

STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVE: THREE TYPES OF REFLECTIVE WRITTEN FEEDBACK

Watcharee Kulprasit

Abstract

To enhance one's writing ability, different types of feedback have been employed in language writing classes. Some are more effective than others in specific learning atmospheres. This paper reveals the attitudes of thirty-four English major sophomores toward three types of reflective written feedback: self-, peer-, and teacher-reflective written feedback through a five-point Likert type rating scale attitude questionnaire. According to the analysis of their responses, the findings indicated that teacher-reflective written feedback was unquestionably the best and most effective feedback source to help develop their writing performance, especially beyond the boundary of grammatical improvement. Self- and peer- reflective written feedback, nevertheless, were both perceived as other significant sources of useful feedback, particularly on grammatical aspects, whereas their limited language proficiency was raised as a rudimentary obstacle to overcome when carrying out these two tasks. Some profound and far-reaching pedagogical implications were taken into account based on the results of the study.

Keywords: writing in English, EFL students' attitudes, reflective written feedback

INTRODUCTION

Multiple sources of feedback have been found in diverse studies to help develop students' writing proficiency in both the foreign and second languages. In the Thai academic context where teacher-centered teaching is important, feedback on students' writing

generally comes from teachers who play a significant role in both the language model and as the expert. Unquestionably, students rely on their teachers for improvement of their foreign or second language knowledge and skills. Apart from that, feedback on students' writing products is normally summative, judging their work based on grammatical rules.

¹Watcharee Kulprasit holds a Bachelor's degree in English (Summa Cum Laude) from Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus, Thailand. She also obtains a Master's degree in Teaching English as an International Language (TEIL) with distinction from Prince of Songkla University, Hatyai Campus, Thailand. Currently she is working as a lecturer in Department of Western Languages, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thaksin University, Songkhla Campus, Thailand.

Hence, teaching writing is nothing, but teaching grammar. As teaching writing methodology is developing and becoming more and more noteworthy in both foreign and second language academic contexts, writing assessment also plays a significant role in these two conditions (Weigle, 2002). The process-based approach thus plays a prominent role in teaching writing. Authentic assessment is integrated into the process-based approach to enhance not only the final writing products of the students but also the process of writing they have been through (Montgomery, 2002). Not only summative, but also formative assessment, which is gaining more and more significance in recent times, should be implemented in writing classes in order to improve students' writing proficiency. Thus, an assessment, which in the past was equal to a test score or grade, is now perceived as a practical tool to enhance learning and foster students' skills (Overmeyer, 2009). Particularly, formative assessment is considered as a tool to bridge the learning gap between students' current writing proficiency, and the writing standards, through the writing process (Tuttle, 2013). It involves monitoring, diagnosing, and providing feedback to help students' to continuously develop their own writing.

The benefits of formative assessment in the process-based writing approach, has become a controversial issue concerning the pros and cons of different sources of feedback, especially with regard to reflective written feedback from three sources; that is, the students themselves, their peers, and the teacher. While this has been widely and distinctively discussed across a number of academic settings, few, if any investigations of students' attitudes toward the three types of reflective written feedback in the Thai EFL

academic context have been found. In order to bridge this gap, the objective of the present study was to provide an opportunity for Thai EFL sophomores to experience all three types of reflective written feedback in their Basic Writing Course, so that their attitudes toward those three types of reflective written feedback could be explored, and their benefits to the students' writing skills and performance development could be determined.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The subjects of the current study were thirty-four English major sophomores at a university in the south of Thailand. During the period of the study, they were taking a Basic Writing Course as a required course in the first semester of the academic year 2014. The subjects were heterogeneous in terms of gender, but were homogeneous in terms of nationality and native language (Thai). Therefore, all students were studying English as a foreign language. The age of the students ranged from 19 to 21, and their exposure to English education was between 13 and 17 years.

Instruments

Attitude toward Reflective Written Feedback Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of four main sections. The first three sections elicited the subjects' attitudes toward the three types of reflective written feedback: self-reflection, peer-reflection, and teacher-reflection. All of these three sections were developed in the

form of a Likert rating-scale ranging from 5 to 1 (5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = neutral, 2 = disagree, 1 = strongly disagree). The last section was provided in an open-ended form, in order for subjects to provide additional information and opinions, beyond the limits of the given statements found in the first three sections of the questionnaire. Although the questionnaire was constructed in both Thai and English versions, only the Thai version was launched to the subjects in order to avoid any misunderstanding, misleading questions, or confusion of statements due to language use. According to Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha, the reliability of the questionnaire was .81.

