# Exploring English-Major Students' Perspectives on Peer Feedback in Second Language Writing

**Intuon Sinlapavijitkarn[1], Kanyarat Sriyota[1],**
**Napatsorn Thotherdwilai[1], Wisut Jarunthawatchai[1*]**

## Abstract

It is widely accepted that English serves as a global language for communication among people from diverse backgrounds. In Thailand, despite English not being an official language, it has become increasingly important in academic, professional, technological, and social contexts. Writing in English as a second language is considered a complex skill, and peer feedback is often integrated into writing classrooms as part of the writing process. This study aimed to investigate students' attitudes toward peer feedback and to explore the advantages and limitations that affect its effectiveness. The study adopted a qualitative approach, involving fifteen third-year English major students at a public university, who had prior experience with peer feedback in writing classes. Data were collected through one-on-one, semi-structured interviews and analyzed using a color-coding method. The findings revealed that while students recognized the benefits of peer feedback, including enhanced confidence and skill development, they also identified limitations such as cultural influences, emotional concerns, and insufficient feedback training. These insights highlight the need for appropriate peer feedback training to maximize its effectiveness in second language writing classrooms.

[*] Corresponding Author
E-mail: faaswsj@ku.ac.th
[1] Kasetsart University

# 1.    Introduction

Writing in a second language is an essential skill for academic and professional success, as it enables learners to articulate complex ideas, engage in disciplinary discourse, and participate effectively in globalized contexts (Archibald & Jeffery, 2000). In Thailand, English proficiency—particularly in writing—has become increasingly vital across education, business, and technology sectors, even though English is not an official national language (Jarunthawatchai, 2010).

Among the instructional strategies designed to develop L2 writers' skills, peer feedback has attracted considerable attention. Unlike teacher-centred, product-focused approaches that emphasise error correction, peer review encourages collaborative interaction, critical reflection, and metalinguistic awareness as students comment on drafts and negotiate meaning (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Such reciprocal engagement can foster deeper understanding of genre conventions and improve subsequent revisions.

English-major undergraduates in Thai universities face particular demands: they must produce essays, reports, and research papers in English to demonstrate disciplinary knowledge and prepare for careers in education, translation, or international business (Jarunthawatchai, 2010). However, their feedback literacy—knowing how to give, interpret, and act on peer comments—may be uneven, and cultural factors can influence their willingness to critique classmates or to trust peer suggestions.

Although numerous studies show the pedagogical benefits of peer feedback in L2 writing, little is known about how English-major students in Thailand perceive its value, challenges, and impact on their composing process. Addressing this gap, the present study explores English-major undergraduates' attitudes toward peer review, identifying the advantages they experience and the limitations they encounter in Thai higher-education writing classrooms.

**Research Questions**

1. What are students' attitudes toward peer feedback in second language writing?

2. What are the advantages and limitations that affect the effectiveness of peer feedback in second language writing within the Thai context?

# 2. Literature review

## 2.1 Writing Process

Writing is a complex process that involves more than merely putting words on paper. In terms of second language writing instruction, there are two understandings of the writing process. The first is the internal cognitive process of writers, which is intricate and non-linear, and therefore difficult to describe systematically. The second, which this study focuses on, is

.

the writing process used in classroom teaching, which provides a clear instructional cycle guiding students through stages of writing development.

White and Arndt (1991) presented a widely accepted model of the classroom writing process. Their model begins with generating ideas, followed by focusing, outlining, and drafting the first version of the text. Evaluation, using feedback for reviewing and revising, follows. Importantly, this process is recursive rather than linear; students may return to earlier stages based on the feedback received. Feedback plays a crucial role in this cycle, especially in the later stages of writing, helping learners to refine their drafts and improve their final outputs.

## 2.2 The Importance of Feedback in Second Language Writing

Feedback has been recognized as a pivotal tool in developing students' understanding of texts, the writing process, and overall language use (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). It guides students not only in identifying weaknesses in their writing but also in improving rhetorical structure and academic literacy skills (Lalande, 1982; Srichanyachon, 2012). The presence of effective feedback transforms writing instruction by providing learners with concrete suggestions that foster skill development and deeper engagement with their writing.

Broadly, feedback in second language writing is categorized into two types: teacher feedback and peer feedback. Both play complementary roles in helping students revise and improve their drafts.

