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This study explores EFL high school learners’ perceptions towards interaction with peers and their teacher in a collaborative writing activity after receiving differential feedback. Forty-five participants equally divided into three English writing classes were given different types of feedback during a group writing activity: peer feedback, teacher direct feedback, and teacher indirect feedback. A survey which examined the participants’ perceptions toward interaction influenced by the particular type of feedback was administered. Results of statistical analyses showed that peer feedback induced students to have a positive attitude toward intra- and inter-group interaction with peers. Teacher direct feedback was found to inhibit group interaction and render students dependent on their teacher. However, similar to peer feedback, teacher indirect feedback encouraged students to increase intra- and inter-group interaction. The results imply that a combination of peer feedback and teacher indirect feedback could be an effective means to foster English writing in Korean secondary school English writing classes.

I. INTRODUCTION

With a growing demand for English writing education, the Korean Ministry of Education attempted to provide guidelines for teaching English writing in
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secondary schools (English Curriculum Design, 2011). Nevertheless, there seem to be several challenges to offering an effective English writing curriculum in light of the fact that writing is not a skill that is assessed in the College Scholastic Aptitude Test (CSAT) which is taken by high school students for admission to universities in Korea. The Ministry of Education has attempted to rectify this situation by developing the National English Ability Test (NEAT) which tested all four language skills of reading, listening, speaking, and writing. Unfortunately, with the ushering in of a new administration, the NEAT was discarded due to the technical difficulties of administering an Internet-based test and financial burdens.

As a result of the washback effect of the CSAT which only assesses reading and listening comprehension, Korean secondary school teachers must continue to focus on a limited set of language skills. Since the Korean CSAT excludes English writing, writing still remains in the shadows of English language education. However, improving English skills and, in particular, writing is essential for intercultural communication with people from different language backgrounds, affords individuals with more job opportunities, and raises their standards of living (Vano & Slovensko, 2013).

In order to respond to the potential demand for English writing—as universities are increasingly offering more English-mediated courses to attract foreign students to their campuses thus affecting the medium of instruction for domestic Korean students as well—English teachers and curriculum designers, particularly at the tertiary education level, have tried to develop English writing courses which help students enhance learner autonomy. A good amount of research at the tertiary education level has shown that the implementation of feedback and collaborative activities are detrimental to writing in English learning contexts (Carson & Nelson, 1996; Fernandez, 2012; Lee, 2004; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Storch, 2005; Tsui & Ng, 2000). The findings from these studies can inform writing in the secondary school classroom and serve as a basis for an English writing teaching model. Additionally, other studies regarding English writing education

---
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indicate that collaborative writing activities (i.e., pair writing, group writing) and various forms of feedback (i.e., peer feedback, teacher direct feedback, or teacher indirect feedback) show differential effects (Ferris, 2011; Gue’nette 2007; Lee, 2004). Along these lines, the present study is designed to explore the effects of differential feedback on Korean high school students’ interaction in collaborative writing.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Theoretical Framework

Writing, especially in a non-native language is a complex process. Research in second language writing has examined topics such as pedagogy and feedback. Studies on feedback in language classrooms have been supported by Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory (1978, 1986). Sociocultural theory postulates that cognitive and linguistic development arise through the internalization of knowledge made possible by social interactions: the more able members of a society (i.e., experts) provide novices with an appropriate level of assistance (Vygotsky, 1986). According to this theory, feedback from a teacher or peers, as a means of social interaction in the language classroom, could enable learners to foster cognitive and linguistic development. Through the perspective of sociocultural theory, this study examines different types of interaction.