Writing Rubric

The writing rubric employed in the present study was adapted from the Teacher Six-Point Writing Guide of Spandel (2009) as its characteristics were compatible with the subjects' writing qualities. According to this writing rubric, there were six traits of writing to be assessed; these were conventions, sentence fluency, ideas, organization, word choice, and voice.

Data Collection

The present study was carried out during the first semester of the academic year 2014. The orientation of the three types of reflective written feedback and their benefits were enthusiastically introduced to the subjects to encourage them to take part in the activity from the first week. During the study, the subjects were assigned to carry out a writing task for thirty minutes. The three types of reflective written feedback: self-, peer-, and teacher-reflective written feedback were asked to be

given after they completed the task respectively. That is, after writing the first drafts, the subjects were required to write reflective feedback on their own drafts. In so doing, some corrections were made after self-reflection. Then they were asked to give their reflective feedback on their partners' second drafts. In this case, the subjects were paired up according to their English proficiency based on their grades in the General English I and II courses in order to take charge of giving peer reflective written feedback on their partners' writing tasks. The subjects who had higher English proficiency were paired up with those who had lower English proficiency as Ferris (2003) highlighted that the subjects can provide each other maximum time and attention when doing peer feedback in pairs. The teacher-reflective written feedback was given on the students' final products. This process was performed weekly for eight weeks. In the final week of the study, the subjects were asked to respond to the questionnaire indicating their attitudes toward the three types of reflective written feedback after they had gained some experience with each type.

Data Analysis

Responses from the thirty-four subjects were collected and recorded using the attitude questionnaire, before computational analysis, item by item to determine the mean scores. These were in turn interpreted according to the criteria shown in **Table 1.1**.

Table 1.1:
Criteria for Rating Scale Interpretation

Range of the Total Mean Value	Level of Agreement
4.21 – 5.00	Strongly agree
3.41 – 4.20	Agree
2.61 – 3.40	Neutral
1.81 – 2.60	Disagree
1.00 – 1.80	Strongly disagree

Moreover, the students’ responses to the open-ended section of the questionnaire were compiled and analyzed to help answer the research question of the present study.

RESULTS

Results according to the analysis of the subjects’ responses to the questionnaire are

reported in two major parts: the analysis and interpretation of the mean scores for each of the three types of reflective written feedback as shown in **Table 1.2**, **Table 1.3**, and **Table 1.4**, and a summary of the students responses to the open-ended questions indicating their opinion toward each type of feedback in their own words.

Table 1.2:
Subjects’ Attitudes toward Self-Reflective Written Feedback

Statement	Mean	S.D.	Level of Agreement
1. I can edit my work myself.	3.65	.71	Agree
2. It is easy for me to edit my work.	2.97	.80	Neutral
3. I enjoy editing my work.	3.29	.86	Neutral
4. I think self-editing is important in the writing process.	4.26	.63	Strongly agree
5. Self-editing develops autonomous learning.	4.39	.56	Strongly agree
6. Self-editing promotes my writing skill.	4.29	.53	Strongly agree
7. Self-editing can diagnose my writing problems.	4.23	.72	Strongly agree
8. Self-editing allows me to realize my strengths.	4.03	.75	Agree
9. Self-editing allows me to realize my weaknesses.	4.23	.72	Strongly agree
10. I think self-reflective feedback should be used in the writing class.	4.23	.76	Strongly agree
11. Through self-reflective feedback, I have found that I always make the same mistakes.	4.35	.75	Strongly agree
12. Self-reflective feedback is the most useful source of feedback.	4.29	.64	Strongly agree
Average	4.02	.70	Agree

According to **Table 1.2**, the mean scores of subjects' responses ranged from 2.97 to 4.39 with an average mean score of 4.02. This indicates agreement with the statements was generally at the level of *agree*, suggesting that most or all subjects have positive attitudes toward self-reflective written feedback.