## 2.3 Teacher Feedback

Teacher feedback remains a dominant form of response in second language writing classrooms. Hyland (2003, as cited in Hyland & Hyland, 2006) stressed that teacher feedback is essential in supporting students' writing proficiency development. Teachers typically provide feedback addressing both global concerns, such as content and organization, and local issues, such as grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation (Min, 2005). With their experience and expertise, teachers are trusted to deliver accurate, reliable feedback (Nguyen T. T., 2017; Tsui & Ng, 2000). Students often feel more confident revising their work based on teacher feedback because it points clearly to areas needing improvement (Ferris, 1995).

However, teacher feedback is not without its drawbacks. Some studies suggest that an overemphasis on correction can result in student anxiety and demotivation (Srichanyachon, 2012). Repeatedly seeing corrections, especially marked in red ink, may undermine students' confidence. Truscott (1996) argued that successful learning occurs when students enjoy the learning process, but heavily corrective feedback risks diminishing that enjoyment. Furthermore, some researchers have noted that teacher feedback can be inconsistent and difficult to interpret. Zhao (2010) and Zamel (1985) observed that teacher feedback tends to focus primarily on language errors while giving less attention to content and organization, despite acknowledging their importance. Lee (2008) similarly noted that teachers often spend

.

so much effort correcting language issues that little time remains for addressing broader concerns. Moreover, inexperienced teachers sometimes give ambiguous feedback, using vague questions instead of direct statements, which leaves students uncertain about how to revise their work effectively (Ferris et al., 1997).

Given that the present study focuses on peer feedback, it does not delve further into the merits and limitations of teacher feedback. Nonetheless, understanding teacher feedback provides useful context for appreciating the role of peer feedback in the writing classroom.

## 2.4 Peer Feedback

Peer feedback is an interactive learning strategy in which students evaluate and comment on each other's writing. Liu and Hansen (2002) defined peer feedback as an activity where students assume responsibility for giving constructive comments on their peers' work, as directed by the teacher. This method allows learners to reflect on both their own writing and that of others, offering insights into strengths, weaknesses, and possible improvements (Nguyen, 2017). Hyland and Hyland (2006) further noted that peer feedback plays a vital role in the development of second language writers, enabling them to engage in dialogue about their writing and make meaningful revisions. By working collaboratively, students benefit from diverse perspectives and learn from mutual support (Tsui & Ng, 2000).

### 2.4.1 Advantages of Peer Feedback

One of the key advantages of peer feedback is its role in fostering self-confidence. Rollinson (2005) suggested that giving students opportunities to read and critique others' work helps them to build confidence in their writing abilities. Through practice, students learn to trust their judgment and become more independent in revising their own drafts.

Another significant benefit of peer feedback lies in skill development. According to Hu (2005), peer feedback promotes improvements in academic writing as students engage in critical reading and exchange valuable suggestions. Peer feedback also heightens students' awareness of audience expectations and common writing challenges. Srichanyachon (2012) reported that peer feedback not only enriches students' learning experiences but also motivates them to improve their writing. Students often find that peer feedback provides new ideas, inspiration, and encouragement. Moreover, it can reduce teachers' workload by serving as an additional revision resource. Liu and Hansen (2002, as cited in Nguyen, 2017) emphasized that peer feedback fosters active student participation and continuous learning improvement.

### 2.4.2 Limitations of Peer Feedback

Despite its benefits, peer feedback has certain limitations. One common concern is insufficient knowledge among students. Srichanyachon (2012) pointed out that students may lack the confidence and expertise to provide useful feedback. Ruegg (2015) noted that while high-proficiency learners offer more accurate feedback, learners at lower proficiency levels

.

may struggle to do so effectively. Tsui and Ng (2000) also found that students often question the reliability of feedback from non-native English speakers. Similarly, Hu (2005, as cited in Nguyen, 2017) highlighted that limited English proficiency, superficial comments, and negative attitudes toward peer feedback can hinder its effectiveness. Furthermore, Wang (2015) discovered that dissatisfaction with poor-quality peer feedback may lead to negative perceptions of the practice.