The positive effects of collaborative learning grounded in sociocultural theory have also been highlighted in writing research. The merits of collaborative learning are multifold. Swain (2000) argues that students’ collaborative dialogues can be used as a mediation of linguistic knowledge and that L2 learning can be attributed to the process of joint accomplishment of a task. His study analyzes peer-to-peer interaction in ESL classrooms and points out that the interaction furnishes an opportunity for collaborative dialogue while students are working to achieve one common goal. Swain (2006) suggests that the term “languaging,” defined as “the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language” (p. 89), is a source of L2 learning. Second language learners use language as a
cognitive means to reflect on their L1 and negotiate problem-solving while engaging in collaborative activities (Swain, 2006).

Along similar lines, Natri (2007) observed a language course using face-to-face peer evaluation. Students tended to give relatively positive grades to each other. This motivated students to grow in their awareness of learning as well as enhance language use (Natri, 2007). Furthermore, Natri’s study suggests that students in the course developed their speaking ability due to prolonged repetition of peer evaluation. Focusing more on pronunciation and peer evaluation, the student audience was able to produce more precise comments on the other students’ speeches they observed.

1) Peer Feedback

In tertiary education, many researchers have conducted studies on the perceptions of peer and teacher feedback among ESL students, and they found a strong preference for teacher feedback (Carson & Nelson, 1996; Lee, 2004; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Tsui & Ng, 2000). Although some cultures might welcome peer feedback more than others (Carson & Nelson, 1994), a preference for teacher’s feedback is universal with learners wanting teachers to point out their errors and provide revisions of which quality is judged according to the teacher’s experience and accuracy (Ferris, 2011; Lee, 2004; Yang et al., 2006).

However, the value of peer feedback should not be undervalued. Paulus (1999) analyzes the types and sources of revisions in peer feedback. In this study, students showed a tendency to use peer feedback to focus more on discourse-level issues than sentence-level ones; on the other hand, the majority of changes that students made were surface-level when teacher feedback was provided. Tsui and Ng (2000) and Fernandez (2012) also focus on the value of peer comments as a resource for English learning. Peer comments can encourage students to engage in collaborative learning in which teachers are not the sole source of knowledge.

Other studies (Fernandez, 2012; Storch, 2005; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2007) also emphasize the value of peer interaction and collaboration in writing classrooms. These studies suggest that peer interaction and
collaboration in ESL or EFL writing classrooms can encourage learners to participate in peer interaction and construct new knowledge related to English writing. This is because learners with weaknesses and strengths can scaffold each other, pooling their knowledge (Fernandez, 2012). In other words, students can be allowed to learn from each other through collaborative writing activities, by sharing different linguistic resources among peers.

2) Teacher Direct Feedback

Although there are various forms of teacher feedback in a teaching context can exist, Ferris (2011) suggests definitions of teacher direct compared to teacher indirect feedback.

When an instructor provides the correct linguistic form for students (word, phrase, rewritten sentence, deleted word[s] or morpheme[s]), this is referred to as direct feedback. Indirect feedback, on the other hand, occurs when the teacher indicates that an error has been made but leaves it to the student writer to solve the problem and correct errors. (p. 19)

Some researchers claim that teacher direct feedback constitutes a great portion of teaching English writing in ESL and EFL classes rather than indirect feedback because of immediacy and convenience (Ferris, 2011; Lee, 2004). Gue’nette (2007) also notes that direct feedback might be effective because it acts “as a form of recast by providing a model of positive evidence” (p. 497). The teacher also feels the need to provide direct feedback to beginners when their errors are “untreatable” (i.e., errors that students are not able to self-correct, such as syntax and vocabulary errors) (Hendrickson, 1980; Lee, 2004).

There is negative criticism about teacher direct feedback. For example, Truscott (1999) argues that direct feedback has no effect on accuracy in students’ writing. In another study by Kepner (1991), college students who received surface-level correction did not show a remarkable reduction in errors compared to those who received meaning-related comments. Ferris
Byungtae Goo·Hikyoung Lee (2011) even claims that a harmful effect of direct error feedback may arise. Although direct feedback is appropriate for students with a low level of proficiency, direct feedback cannot foster self-editing ability for student writers. Lee (2008) also exhorts teachers to be aware of the long term effects of direct feedback and shows that teacher–centric feedback practices are likely to make learners passive and reliant.