To highlight this, most subjects actually reported a *strong agreement* as we can see that most items (item 4, $\bar{x} = 4.26$; item 5, $\bar{x} = 4.39$; item 6, $\bar{x} = 4.29$; item 7, $\bar{x} = 4.23$; item 9, $\bar{x} = 4.23$; item 10, $\bar{x} = 4.23$; item 11, $\bar{x} = 4.35$; item 12, $\bar{x} = 4.29$) had a calculated average above 4.21, indicating strong agreement in these statements. It can be inferred that the subjects recognized the value in the process of self-reflective written feedback which was used in the writing class,

as it helped to develop autonomous learning, promote improvement in their general writing skills, and to self-diagnose their writing problems; students were able to realize their own weaknesses through self-reflection, although they still made the same writing mistakes. Self-reflective written feedback was considered as one of the most useful sources of feedback used in the writing class.

Interestingly, the subjects *agreed* that they could edit their own work themselves as well as realize their own strengths in writing, through self-reflective feedback (item 1, $\bar{x} = 3.65$; item 8, $\bar{x} = 4.03$), but that it was not easy or enjoyable for them to do so, as they reported *neutral agreement* for these two items (item 2, $\bar{x} = 2.97$; item 3, $\bar{x} = 3.29$).

Table 1.3:

Subjects' Attitudes toward Peer-Reflective Written Feedback

Statement	Mean	S.D.	Level of Agreement
1. Peer feedback helps to improve my work in general.	3.94	.63	Agree
2. I understand the feedback my peer gives me.	3.71	.69	Agree
3. I can edit my peer's work.	3.48	.57	Agree
4. I think my feedback helps to improve my peer's work.	3.61	.76	Agree
5. I think my English proficiency is too limited to give feedback to my peer.	3.35	.84	Neutral
6. I think the English proficiency of my peers is too limited for them to provide feedback on my work.	3.35	.61	Neutral
7. I enjoy giving feedback on my peer's work.	3.55	.77	Agree
8. I like my writing to be reviewed by my peer.	3.97	.71	Agree
9. Peer feedback is important when learning to write.	4.03	.84	Agree
10. Peer feedback encourages me to improve my writing.	4.13	.67	Agree
11. Peer feedback can help to diagnose my writing problems.	4.16	.69	Agree
12. My peer's weaknesses help me to realize my own.	4.00	.68	Agree
13. Although I get peer feedback, I still make the same mistakes.	4.16	.64	Agree
14. I think peer feedback should be used in the writing class.	4.10	.75	Agree
15. Peer feedback is the most useful source of feedback.	4.00	.73	Agree
Average	3.84	.71	Agree

Table 1.3 demonstrates that the subjects *agreed* with most items. The mean scores of their responses ranged from 3.29 to 4.16 with an average mean score of 3.84. This means that the subjects had generally positive attitudes toward peer-reflective written feedback.

More specifically, the subjects realized the importance and the benefits of peer-reflective written feedback in the learning process (item 9, \bar{x} = 4.03). It helped to improve their writing in general, as well as encourage them to develop their writing skills (item 1, \bar{x} = 3.94; item 10, \bar{x} = 4.13). This is probably why the subjects also *agreed* that peer-reflective written feedback is one of the most useful sources of feedback, and should be used in the writing class (item 14, \bar{x} = 4.10; item 15, \bar{x} = 4.00).

Regarding the process of giving and receiving peer-reflective written feedback, the subjects reported that, although they could edit their peers' writing and enjoyed doing it, and

that they perceived peer-reflective written feedback to be useful in improving their peers' writing, they also thought that their English proficiency was too limited to give feedback to their peers (item 3, \bar{x} = 3.48; item 4, \bar{x} = 3.61; item 5, \bar{x} = 3.35; item 7, \bar{x} = 3.55). However, the subjects also *agreed* to have their work reviewed by their peers, even though they felt that their peers' English proficiency was also too limited to provide feedback. Feedback provided by peers was comprehensible to the subjects and did help to improve their work (item 2, \bar{x} = 3.71; item 6, \bar{x} = 3.35; item 8, \bar{x} = 3.97).

Nonetheless, the subjects *agreed* that although peer-reflective written feedback helped them to realize their own weaknesses, and that this type of feedback could help to diagnose their writing problems, they also reported that they still made the same writing mistakes (item 11, \bar{x} = 4.16; item 12, \bar{x} = 4.00; item 13, \bar{x} = 4.16).