Cultural factors also influence peer feedback effectiveness. Ruegg (2015) observed that hierarchical cultural norms, such as those in Japanese society, can make students reluctant to critique their peers. Zhang (1995) similarly argued that Asian students, accustomed to teacher-centered instruction, may be less inclined to engage fully with peer feedback. However, Fithriani (2017) found that Indonesian students, while respecting teacher feedback, are not necessarily afraid to question it and make independent revisions.

Emotional factors can also limit peer feedback. Carson and Nelson (1996) found that Chinese students were hesitant to provide critical comments, fearing it might harm group harmony. Students are more likely to use peer feedback when they have positive interactions with their classmates (Nelson & Murphy, 1993).

Another issue is the inappropriate use of peer feedback models. Demirel and Enginarlar (2016) noted that peer feedback loses its effectiveness if not implemented properly. Holt (1992, as cited in Demirel & Enginarlar, 2016) emphasized the importance of discussing not only writing mechanics but also the expression of ideas. Min (2005) demonstrated that with proper training, students can offer specific, relevant feedback, particularly on global issues like idea development and organization. Min's study also found that well-trained students gained greater confidence and critical thinking skills.

### 2.4.3 Peer Feedback Training

Effective peer feedback requires preparation and training. Berg (1999) argued that providing and responding to peer feedback is a complex skill, especially for ESL learners with limited experience. Min (2005) proposed a four-step training procedure: clarifying writers' purposes, analyzing issues, explaining points of concern, and giving specific comments. Teachers play a crucial role in guiding students through this process, offering both in-class and individual support. With adequate training, students not only deliver better feedback but also develop a more positive attitude toward the process, enhancing their writing proficiency and critical thinking (Min, 2005). Nelson and Murphy (1993) also stressed the teacher's responsibility to ensure peer feedback is conducted appropriately and meaningfully.

## 2.5 Comparing Teacher Feedback and Peer Feedback

The effectiveness of peer feedback is often compared to that of teacher feedback. Paulus (1999) found that students tend to prioritize teacher feedback during revisions.

.

Similarly, Srichanyachon (2012) reported that students generally value teacher feedback more highly, believing in teachers' expertise and knowledge.

However, some studies challenge this perspective. Fox (1980, as cited in Ruegg, 2015) found no significant difference in writing performance between students receiving teacher feedback and those receiving peer feedback. Hidetoshi and Fujita (2004) observed similar findings, with both groups achieving comparable scores.

Interestingly, students seem to appreciate receiving both types of feedback. Nguyen T. T. (2017) noted that while students value teacher feedback, they also recognize the benefits of peer feedback. Demirel and Enginarlar (2016) concluded that students' attitudes toward peer feedback tend to improve with experience. However, relying solely on teacher feedback may foster over-dependence on teachers.

Other researchers have argued that peer feedback, despite being less influential than teacher feedback, offers unique advantages. Miao, Badger, and Zhen (2006) explained that peer feedback encourages meaningful revisions and promotes autonomous learning. Unlike teacher feedback, which often focuses on surface-level errors, peer feedback tends to generate more substantial changes in content and meaning. Furthermore, the interactive nature of peer feedback discussions enhances students' understanding and reduces miscommunication.3.

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1 Population and Sample

The English curriculum for English-major students at the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Science in a public university in central Thailand includes four writing courses: *Introduction to English Reading and Writing Skills*, *English Writing*, *Integrated English Reading and Writing Skills*, and *Advanced Integrated English Reading and Writing Skills*. The population of this study consisted of third-year English major students, aged between 21 and 22 years. Fifteen third-year English-major students voluntarily participated in this study. All of them had completed the aforementioned writing courses and had engaged in peer feedback activities during their classes.

### 3.2 Research Design

This study employed a qualitative research design, using interviews as the primary data collection instrument. Interviews are recognized as a versatile tool commonly used in qualitative research for gathering in-depth insights (Dörnyei, 2007). The purpose of the interviews was to explore participants' general perceptions and experiences with peer feedback in second language writing. Each participant was individually interviewed in a one-to-one setting, allowing researchers to observe non-verbal cues, such as body language, facial expressions, and eye contact, to gain a deeper understanding of the participants' responses.

.

The interviews were semi-structured. Although a set of guiding questions had been prepared in advance, participants were encouraged to express their views openly. The researchers not only used these guiding questions but also probed further when participants provided interesting or unexpected answers, allowing for richer and more nuanced responses (Dörnyei, 2007). The interview questions were designed by adapting existing instruments from previous studies, including Nguyen T. T. (2017), Tsui and Ng (2000), and Wang (2015). Additionally, the researchers developed supplementary questions to elicit more in-depth information from participants.