3) Teacher Indirect Feedback

When implementing indirect feedback, teachers have to make a decision on how to indicate errors (e.g., circling or underlining errors) or identify errors (e.g., presenting categories of errors with codes or labels) (Ferris, 2011; Lee, 2003, 2004, 2008). Coded error feedback involves types of errors being directly indicated or symbolized; for example, errors in past tense can be marked with “Verb Tense” or “T” (Ferris, 2011; Lee, 2004). The opposite to coded feedback, underlining or circling is uncoded error feedback. The effectiveness of coded vs. uncoded error feedback is inconclusive. Ferris (2006) comments that students who received uncoded feedback performed as successfully at error correction as those receiving coded indirect feedback. Contrary results were obtained from Lee (1997) and Chandler (2003), who found that direct error location is more effective than indirect, because directly locating errors prompts students to notice and correct the errors.

Though indirect feedback could be affected by explicitness, many studies (Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2006, 2011; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lee, 1997, 2003, 2004, 2008) agree that both coded and uncoded feedback in indirect feedback can provide students with the opportunity to correct their errors and mistakes. Moreover, longitudinal studies (Ferris, 2003; Lalande, 1982) also argue that students’ long–term writing development can benefit more from indirect feedback than direct feedback through “greater cognitive engagement, reflection, and guided learning and problem-solving” (Ferris, 2011, p. 19).

4) Korean EFL Context

The interest in collaborative writing has recently been expanded to the
Korean EFL context. Park (2012) reported that Korean students at a college showed a preference for their teacher’s advice in terms of vocabulary and grammar, but they willingly engaged in peer interaction in order to achieve a common goal and negotiate the meaning of the teacher’s feedback. Interaction occurring in the process of collaborative writing can also affect students’ language learning strategies (Park, 2012). Other studies (Kim, 2011; Nam, 2013) mention that collaborative writing is positively perceived by students and mostly effective in improving students’ writing in Korean secondary education EFL classes. However, the research on collaborative writing regarding Korean secondary school learners is still insufficient. Particularly, the learners’ use of and attitude toward various forms of feedback in collaborative writing have not been studied yet to propose an efficient model of teaching English writing in Korean secondary education. The characteristics of peer interaction in collaborative writing also warrant more attention. Therefore, there is a need to explore types of feedback which can affect collaborative writing in Korean secondary education.

2. Research Question

From the above literature review on collaborative learning, three different types of feedback (i.e., peer feedback, teacher direct feedback, and teacher indirect feedback), and the need to address EFL writing in the secondary education context, the following research question is posed.

RQ: How do Korean EFL high school learners’ perceptions of interaction vary according to different types of feedback (peer, teacher direct, and teacher indirect) in a collaborative writing activity?

The research question aims to investigate the impact of different types of feedback in a collaborative writing activity by examining the perceptions of learners. The study fills a niche in EFL writing research as very few studies have looked at the combination of effects of different types of feedback on interaction in secondary education collaborative writing.
III. METHODOLOGY

1. Participants

The subjects in the present study were 16 to 17 years old and in the second year at a Korean high school located in Ik-san, Jeonbuk province at the time of data collection. They have been taught advanced English writing for two semesters in their first year. According to their level of English proficiency which was evaluated through a spoken interview, a placement test, a mock TOEIC test, and mid- and final English exams, students were placed in levelled classes. The English teachers at the school selected approximately the top 10 percent of the second year students and placed them in three advanced English classes so they could receive special instruction. Of the 394 students at the high school, the 45 students who were placed in three advanced classes were recruited for the present study.