Table 1.4:

Subjects' Attitudes toward Teacher-Reflective Written Feedback

Statement	Mean	S.D.	Level of Agreement
1. I like my writing to be reviewed by teacher.	4.61	.56	Strongly agree
2. I understand teacher feedback.	4.45	.68	Strongly agree
3. Teacher feedback helps improve my work in general.	4.52	.72	Strongly agree
4. Teacher feedback encourages me to improve my writing.	4.42	.67	Strongly agree
5. Teacher feedback can diagnose my writing problems.	4.58	.62	Strongly agree
6. Teacher feedback should be a method used in teaching writing.	4.52	.57	Strongly agree
7. Teacher feedback has a significant impact in the process of learning to write.	4.48	.63	Strongly agree
8. Teacher feedback increases motivation when learning to write.	4.39	.67	Strongly agree
9. Although I get teacher feedback, I still make the same mistakes.	4.35	.66	Strongly agree
10. I know my strengths in writing because of teacher feedback.	4.39	.62	Strongly agree
11. I know my weaknesses in writing because of teacher feedback.	4.52	.57	Strongly agree
12. Teacher feedback is the most useful source of feedback.	4.52	.57	Strongly agree
Average	4.48	.63	Strongly agree

Not surprisingly, regarding teacher-reflective written feedback, the mean scores of the subjects' responses range from 4.35 to 4.61 with an average mean score of 4.48, falling into the level of *strongly agree* according to **Table 1.4**. Interestingly, all items were rated in the highest level of agreement. It is therefore determined that the subjects, showed high positive attitudes toward teacher-reflective written feedback which explains their preference for having their writing reviewed by the teacher (item 1, $\bar{x} = 4.61$). Teacher-reflective written feedback was seen by subjects to, develop their writing proficiency, and improve their writing in general, as subjects became aware of their weaknesses and strengths in writing through teacher-reflective feedback (item 3, $\bar{x} = 4.52$; item 5, $\bar{x} = 4.58$; item 10, $\bar{x} = 4.39$; item 11, $\bar{x} = 4.52$). Hence, teacher-reflective written feedback was regarded as a significant feedback source in the process of learning to write; its reader-friendly characteristic also encouraged the subjects to enhance their writing (item 2, $\bar{x} = 4.45$; item 4, $\bar{x} = 4.42$; item 7, $\bar{x} = 4.48$). Unquestionably, their motivation for learning to write was reported to be increased (item 8, $\bar{x} = 4.39$). However, the subjects stated that they still made the same mistakes, even though they received teacher-reflective feedback on certain points (item 9, $\bar{x} = 4.35$). All in all, teacher-reflective feedback was considered as the most useful source of feedback, as well as a recommended method to be used when teaching writing (item 6, $\bar{x} = 4.52$; item 12, $\bar{x} = 4.52$).

Apart from the five-point Likert scale sections of the questionnaire, the subjects' responses to three open-ended questions,

reflecting on their attitudes toward the employment of self-reflective written feedback, peer-reflective written feedback, and teacher-reflective written feedback in their writing course can be summarized as follows.

Subjects' Attitudes toward Self-Reflective Written Feedback and Textual Quality Improvement

Being compared to peer-reflective written feedback and teacher-reflective written feedback, the subjects found out that self-reflective written feedback was less effective. Although they learned how to correct their own work, and it did help them to improve their writing, allowing them to realize both their strengths and weaknesses, they still felt awkward and uncertain when editing their own work. Therefore, there were limits in its effectiveness due to the constraints of their own language proficiency. However, the subjects generally had positive attitudes toward self-reflective written feedback as it made them more aware of their own mistakes, so that they could avoid making them in the future. In addition, it allowed them to see their work as readers, so that they could improve various aspects of their writing based on the readers' point of view, through the process of giving self-reflective written feedback. Nonetheless, a few subjects even stated that they were not motivated to develop their writing through self-reflective written feedback as they already knew their own writing performance. Hence, giving them a chance to provide feedback to themselves did not make their writing any better because if they had known better than what they had done, they would have done that.