### 3.3 Data Collection Procedure

All fifteen participants were invited to take part in the interviews at times that were convenient for them. The interviews were conducted in various locations on campus, including empty classrooms, the university library, and the Language Learning building backyard. Each interview lasted approximately 15 to 25 minutes. Before beginning the interviews, the researchers obtained participants' consent to audio-record the sessions. To help participants feel comfortable and encourage them to focus on expressing their ideas freely, the interviews were conducted in Thai, the participants' native language. This approach allowed participants to articulate their thoughts without the additional challenge of translating from Thai to English. After each interview, the researchers promptly transcribed the audio recordings. Each participant was assigned a pseudonym to maintain confidentiality.

### 3.4 Data Analysis

Data analysis followed a structured, multi-step procedure. First, the first three authors independently reviewed the interview transcripts, highlighting significant quotations that corresponded to the peer-review framework outlined in the literature review. Using this framework as a coding guide, they systematically coded participants' responses and allowed emerging themes to surface. To ensure inter-rater reliability, these initial codes were then cross-checked among the three authors; any discrepancies were discussed and resolved through consensus. This collaborative, iterative approach not only secured the trustworthiness of the coding but also enabled clear categorization of responses and the identification of key themes and patterns directly relevant to the study's research questions.

## 4. Findings

This section presents the findings from the interviews, organized thematically based on the participants' responses. The themes include Confidence, Skills Development, Insufficient Knowledge, Cultural Influence, Emotional Influence, Peer Review Training, and Inappropriate Models. Participant responses are quoted to illustrate the emerging themes.

.

## 4.1 Attitudes toward Peer Feedback

### 4.1.1 Confidence

Many participants shared that receiving peer feedback enhanced their confidence in writing. Positive comments encouraged them to continue writing and revise their drafts based on peer suggestions. However, even with increased confidence, some still preferred to receive further feedback for reassurance.

"I had more confidence to write [after peer feedback]." (Eye)

"If I got a good comment on my draft, like… it is okay, I would feel that I wrote quite well. Good comments gave us more confidence in our writing." (Gigi)

"[After receiving feedback], I would be able to recheck by myself. I had received feedback about this point, having feedback from peers already. I would bring it to improve my draft." (Jaja)

Some participants still felt uncertain and desired additional feedback.

"I was not 100% confident regardless of how many times I received feedback. There might be some slight mistakes. I still want new feedback." (May)

As feedback givers, a few participants expressed that regularly commenting on peers' drafts helped them build confidence in their own writing and evaluation abilities.

"I felt more confident when I kept commenting on peers' drafts. They trusted me. After I commented in the second year, my peers asked me for help again in a speaking course. I felt more confident that I was quite good at writing." (Ploy)

"It made me know that I also had the potential to correct peers' drafts. I gained more confidence, not in the sense of believing I was always right, but in my ability to explain reasons to peers." (Prim)

### 4.1.2 Assertiveness

Although no participants mentioned gaining assertiveness as receivers, a few, as givers, shared that frequent commenting increased their assertiveness when providing feedback.

"Peers would be more courageous because not everyone dared to say what they thought. If one peer dared to comment, others might have joined in discussion. If this happened frequently, it would increase that person's assertiveness to talk more." (May)

"If I saw that peers were not writing well, I corrected it for them, and I felt good. It made me more assertive in commenting on peers' drafts." (Toy)

## 4.2 Perceived Advantages of Peer Feedbacks

### 4.2.1 Skills Development

### Gaining Different Ideas and Perspectives

About half of the participants, as receivers, highlighted that peer feedback broadened their perspectives. Peers offered alternative views and spotted mistakes they had overlooked in their own drafts.

"I gained different views from others' perspectives. Sometimes only my view was not enough. I might have gained an unexpected view from peers' comments." (Eye)

"Each person had different writing styles and different thoughts. If I received suggestions from peers, it helped me improve my writing." (Nine)

Feedback givers also gained insights from reading multiple drafts, which expanded their understanding of the topic.

"If I read peers' drafts, I could get their way of thinking. They might have had a writing style different from mine. It could have expanded my way of thinking." (Fome)

**Gaining Knowledge**

Some participants, as receivers, learned grammar rules through peer corrections.