2. Procedure

In the target high school for this study, an advanced English writing course was a part of the English language curriculum. The high school operated three advanced writing classes and each class had fifteen second year students. For the present study, the three classes received different feedback types: peer feedback, teacher direct feedback, teacher indirect feedback. Students met a native English teacher once a week and all three classes were taught by the same teacher. The objective of the writing course was to enable students to quote and paraphrase to support arguments, and summarize information in a concise way. The students in each class completed a collaborative writing task during a 6 week period. In the first lesson, the teacher led a discussion on the topic of “cheating and plagiarizing.” The teacher assigned an article about cheating and instructed students to read it aloud. For the following two lessons, students were divided into five groups.

in each of three feedback classes. Each group produced one essay on the given article. Students in a group were directed to write a single essay with their group members. Each student in a group had to write one of three essay components (i.e., introduction, body, and conclusion). After submitting the first draft, each class received and reviewed the feedback type their class was assigned to in the next lesson through group discussions that the teacher organized. In the last lesson, the students discussed and wrote the final drafts.

In the peer feedback class, students in one group gave written feedback on another group’s essay. The teacher instructed every student group to review another group’s writing and asked them to make comments and provide corrective feedback regarding errors. When the writing was returned to the authors, students reviewed and discussed the comments or corrections from their peers. Therefore, students in the peer feedback class had to work with other group students, which enabled inter-group interaction.

In the teacher direct feedback class, the teacher provided students with written direct feedback, making corrections to mistakes and errors on the student group drafts. Students could reevaluate their writing with their group and other groups during the feedback review session, but unlike the peer feedback class, it was not necessary for students in the direct feedback class to work with other groups. While discussing feedback on their essays, the groups revised drafts and then submitted the final draft to the teacher.

In the teacher indirect feedback class, the teacher used a variety of types of indirect feedback: for example, circling, underlining, and using correction symbols. Student writers also reviewed their writing and discussed the teacher’s written feedback with any other peers in the class.

The procedure of how the classes were conducted is summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Procedure of Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1: Introduce topic and task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2–3: Group students and write first drafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 4: Feedback activity (peer feedback class, teacher direct feedback class, teacher indirect feedback class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 5–6: Feedback review discussion and writing of final drafts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Feedback Perception Survey

To measure students' perceptions toward the effects of the three different types of feedback on interaction in the collaborative writing activity, a survey was developed. It also was necessary to design two versions of the survey because the respondents differed according to the feedback type. One survey was for the peer feedback class (Appendix 1) and the other was for the recipients of teacher direct and indirect feedback (Appendix 2). The surveys administered to the students were written in Korean to ease comprehension and to ensure accuracy in the responses. The surveys adopted a four-point Likert scale to prevent students from selecting a neutral item. The survey items reflect suggestions and principles on feedback activities and collaborative writing provided in previous studies (Lee, 2004, 2008; McClure, 2001; Tsui & Ng, 2000). Eight question items were formulated for the survey. The items were divided into three categories based on perceptions of the interaction involved in the collaborative writing activity according to the feedback type: intra-group” (items 1–3), inter-group (items 4–6), and teacher (items 7–8). In the process of collaborative writing, students naturally discussed their essay with their group members, and intra-group interaction was expected to occur. They could also work together with members who did not belong to their group, participating in inter-group interaction. How students perceive the effects of feedback on interaction with the teacher was examined by looking at the dependency on the teacher.

4. Data Analysis

For the survey responses in the three feedback classes, the Likert scaling shows the distance of each of the three categories intra-group, inter-group interaction, and teacher. One-way ANOVA was employed to test for differences among the three feedback classes (e.g., peer feedback, teacher direct feedback, and teacher indirect feedback). Scheffe’s multiple comparisons test, as a post-hoc analysis, was also conducted to analyze the three feedback classes.
IV. RESULTS