Subjects' Attitudes toward Peer-Reflective Written Feedback and Textual Quality Improvement

As the language proficiency of their peers' was similarly limited to their own, peer-reflective written feedback, was not considered to be one hundred percent effective for the subjects based on their perspectives. Moreover, the subjects were not confident in their peers' corrections or suggestions, as they perceived that their peers probably had no idea about what they wanted to express. However, the subjects reported that peer-reflective written feedback did help them to realize more mistakes and to improve their writing, especially in terms of the grammatical aspects. Additionally, they could exchange their ideas about the topics that they were writing about and compare their ideas developing a better piece of writing. Finally, their motivation for improving their writing was also increased.

Subjects' Attitudes toward Teacher-Reflective Written Feedback and Textual Quality Improvement

Due to the teacher's knowledge and experience, teacher-reflective written feedback was considered as the best and most effective feedback according to the subjects' responses. From this source of feedback, the subjects knew both their strengths and weaknesses, including different aspects of writing apart from grammar; for instance, fluency, word choice, and organization. Furthermore, their writing proficiency was improved step-by-step since they learnt from their own mistakes.

DISCUSSION

Regarding the main findings of the present study, the subjects had positive attitudes toward all three types of reflective written feedback as they *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that all of these three types of feedback were useful to them. However, the same mistakes in their writing could be spotted, even though all of these types of feedback had been employed. This can possibly be explained, if these mistakes were those that had become "fossilized", meaning that it would probably take more time for the subjects to overcome these mistakes and master the respective elements of language use. One possible way to help them increase their ability to overcome the language elements that they are struggling to master, is to ask them to further study those specific language problems in detail before producing their next piece of writing. In so doing, the process of language instruction can be done through self-regulated learning with their teacher or peers as their facilitators when needed or if any confusion needs to be clarified. Apart from that, more language practice on those issues is also required to help them strengthen their weaknesses.

Additionally, further discussion of the research findings and some practical pedagogical implications is provided below; this is based on the subjects' questionnaire responses and provided under separate headings, for each of the three types of reflective written feedback.

Subjects' Attitudes toward Self-Reflective Written Feedback

The subjects had positive attitudes toward self-reflective written feedback as they

perceived its value in the writing process to help improve their writing products as well as their writing performance. Moreover, they were aware of both their own strengths and weaknesses. Even though the same mistakes could be found in their writing, this type of feedback still enhanced their general writing skill according to their point of view. Some of them, nevertheless, remarked that this type of feedback did not make their writing any better because if they had known better than what they had done, they would have done that. One possible way to deal with this attitude of the subjects is through instruction. That is, through the assessment for learning process, the subjects should be instructed to realize what they had already mastered and what they had to develop further. From this process, they are pushed to learn to improve their writing in the aspects that they have not yet achieved or mastered. In so doing, some training should be given to the subjects to do some self-reflective written feedback practice in order to help them make the most of this language learning strategy to improve their writing. This finding is consistent with Khonbi and Sadeghi's (2013) study. In their study, an investigation of Iranian EFL students' attitudes toward self-, peer-, and teacher-assessment was carried out. The students showed positive attitudes toward the three types of assessment. The same finding was also reported in Kasule and Lunga's (2010) study in which the attitude of second language students toward self-editing their own written texts was explored. According to their study, the students had positive attitudes toward self-editing because it could reduce the number of language errors in their written texts which led them to produce better quality writing products with fewer errors. The same situation occurred in the

present study though in a different degree. Interestingly, self-reflective written feedback, was claimed by the subjects in the present study, to be a type of feedback that promoted autonomous learning. As we can see from the analysis of the mean scores in the present study, the subjects claimed that their autonomous learning was boosted to some degree. This is because during the self-reflective written feedback process, the subjects learnt how to edit their own work by themselves, even though they reported that it was not an easy task for them and they felt awkward when doing so. This could possibly happen because the normal situation to which they were familiar, consisted of teacher-reflective written feedback, whereby the teacher plays the important role to take charge of the writing process. Thus, when they took on this significant role themselves, they lacked confidence in doing so. In addition, the language barrier of their own proficiency was counted as an obstacle to the subjects when doing this type of feedback. Therefore, some subjects undoubtedly indicated that they were not motivated to improve their writing through self-reflective written feedback. All in all, self-reflective written feedback, one alternative form of assessment, should be integrated in any EFL writing class in order to promote autonomous learning, although it could be done in different levels of achievement in various academic contexts (Wanchid, 2013).