"If peers corrected the errors, it could have made me understand more how to use that kind of grammar." (Toy)

Givers, too, reported gaining knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, and even general knowledge from reviewing peers' drafts.

"If I read many peers' drafts, I could see if they used difficult vocabulary. If I used the easy one, I needed to revise it." (Gigi)

"It improved my vocabulary treasury. I could remember the new vocabulary and apply it." (Namwaan)

**Improving Writing Skills**

Participants, both receivers and givers, indicated that peer feedback heightened their awareness of mistakes and encouraged them to apply this awareness in future writing.

"When peers commented on my draft, I could see where my mistake was. It made me think more when writing the next draft." (Ploy)

"More than knowledge, it helped me improve all aspects. When I found an error, I knew my weaknesses and what I should have improved." (Captain)

Givers also reflected that peer reviewing trained them to apply the same careful examination to their own drafts.

"Practicing checking peers' drafts made me reconsider my draft. If peers' drafts had these mistakes, what about mine?" (May)

**4.2.2 Peer Review Training**

**Before the Activity**

Participants reported inconsistent training experiences. Some mentioned that teachers provided only oral explanations without clear forms or structured guidance.

"It seemed like just telling the topic." (Eye)

"The teacher just explained orally." (Prim)

Others noted that teachers provided guidance and checklists, focusing mostly on grammar, organization, and content.

.

"Teachers taught us beforehand how proper writing should be." (Nine)

**During the Activity**

Some participants observed that teachers were actively involved, monitoring student progress and providing clarification when needed.

"The teacher walked around asking some questions." (Eye)

"If we did not understand, we could ask the teacher how much score we should give." (Nine)

Others mentioned that the teacher let them work independently with minimal intervention.

"Teacher let us do it ourselves." (Captain)

**After the Activity**

Participants shared mixed experiences regarding follow-up. Some teachers checked peer feedback and provided further explanations.

"After the comments were finished, I gave them to the teacher, and she checked them again." (Friend)

## 4.3 Perceived Limitations of Peer Feedback

### 4.3.1 Insufficient Knowledge

Over half of the participants, as receivers, expressed concerns about the reliability of peer feedback, given peers' similar knowledge level and lack of expertise.

"I did not believe in peers' comments because they were at the same level as me. I did not trust them 100%." (Eye)

"Peers were not experts. They might not have really known what they were doing." (Money)

As givers, several participants admitted hesitation to comment on peers' drafts, fearing insufficient knowledge might lead to giving incorrect feedback.

"Sometimes, peers wrote drafts with a lot of information. I did not know what I should have commented on. Maybe because of insufficient knowledge?" (Friend)

### 4.3.2 Cultural Influence

Most participants strongly believed that teacher feedback was more trustworthy than peer feedback. They valued teachers' expertise and saw their feedback as more reliable.

"Teachers guided us better than friends because of more experience." (Eye)

"Although peers were better than me, they were not professional and did not have more knowledge than teachers." (Money)

Only one participant highlighted that teacher authority influenced her decision to accept feedback without question.

"If the teacher commented by themselves, since I was just a student, I was afraid to argue. But if it was my peers, I would have dared to argue." (May)

### 4.3.3 Emotional Influence

Some participants, as givers, felt uncomfortable providing critical feedback, especially to close friends, fearing it might harm their relationships.

"Sometimes I got a close friend's draft. I did not know how to write it softly because I was afraid they might have sulked." (Friend)

Conversely, receivers generally expressed openness to feedback and did not feel offended by negative comments.

"If I got feedback, then I needed to improve. I just focused on whether it was right, without prejudice." (Captain)

A few participants believed that conflicts or biases could influence how feedback was given or received.

"If it seemed they did not like me, I did not believe their feedback." (May)

Others disagreed, stating that feedback is separate from personal relationships.

"I did not think about the personality of peers. I received all the comments to consider." (Jaja)

Some givers also felt that giving feedback could improve relationships through constructive collaboration.

"It should be in a good way, as I helped peers to develop. It might improve our relationship to be better and closer." (Eye)

### 4.3.4 Inappropriate Models

**Training Styles**

A few participants criticized the lack of clarity in training models, suggesting the need for clearer instructions and structured forms.

