Azad, A. K. (2012). Feedback in EFL writing at tertiary level: Teachers' and learners' perceptions. *ASA University Review*, 6(1), 139-155.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).