In this section, the results of the survey are analyzed and presented. Table 2 shows the ANOVA results of the students’ perceptions on three types of interaction, inter-group, intra-group, and teacher in the three different feedback classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intra-group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>3.422</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>6.572</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.643</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter-group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.911</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.956</td>
<td>6.650</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>18.667</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.578</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.911</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>4.874</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8.233</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.144</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The feedback activities influenced students to have significantly different attitudes towards every category in Table 2. Statistical results show the following: intra-group (p=.042), inter-group (p=.003), and teacher (p=.012). This implies that a statistically significant difference (p<.05) in students’ perception on both types of peer interaction exists. The different types of feedback also led to differential levels of dependence on the teacher. However, Table 2 does not provide information on the differences in each category between groups. Therefore, a multiple comparisons analysis among the different feedback classes was needed to supplement and to check which feedback affected students’ perceptions in all categories.
Table 3. Survey Analysis (Multiple Comparisons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) feedback type</th>
<th>(J) feedback type</th>
<th>(I-J) Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intra-group (n=15)</td>
<td>Scheffe</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>-.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>-.376</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>-.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>-.376</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-group (n=15)</td>
<td>Scheffe</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>-.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>-.800</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>-.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (n=15)</td>
<td>Scheffe</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>-.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>-.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 presents the results of multiple comparisons analyzed using the Scheffe’s test, which contrasts an individual feedback class to other classes. With regards to the intra-group, peer feedback is much more effective than teacher direct feedback and it is statistically significant at .043 (p<.05). However, the teacher indirect feedback seems to be ambiguous. Two between-feedback groups did not show any significant value regarding the intra-group. For example, indirect-direct feedback group and indirect-peer feedback group were .565 (p>.05) and .321 (p>.05), respectively. These results cannot explain how students in the teacher indirect feedback class perceive peer interaction at the intra-group level in terms of the p-value. Given the mean differences of the indirect-direct (.155) and indirect-peer (-.221), the means for teacher indirect feedback is higher than teacher direct feedback and lower than peer feedback.

The comparison of teacher direct feedback with the other two feedback types shows statistically significant differences (p<.05) in the inter-group. The inactivation of the inter-group interaction is evidenced by the mean
differences of two between feedback groups: for instance, direct–indirect (−.733), and direct–peer (−.800). On the other hand, between peer–indirect feedback ($p=.963$) is not significant for the inter-group. Furthermore, the mean difference between peer and teacher indirect feedback (.067) supports the notion that the effects of both types of feedback are comparable for inter-group interaction. From this, peer interaction at the inter-group level was activated in both the peer and teacher indirect feedback classes.

In the teacher interaction category, peer feedback shows a statistical significance ($p=.022$) from other classes. The results of the mean differences in two between-groups (i.e., the peer–direct feedback and the peer–indirect feedback) implies that students in the peer feedback classes had a low level of dependence on their teacher compared to those in the other teacher feedback classes. The $p$-value of the direct–indirect feedback ($p=.919$) does not show any significance in the teacher interaction categories. Therefore, the effects of teacher direct feedback and teacher indirect feedback are similar in terms of the students’ attitudes towards teacher.

In summary, peer feedback influenced students’ perceptions in all interaction categories: intra-group, inter-group, and teacher. The students in the peer feedback class enjoyed peer interaction which decreased teacher dependency. Conversely, teacher direct feedback brought about the opposite results in the three types of the interaction. Students in the teacher direct feedback class negatively perceived peer interaction and showed a heavy dependence on their teacher. Teacher indirect feedback led to students having a positive attitude toward peer interaction at the inter-group level. Although statistical results were not significant in this case, it is speculated that the teacher indirect feedback increased peer interaction at the intra-group level.