"If for checking the draft, this type of teaching was not very clear. The method was not clear." (Captain)

**Activity Styles**

Participants highlighted that peer feedback activities lacked follow-up discussions or opportunities to revise drafts based on feedback.

"After peer edited the draft, we did not revise it at all." (Jaja)

"It should have one class for writing a review and another class for discussion." (Grace)

Some participants also felt peer feedback activities should occur more frequently for continuous improvement.

"It was good to have peer editing often, like trying to adjust continuously." (Eye)

.

**Combined Peer-Teacher Feedback**

Participants recommended that peer feedback should be complemented by teacher feedback to ensure accuracy and effectiveness.

"I wanted the teacher to re-check my draft." (Eye)

"The teacher should check it out." (Captain)

# 5. Discussion and Conclusion

## 5.1 Discussion

In response to the first research question, "What are students' attitudes toward peer feedback in second language writing?", all participants acknowledged that peer feedback was beneficial, particularly in developing their confidence and writing skills. We observed that this confidence boost often translated into greater willingness to take risks in subsequent drafts. Participants explained that receiving feedback from peers encouraged them to write and revise their drafts more confidently. This finding aligns with Rollinson (2005), who noted that giving students opportunities to practice being critical readers simultaneously builds their confidence as writers. Developing such confidence eventually enables learners to self-edit their work effectively. However, while some participants gained more confidence, they still preferred to receive ongoing feedback from peers to ensure continuous improvement.

Furthermore, the study revealed a new insight: as feedback givers, participants experienced growth in assertiveness. We interpreted this as evidence that the act of critiquing others can empower students to claim a more active role in their own writing development. Those who developed assertiveness became more willing to express their opinions, which in turn encouraged their peers to participate actively in the feedback process.

Another major advantage of peer feedback was skill development, as participants reported gaining new ideas and knowledge. As receivers, they noted that peer comments helped them recognize errors and areas for improvement that they might have overlooked. This finding is consistent with Hu (2005), who observed that students benefit from reading each other's work and receiving multiple suggestions. Similarly, as givers, participants expanded their perspectives by reviewing peers' drafts, which deepened their understanding of the topic. Moreover, both receivers and givers acquired not only fresh ideas but also specific knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, and general writing skills. These findings support Srichanyachon's (2012) conclusion that peer feedback enhances learning, knowledge, and motivation.

In addition, peer feedback prompted participants to be more cautious and thoughtful writers. Receivers reviewed their drafts more carefully, keeping in mind the mistakes previously highlighted by peers. Our analysis suggests that this heightened self-monitoring may lead to longer-term gains in writing autonomy. Givers, too, reflected on their own writing

.

while providing feedback, becoming more accurate and attentive writers themselves. These findings echo Liu and Hansen's (2002, as cited in Nguyen, 2016), who viewed peer feedback as promoting active participation and continuous learning improvement.

Addressing the second research question, "What are the advantages and limitations that affect the effectiveness of peer feedback in second language writing within the Thai context?", participants identified several limitations alongside the advantages previously discussed.

The foremost concern was insufficient knowledge among peers. Participants questioned the reliability of peer comments, recognizing that their classmates, sharing similar levels of proficiency, might not provide fully accurate feedback. This concern aligns with Tsui and Ng (2000), who found that students doubt the quality of feedback provided by non-native English speakers. Additionally, participants noted that limited knowledge led to misunderstandings about the writers' intentions, making some hesitant to comment at all. Srichanyachon (2012) also identified insufficient knowledge and lack of confidence as major challenges in peer feedback practices.

Cultural influence emerged as another significant limitation. Most participants expressed greater trust in teacher feedback, viewing teachers as experts who offer accurate guidance. This reliance reflects the teacher-centered nature of Thai educational culture, where students expect teachers to have the final say. Zhang (1995) similarly noted that teacher-dominated instruction can reduce students' engagement with peer feedback. Moreover, one participant mentioned that teacher authority left little room for argument, even when peer comments differed from the teacher's suggestions. We argue that this cultural deference to authority must be explicitly addressed when designing peer review activities. In contrast, Fithriani (2017) found that while students respect teacher feedback, they are not necessarily afraid to disagree and make independent revisions.