Subjects' Attitudes toward Peer-Reflective Written Feedback

All the subjects appreciated the benefits of peer-reflective written feedback as they all had positive attitudes toward it. According to their perspectives, peer-reflective written

feedback was another useful and informative method of feedback to improve their writing, especially in terms of the grammatical aspects although the same errors were reported to be found in their writing. The finding is in line with Morra and Romano's (2008) study. In their study, the students' motivation toward their writing development, especially in terms of accuracy, particularly in the intra-sentential level; for instance, syntax, spelling, and punctuation, increased because of peer-reflective written feedback. This is likely to be due to the fact that this particular writing trait was probably the one most commonly referred to when given feedback by their teacher, and therefore the most familiar trait of writing, allowing peers to provide feedback in this regard more easily. Moreover, Srichanyachon (2012) conducted a study to investigate university EFL students' attitudes toward peer and teacher feedback. The results showed that the students had positive attitudes toward peer feedback since their writing ability was improved through the peer feedback process. That's why their motivation toward writing development was also increased. In another academic context, Liu and Chai (2006) carried out a study to examine EFL students' attitudes toward peer review in Chinese EFL writing classrooms and a similar finding was found. Here, students also reported positive attitudes toward peer review and its value in the learning process was also emphasized. Particularly, their writing quality was improved in terms of accuracy, ideas, word choices, etc. The value of peer-reflective written feedback and outstanding characteristic of this type of feedback was in its ability to promote a collaborative interaction in a non-threatening atmosphere, enhancing the writing performance and writing products of learners

and their peers, and more importantly their motivation for improving their writing proficiency. This notion was highlighted in the study of Azarnoosh (2013), an investigation of university students' perspectives on peer assessment in an EFL context. The findings in this study revealed that the students had positive attitudes toward peer assessment. Interestingly, Azarnoosh highlighted that it promoted "a more learner-centered class" rather than "the traditional one-way teacher-centered classes" (p. 8) in which the students took the significant role to take charge of their own learning development, leading them to become autonomous learners. Additionally, some interesting findings were, however, found in Wang's (2014) study. Wang did longitudinal research on students' perspectives of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing. According to the results of the study, the students' positive perceptions of peer feedback on their writing, nevertheless, decreased over time because of five factors: their knowledge on the topics they were assigned to write about, their limited language proficiency, their attitudes toward the peer feedback practice itself, the limitation of time for the in-class peer feedback procedure, and their concerns about their friendship. One of these five factors, their limited language proficiency was raised as an essential obstacle for the subjects to give peer-reflective written feedback according to the responses from the subjects in the present study. Both the limited language proficiency and their remark on their doubts about their peers' understanding of their writing, which were also mentioned in the present study, were the two crucial issues noted in Morra and Romano's (2008) study that "This is critical in an EFL environment where many students not only have serious doubts regarding their

capability to help other writers improve their texts, but are also very anxious about other aspects of the foreign language (such as pronunciation, vocabulary, and fluency, among many others) in which they might feel weak and which may pose important limitations for them to carry out the activity in an effective, self-confident, and collaborative way.” (p. 26). This unfamiliar role of the subjects which should have been traditionally taken by teachers, however, could be diminished by creating a mutual trust and respect atmosphere as well as training the students before integrating peer-reflective written feedback in the writing class. As the results being reported in Morra and Romano’s (2008) study, the university students appreciated the value of peer feedback when they were well trained to do it in a non-threatening atmosphere.

Subjects’ Attitudes toward Teacher-Reflective Written Feedback

Unquestionably, teacher-reflective written feedback was regarded as the best and most effective reflective feedback to foster both the subjects’ writing skill and performance in respect of enhancing their writing qualities to produce better writing products, as they showed the highest positive attitudes toward teacher-reflective written feedback. This finding is in line with Srichanyachon’s (2012) study. In this study, university EFL students’ attitudes toward peer feedback and teacher feedback were investigated. It revealed that the students regarded teacher feedback as effective and preferable feedback because it helped their revision in the writing process. This