V. DISCUSSION

Regarding the research question about how students perceive interaction in a collaborative writing activity influenced by different types of feedback and the results of the statistical analysis on the survey results, type of feedback
does appear to influence interaction. Students in the peer feedback class seem to have positive perceptions about all types of interaction, intra-group, inter-group, and teacher. They appeared to discover the benefit of discussing their writing with peers and peer interaction at the intra- and inter-group levels. Students might think peer interaction can improve their writing through sharing the perspective of other writers and reviewing the written forms of interlanguage in peers’ texts (Storch, 2005, 2011; Swain, 2000, 2006). In addition, a low level of dependence on the teacher indicates that students found peer comments as valuable as teacher’s comments. The peer feedback activity could also lead students to foster self-editing ability and enable them to develop their own language learning strategies. Active peer interaction and students’ confidence in collaborative revision can reduce teachers’ burden by reducing the need to make laborious corrections to students’ mistakes and errors. Therefore, if students can offer effective and sufficient comments, peer feedback can be the pillar of a teaching model in collaborative writing classes.

Students in the teacher direct feedback class did not perceive the advantages of discussion with peers. The feedback did not stimulate students’ interaction at the intra-group level and it also inhibited inter-group interaction as well. When direct feedback was given, students seemed to focus only on the teacher’s comments and corrections. They did not feel any need for peers’ feedback and preferred teacher direct feedback due to its convenience and accuracy (Lee, 2008). Moreover, direct teacher feedback did not help the students develop learning strategies since the feedback did not give an opportunity for self-correction of errors and self-editing of compositions. If a teacher continuously uses direct feedback, students might fail to perceive peers as potential language sources and possibly maintain a passive attitude towards learning.

Students who received teacher indirect feedback showed mixed results. The indirect teacher feedback encouraged students to participate positively in the inter-group interaction, yet their involvement in the intra-group interaction was vague. They may have encountered difficulty in interpreting the teacher’s feedback because of the explicitness of the feedback. Thus, the writers felt a need to help each other to negotiate the meaning of the
teacher’s written feedback after discussion with the co–writers of their group essay. Therefore, the students in a group cooperated with other group members who could help them. In addition, students seemed to enjoy sharing others’ ideas in the process of negotiating the meaning of the teacher’s feedback. As noted, such active peer interaction could help develop the students’ own language learning skills. However, teacher indirect feedback did not seem to lessen students’ dependence on their teacher so there exists the possibility that students may keep preferring interaction with the teacher, and seek the teacher’s help. From this, it is concluded that a teacher should be aware of the merits and demerits of using teacher indirect feedback. If the teacher instructs his or her students to engage in inter–group interaction appropriately, the students will be able to develop writing skills autonomously during the collaborative writing activity.

VI. CONCLUSION

The main findings from this research are summarized as follows. Peer feedback can enhance peer interaction at the intra– and inter–group levels. Students may become more aware of their own learning strategies by sharing perspectives and interlanguage features. Indirect teacher feedback can also help students reconstruct membership with other group students. By sharing ideas and confirming the teacher’s feedback, the influx of new perspectives can trigger interaction with other students. Conversely, direct teacher feedback seems to inhibit inter–group interaction because it increases the students’ reliance on teacher feedback. Prolonged exposure to direct teacher feedback could lead the students to become over–dependent on the teacher.

In the process of collaborative writing, students in a group share a sense of responsibility for completing a task (Saunders, 1989). For example, peer feedback and indirect teacher feedback can give students the opportunity to revise their own written work with peers. These methods help students to build their own learning strategies, raising students’ awareness of language use. Therefore, peer feedback and indirect feedback could be considered as an effective combination for a collaborative writing activity model in foreign language writing classes.
Although peer feedback seems to have several advantages as discussed above, in order to execute feedback well several aspects need to be taken into consideration. In the case of peer feedback, students did not know what kind of feedback they had to provide and whether or not their comments were accurate. Regarding this, if time is allowed, revision guidelines that are peer-initiated could be suggested beforehand (Yang et al., 2006). At the initial stage of the revision, the teacher can emphasize the main problems of the text at the discourse level. Students utilizing peer feedback can positively cooperate with their peers in or outside their group when revising their drafts. They can feel free to accept different points of view from others (McClure, 2001). After comparing different perspectives, students can negotiate meaning in order to reinforce or alter arguments in their texts. Teacher indirect feedback can deal with students’ weaknesses such as inaccuracies and errors in a complimentary way.