The third identified limitation was emotional influence. Some participants, as givers, felt uncomfortable providing critical feedback to peers, particularly close friends, for fear of offending them. This finding corresponds with Carson and Nelson (1996), who suggested that peer feedback can create tension among students, especially in collectivist cultures. However, receivers generally welcomed constructive criticism, focusing on its usefulness rather than its potential to cause discomfort. Furthermore, some participants believed that poor relationships with peers could affect their willingness to accept feedback, supporting Nelson and Murphy's (1993) observation that interpersonal dynamics influence the effectiveness of peer feedback. We see this as an opportunity to foster clearer norms when pairing students, so that personal feelings do not overshadow academic critique. Nonetheless, others argued that peer feedback should be separated from personal feelings, maintaining a focus on the writing task itself.

.

In addition to these limitations, participants highlighted several areas for improvement to enhance the effectiveness of peer feedback. Firstly, they pointed out insufficient teacher involvement during peer feedback activities. Some participants felt that teachers allowed students to provide feedback independently without adequate monitoring or guidance. According to Nelson and Murphy (1993), teachers play a critical role in ensuring peer feedback is conducted appropriately and meaningfully. Continuous teacher support helps students who may feel uncertain about providing feedback.

Secondly, the frequency of peer feedback activities was found to be lacking. Participants suggested that peer feedback should be conducted more often to allow students to practice and refine their feedback skills. Min (2005) similarly reported that regular exposure to peer feedback enhances students' positive attitudes toward the process.

Another issue was the lack of opportunity to revise drafts after receiving peer feedback. Some teachers collected drafts without allowing students to apply the feedback to their revisions. This practice undermines the purpose of feedback, which is to foster reflection and improvement (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Participants recommended that teachers allow time for revisions and encourage post-feedback discussions between givers and receivers. Such dialogues would help clarify comments and improve the quality of future feedback.

Additionally, participants emphasized the importance of integrating teacher feedback alongside peer feedback. Given the limitations of peer knowledge and cultural preferences for teacher guidance, combining both forms of feedback would strengthen the process. Teachers can validate or supplement peer comments, increasing students' trust in the feedback received. This combination also addresses teacher workload, as suggested by Srichanyachon (2012), who viewed peer feedback as a useful support tool for teachers.

Finally, the most significant issue highlighted was inadequate peer feedback training. Some participants were instructed only to give scores or focus narrowly on grammar, neglecting global writing issues such as content and organization. Holt (1992, as cited in Demirel & Enginarlar, 2016) stressed that peer feedback should encompass both writing mechanics and the expression of ideas. Our findings confirm that without deliberate training, peer feedback risks becoming a superficial exercise. Compared to Min's (2005) four-step peer feedback training procedure, current training in the study context fell short. Teachers did not systematically guide students to clarify purposes, analyze issues, explain problems, and provide specific comments. As a result, students were often unsure about how to critique drafts effectively.

Proper peer feedback training, following Min's (2005) framework, could help students develop a clearer understanding and provide more relevant feedback. We recommend that future implementations include regular modeling sessions and reflective debriefs to solidify students' feedback skills. With better training, students may overcome concerns about

.

insufficient knowledge and cultural barriers, leading to more effective peer feedback practices. Teachers should introduce clear objectives for peer feedback, define student roles, monitor activities, and ensure feedback is returned to students for revision. Ideally, teachers could also facilitate post-feedback discussions to deepen understanding and promote meaningful engagement. Moreover, peer feedback activities should be regularly incorporated throughout the writing process, whether after the first or final drafts, to maximize learning opportunities.

## 5.2 Conclusion and Implications

In conclusion, participants recognized the usefulness of peer feedback in enhancing writing confidence, broadening perspectives, and improving writing skills. However, the study also identified significant challenges, particularly concerning insufficient peer knowledge, cultural influences, emotional sensitivities, and inadequate training. Without proper guidance, students may provide superficial or unclear feedback, which could lead to frustration and negative attitudes toward the activity.

To address these issues, teachers should provide comprehensive peer feedback training and maintain active involvement throughout the process. Clear objectives, systematic training, teacher support, and opportunities for discussion and revision are essential for maximizing the effectiveness of peer feedback. When implemented effectively, peer feedback can become a powerful tool for supporting student learning in second language writing classrooms.