mutual result could possibly be explained by the teachers’ greater linguistic knowledge and pragmatism for error correction; their experience and exposure to the target language as well as their expertise in the target language made the subjects more confident in the way that teachers guided them in improve their writing. Apart from that, five conditions which support effective teacher-reflective written feedback according to Mack (2009) were found in the feedback process given in the present study. First, teacher-reflective written feedback was formative. That is, the subjects got the feedback throughout the writing process: brainstorming, drafting, and so forth. Second, teacher-reflective written feedback was timely. In the current study, it was given to the subjects right after the submission of their final writing products. Next, teacher-reflective written feedback drew the subjects’ attention to the errors through both direct feedback (the explicit corrective feedback on the subjects’ writing) and indirect feedback (the indication by drawing a circle where an error had been made on the subjects’ writing and the written feedback in the subjects’ native language in terms of strengths and weaknesses of their writing), so they realized and accurately corrected their own writing mistakes. In so doing, problem-solving skills were also developed through the indirect feedback process. This skill was, however, further promoting self-edited writing. Finally, teacher-reflective written feedback in the present study was related to a rubric. Thus, the subjects’ writing assignments were analytically evaluated via criterion-referenced assessment.

Positive Impacts of an Integration of Three Types of Reflective Written Feedback into a Writing Class

Self-Reflective Written Feedback

The self-reflective written feedback employed in the present study emphasizes its major benefit in the way that it promotes autonomous learning in writing classes. Since the students must edit their own writing, they learn to be aware of both their strengths and weaknesses in order to build up their writing performance based on their current writing proficiency. This develops self-editors who take responsibility of their own learning to produce better writing products with less assistance from teachers or friends. Self-improvement also promotes self-regulated learning and student-centered language teaching in the writing class.

Peer-Reflective Written Feedback

The teacher-directed language teaching method is commonly found in the Thai academic context. Hence, it is quite difficult to provide an opportunity for the students to take responsibility of their own learning without intervention. The integration of peer-reflective written feedback in the present study helped to decrease the role and authority of the teacher in the classroom, for the students to take charge of their own language learning and improvement. This method additionally promotes peer facilitation as well as a collaborative and interactive atmosphere in the language classroom, especially in the writing class. Sooner or later, their positive attitudes toward such a learning environment help boost their positive attitudes toward learning to write.

Teacher-Reflective Written Feedback

The teacher-reflective written feedback used in the present study changes the common role of the teacher in the EFL writing class from a director or an assessor to be a facilitator who encourages the students to develop their collaborative strategies to improve their language learning and skill.

The positive impact of an integration of the three types of reflective written feedback in the current study suggests pedagogical implications for teaching writing more effectively, particularly in the academic context where English is taught as a foreign language.

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Integration of self- and peer- reflective written feedback into the writing class, does not mean that teacher-reflective written feedback is insufficient or insignificant. It is how we teachers in the 21st century make the most of whatever strategies can be employed in the classroom meaningfully as well as maximizing opportunities for students to develop themselves in such a way as to possess the characteristics required of 21st century learners; for example, collaboration, creativity, critical thinking, learner-centred, learning by doing, a “can do” attitude, or a trial and error approach to learning new skills.

According to Killen (2006), in order to enhance the students’ capacity for self- and peer- evaluations, a well-prepared orientation and some encouragement from the teacher should be involved to motivate the students to take part in the activities. Apart from that, the benefits of an integration of these two types of assessment into the writing process should be informed, for the students to realize their

efficacy in helping them to develop their writing skill and performance (Harris, Graham, MacArthur, Reid, & Mason, 2011). As Harris, Graham, MacArthur, Reid, and Mason, (2011) remarked, some instruction on self-regulation in writing should be carried out to increase its effectiveness on the improvement of the students' writing performance. In addition, a writing rubric should be integrated in this process as a guideline to help the students have less difficulty in assesses their own writing as well as their peers' and acknowledge their weaknesses and learn from their peers' mistakes to further improve their own writing products in the future (Killen, 2006). However, a checklist or an evaluation form can be used as a starter tool to make students familiar with or gain more practice with evaluation in the beginning. In so doing, the writing rubric, the checklist, or the evaluation form can be either constructed by the students themselves or adapted from the ones in the students' books in order to set the writing criteria that match their writing performance (Harris Graham, MacArthur, Reid, & Mason, 2011). In this case, either self- or peer- reflective written feedback is used as a teaching strategy to improve the students' writing proficiency (Killen, 2006).