The present study is not without limitations. One limitation is that although the study participants were the top students, their English proficiency was not correlated with their perceptions. Relatively higher proficiency students could have different perceptions than lower proficiency students. The survey questions were general and so specific aspects of interaction were not investigated in-depth. This study also only examined one collaborative writing activity so the results cannot be widely generalized. Despite these shortcomings, the present study could serve as impetus for more investigation in English language writing classes at the secondary school level. Further research could place more weight on what exactly it is students share when they are interacting with peers and their teacher after receiving a specific feedback type. Exploring how learners can benefit from feedback induced interaction can provide greater insight into designing EFL writing activities or classes.

REFERENCES


Byungtae Goo-Hikyoung Lee


Kim, S–K. (2011). *The influence of collaborative group writing on English writing performance and characteristics of collaborative dialogues in the*
Women’s University, Seoul, Korea.
Language Curriculum (Issue 2011–316). Retrieved from
=10&boardSeq=48045&currentPage=1&encodeYn=Y&mode=view
Modern Language Journal, 66(2), 140–149.
Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners’ performance in error correction in writing:
case of Hong Kong. Journal of Second Language Writing, 13(4),
285–312.
Kong secondary classrooms. Journal of Second Language Writing, 17(2),
69–85.
Nam, H-M. (2013). Effects of collaborative and competitive peer feedback
on Korean high school students’ English writing: Some observational and
introspective data. Unpublished master’s thesis, Hankuk University of
Foreign Studies, Seoul, Korea.
Natri, T. (2007). Active learnership in continuous self- and peer-
evaluation. In A. Barfield, S. Brown, & D. Little (Eds.), Reconstructing
autonomy in language education: Inquiry and innovation (pp. 108–119).
effectiveness in peer response groups. Journal of Second Language
Writing, 7(2), 113–131.
McClure, J. (2001). Developing language skills and learner autonomy in
Park, S-H. (2012). Effects of teacher feedback utilization practices on
Korean EFL learners’ revision and writing development. Unpublished
doctoral dissertation, Ewha Womans University, Seoul, Korea.

20 Byungtae Goo·Hikyoung Lee


**APPENDIX 1**

Interaction Perception Survey – Peer Feedback (English translation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You had a discussion on how to revise your assignment after you received written feedback from other group members. Look back on the discussion session.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It was necessary to discuss our assignment with my group members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. With my group members, I was able to find the strengths and weaknesses of our assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. With my group members, I was able to correct errors in our assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It was necessary to discuss my group’s assignment with other group members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. With members from other groups, I was able to find strengths and weakness of my group’s assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. With other group members, I was able to correct the errors in my group’s assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It was necessary for my teacher to confirm whether there were any errors in my group’s assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My teacher’s help was necessary to correct errors in my group’s assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Interaction Perception Survey – Teacher Direct/Indirect Feedback (English translation)

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements according to the scale below. Please tick the most appropriate number for each statement. 
strongly disagree: 1, disagree: 2, agree: 3, strongly agree: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You had a discussion on how to revise your assignment after you received written feedback from your teacher. Look back on the discussion session.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It was necessary to discuss our assignment with my group members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. With my group members, I was able to find the strengths and weaknesses of our assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. With my group members, I was able to correct errors in our assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It was necessary to discuss my group’s assignment with other group members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. With members from other groups, I was able to find strengths and weakness of my group’s summary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. With other group members, I was able to correct the errors in my group’s assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It was necessary for my teacher to confirm whether there were any errors in my group’s assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My teacher’s help was necessary to correct errors in my group’s assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: Korean/English
Applicable Levels: Secondary
Key words: Collaborative writing, Peer feedback, Teacher direct feedback, Teacher indirect feedback / 협동작문, 동료피드백, 교사 직접 피드백, 교사 간접 피드백
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