The implications of this study highlight four practical steps for Thai L2 writing courses. First, instructors should provide clear peer-feedback training by introducing straightforward criteria, demonstrating examples, and guiding students through practice sessions before they review each other's drafts. Second, teachers need to guide the review process—circulating among peers during feedback, confirming helpful comments, and holding short discussions afterward to clarify any points. Third, combining peer and teacher feedback gives students multiple perspectives and boosts their confidence when revising. Finally, embedding regular peer-review tasks at multiple stages of each writing assignment lets students practice both giving and receiving comments over time, fostering greater autonomy and steady improvement in their writing.

## 5.3 Suggestions for Further Study

This study collected data from fifteen third-year English major students at a public university. Future research should include a larger sample to capture a broader range of perspectives and challenges related to peer feedback in second language writing. This expansion could reveal different patterns and insights not found in the current study.

Although the participants had experience with peer feedback, they were taught by different teachers, resulting in varied experiences with peer feedback training. Future research should focus on students who have been trained by the same teacher to narrow down specific

training-related issues. This approach would enable researchers to develop more precise recommendations for improving peer feedback in second language writing classrooms.

## Authors

**Intuon Sinlapavijitkarn** A fourth-year undergraduate student majoring in English at Kasetsart University, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand.

**Kanyarat Sriyota** A fourth-year undergraduate student majoring in English at Kasetsart University, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand.

**Napatsorn Thotherdwilai** A fourth-year undergraduate student majoring in English at Kasetsart University, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand.

**Wisut Jarunthawatchai** Assistant Professor at Division of English, Kasetsart University, Nakhon Pathom Thailand.

## References

Archibald, A., & Jeffery, G. C. (2000). Second language acquisition and writing: A multi-disciplinary approach. **Learning and Instruction**, 10(1), 1–11.

Berg, E. C. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 3(3), 215–241.

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

Demirel, E., & Enginarlar, H. (2016). Effects of combined peer–teacher feedback on second language writing development. **Hacettepe University Journal of Education**, 31(4), 657–675. https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2016015701

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). **Research methods in applied linguistics** (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.

Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. **TESOL Quarterly**, 29(1), 33–53.

Ferris, D. R., Pezone, S., Tade, C. R., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications. **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 6(2), 155–182.

Fithriani, R. (2017). **Indonesian students' perceptions of written feedback in second language writing** [Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico].

Fox, R. F. (1980). Treatment of writing apprehension and its effects on composition. **Studies in the Teaching of English**, 14(1), 39–49.

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

Hidetoshi, S., & Fujita, T. (2004). Characteristics and user acceptance of peer rating in EFL writing classrooms. **Language Teaching Studies**, 8(1), 31–54.

Holt, M. (1992). The value of written peer criticism. **College Composition and Communication**, 43(3), 384–392.

Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. **Language Teaching Studies**, 9(3), 321–342.

Hyland, K. (2003). **Second language writing**. Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). **Feedback in second language writing**. Cambridge University Press.

Jarunthawatchai, W. (2010). **A process-genre approach to teaching second language writing: Theoretical perspective and implementation in a Thai university setting** [Doctoral dissertation, University of Southampton].

.

Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. **Modern Language Journal**, 66(2), 140–149.

Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 17(1), 69–85.

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

Miao, Y., Badger, R., & Zhen, Y. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 15(2), 179–200.

Min, H. T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. **System**, 33(3), 293–308.

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

Nguyen, H. T. (2016). Peer feedback practice in EFL tertiary writing classes. **English Language Teaching**, 9(6), 76–91.

Nguyen, T. T. (2017). A case study of combined peer-teacher feedback on paragraph writing at a university in Thailand. **Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics**, 7(2), 253–262.

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

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

Ruegg, R. (2015). **The effects of peer and teacher feedback: A longitudinal, multi-method study** [Doctoral dissertation, Macquarie University].

Srichanyachon, N. (2012). An investigation of university EFL students' attitudes toward peer and teacher feedback. **Educational Studies and Reviews**, 7(26), 558–562.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. **Language Learning**, 46(2), 327–369.

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

Wang, W. (2015). Students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing: A longitudinal inquiry. **Assessing Writing**, 19, 80–96.

White, R., & Arndt, V. (1991). **Process writing**. Addison Wesley Longman.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. **TESOL Quarterly**, 19(1), 79–101.

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

Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. **Assessing Writing**, 15, 3–17.