Moreover, in order to incorporate peer-reflective written feedback into the writing class effectively, "a welcoming respectful learning environment that supports risk taking and honest sharing" (Sackstein, 2017, p. 19) should be built to create "a dynamic learning space" (Sackstein, 2017, p. 16) by establishing rapport, respect, ritual, and routines, celebrating success and failure, and promoting the student-led learning environment by working cooperatively with the students (Sackstein, 2017). Furthermore, how to

organize the students when carrying out the peer-reflective written feedback process is also significant, as it affects the language learning and development atmosphere (Ferris, 2003). That is, the students can give each other their full time and attention when they do the feedback in pairs, whereas it is more comfortable and a variety of feedback can be drawn out when running this process in groups. Additionally, the process of self- or peer-reflective written feedback should be modeled for the class to make sure that the students can run the whole processes by themselves properly (Ferris, 2003). Most importantly, some discussion about the integration of both types of reflective written feedback should be done at the end of the orientation phase for identifying any misunderstanding or problems that need to be dealt with before the students use these two strategies on their own.

CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTION

The present study reports both positive and negative aspects of three types of reflective written feedback. It provides valuable pedagogical implications for EFL writing classes whose aim is to improve students' writing proficiency as well as their writing process and writing products. Regarding the findings and certain limitations of the study, some recommendations for further studies are given to shed light on the following aspects.

1. The correlation between the students' attitudes toward the feedback and their competence in writing in English should be considered in the future study to see if they are significantly related or not.
2. To confirm the findings of the present study, this study should be replicated with a

larger sample size at different levels of education for a longer period of time in different academic contexts to see whether the same findings will be produced; that is, whether the students will have positive attitudes toward an integration of the three types of reflective written feedback as well as when writing in English.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My gratitude goes to Department of Western Languages, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thaksin University for their support.

REFERENCES

- Azarnoosh, M. (2013). Peer assessment in an EFL context: Attitudes and friendship bias. *Language Testing in Asia*, 3(11), 1-10.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Harris, K. R., Graham, S., MacArthur, C. A., Reid, R., & Mason, L. H. (2011). Self-regulated learning processes and children's writing. In Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 187-201). New York: Routledge.
- Kasule, D., & Lunga, V. B. (2010). Attitudes of second language students towards self-editing their own written texts. *Reading and Writing*, 1(1). 61-72.
- Khonbi, Z. A., & Sadeghi, K. (2013). Self-, peer-, and teacher-assessment: An investigation into Iranian EFL students' attitudes. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 3(1), 87-107.
- Killen, R. (2006). *Effective teaching strategies: Lessons from research and practice*. AU: Thomson Social Science Press.
- Liu, M., & Chai, Y. (2006). Attitudes towards peer review and reaction to peer feedback in Chinese EFL writing classrooms. *TESL Reporter*, 42(1), 33-51.
- Mack, L. (2009). Issues and dilemmas: What conditions are necessary for effective teacher written feedback for ESL learners? *Polyglossia*, 16, 33-39.
- Mongomery, K. (2002). Authentic tasks and rubrics: Going beyond traditional assessments in college teaching. *College Teaching*, 50(1), 34-39.
- Morra, A. M., & Romano, M. E. (2008). University students' reactions to guided peer feedback of EAP compositions. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning*, 35, 19-30.
- Overmeyer, M. (2009). *What student writing teaches us: Formative assessment in the writing workshop*. Colorado: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Sackstein, S. (2017). *Peer feedback in the classroom: Empowering students to be the experts*. Virginia: ASCD.
- Spandel, V. (2009). *Creating writers through 6-trait writing: Assessment and instruction*. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Srichanyachon, N. (2012). An investigation of university EFL students' attitudes toward peer and teacher feedback. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 7(26), 558-562.

- Tuttle, H. G. (2013). *Successful student writing through formative assessment*. New York: Routledge.
- Wanchid, R. (2013). The use of self-correction, paper-pencil peer feedback and electronic peer feedback in the EFL writing class: Opportunities and challenges. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(3), 157-164.
- Wang, W. (2014). Students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing: A longitudinal inquiry. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 80-96.
- Weigle, S. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.