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Using a sociocultural approach, this study investigates how Korean learners of English internalize feedback and how this internalization affects their actual revision. To date, studies on learner response to feedback has used a cognitive approach in which learners are asked about their perceptions of teacher feedback. By adopting the idea of internalization from sociocultural theory, this study complexifies analysis by comparing the extent to which two EFL students, Jeong-soo and Jee-min, internalize feedback by conducting in-depth interviews, collecting the written and oral feedback they received on their texts, and collecting the writing assignments they wrote. Analysis reveals that these two students are at different levels of internalization and that this difference is represented in their revisions. This developmental view of learners’ understanding of feedback provides a new perspective on learner response to feedback and implies that writing instructors should not only provide feedback but also facilitate learners’ understanding of feedback so that they can grow into self-regulated learners.

I. INTRODUCTION

Students’ response to feedback has attracted a great deal of attention from writing instructors as well as researchers. One of the major responsibilities of writing instructors, and oftentimes the most difficult aspect of the job, is to provide feedback on student writing. Although this requires extensive time and effort from instructors, the effect is not usually found and, when it is, it is often at a very basic level in students’ revised drafts. For this reason, while earlier studies investigating writing feedback examined whether students incorporate teacher or peer feedback into their revisions (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Ferris, 1997), more recent studies have
become interested in the question of whether students understand feedback (Brice, 1995; Cho & MacArthur, 2010; Zhao, 2010). That is, researchers have come to link the issues of how students think of feedback to the issue of whether they reflect on the feedback and incorporate it into their revisions. To date, students’ understanding of feedback has been investigated in various ways, such as response to feedback, perceptions of feedback, and attitudes towards feedback (Brice, 1995; Cho & MacArthur, 2010; Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 1995; Hedgecock & Lefkowitz, 1994, 1996; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Zhao, 2010). However, under these umbrella terms, students’ different levels of understanding cannot be distinguished; moreover, it is rarely studied how these different levels of understanding can be reflected in their writing. By using a sociocultural perspective instead of the traditional cognitive approach of examining learners’ perception of feedback, this study provides a new approach that views students’ understanding of feedback as the process of development as second language learners, through interaction with others such as teachers and classmates, and examines how these stages are reflected in their revisions.

II. PERCEPTIONS OF FEEDBACK IN L2 LEARNING

To date, most studies on learner response to feedback have measured learners’ understanding of feedback. Students are usually asked to evaluate what they think of received feedback, whether it is from teachers or from peers (Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 1995; Hedgecock & Lefkowitz, 1994, 1996; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Zhao, 2010). For instance, Hedgecock and Lefkowitz (1994, 1996) asked English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners to evaluate their perceptions of various types of feedback, such as feedback on ideas, organization, expression, grammatical errors, and punctuation and found that EFL students believe feedback focused on linguistic accuracy is more useful, while ESL students are more interested in feedback that helps them develop their ideas. Also, through a questionnaire, Radecki and Swales (1988) examined students’ opinions of the usefulness of teacher feedback, as well as its scope, and the responsibility of teachers to mark and correct errors, and their opinions on rewriting. Depending on the questionnaire scores, Radecki and Swales classified the students into three different groups—receptors, semi-receptors, and resisters. While receptors and semi-receptors had positive attitudes towards feedback, resisters usually did not want their errors indentified.

In order to ascertain the extent to which an individual learner pays attention to a certain type or aspect of feedback, these studies often use a Likert scale (Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 1995; Hedgecock & Lefkowitz, 1994, 1996). Enginarlar (1993) used a
three-point scale consisting of high, moderate, and low and asked the students to mark their perceptions of utility, interest, and responsibility in regard to feedback. Based on the students’ ratings on this scale, Enginarlar found that students evaluated teacher feedback as highly useful, but not that interesting, and that they feel responsibility is shared both by students and teachers. Ferris (1995) also asked the students to assess the extent to which they pay attention to teacher feedback and utilize it in revision between preliminary and final drafts through marking “a lot,” “some,” “a little,” or “none” on the questionnaire, finding that students pay more attention to teacher feedback on their preliminary drafts than on their final drafts.

However, this method of self-appraisal is limited in that learners measure their own understanding of themselves. The validity of this self-appraisal depends completely on how well the students are aware of their own cognition, which requires meta-cognitive knowledge. According to Kasper (1997), ESL learners vary in their metacognitive growth in terms of personal, task, and strategic knowledge, and their metacognitive knowledge grows as their writing performance improves. Given this variation in learners’ level of meta-cognitive knowledge, these self-rating procedures are not enough to indicate how much of feedback the learners understand and use in their revisions.

In order to compensate for this limitation, several studies have collected multiple data sources in addition to self-appraisal, or have resorted to completely different ways of examining learners’ understanding of feedback (Brice, 1995; Cho & MacArthur, 2010; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996; Zhao, 2010). For instance, out of the 316 participants who filled out a self-rating questionnaire, Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996) interviewed 12 participants to more fully understand their self-monitoring and revision procedures. On the other hand, Brice (1995) asked the raters, not the learners themselves, to evaluate the learners’ think-aloud protocols during their responses to teacher comments on a three-point scale from negative to positive understanding of teacher feedback. The ratings showed that all three participants most frequently used the functions of reading comments and responding to teacher comments, and that they had the greatest difficulty with understanding teacher comments on grammar and vocabulary. Cho and MacArthur (2010) examined student drafts that resulted from feedback in different conditions, such as feedback from one expert, feedback from one peer, and feedback from multiple peers. Their findings suggest that students in the multiple-peer condition are likely to receive more non-directive feedback, which leads to more complex repairs and usually to revised drafts of higher quality in comparison with students in the other conditions. Furthermore, Zhao (2010) conducted content analyses of learners’ use of feedback and stimulated recall interviews with learners and found that while students tend to incorporate more teacher feedback into their revisions, they understood peer feedback better than teacher feedback.
Unlike the studies that have attempted to quantify learners’ understanding of feedback by the method of self-appraisal, however, the studies in which researchers or raters observe how learners respond to feedback often fail to account for the extent to which an individual learner pays attention to a particular type of feedback. For instance, Zhao (2010) simply assessed whether learners understood teacher feedback through interview protocols, and Cho and MacArthur (2010) looked only at how learners respond to feedback, not how they understood it. However, the current study attempts to account for learners’ understanding of feedback as the process of development by incorporating a sociocultural perspective, in particular, the concept of internalization, into the traditional cognitive approach to examine learner response to feedback and to examine how these different levels of understanding can be reflected in their revision.

III. INTERNALIZATION OF FEEDBACK IN SOCIOCULTURAL THEORY

As has been argued thus far, the issue of learner response to feedback has been approached from a cognitive perspective. That is, the studies that examine how learners think of feedback have based their analysis and interpretation of feedback on learners’ evaluation of themselves, which requires from learners, meta-cognitive knowledge, or cognition about cognition. Interestingly, however, meta-cognitive knowledge has very close relationship with internalization the key concept in Sociocultural theory. Kuhn and Dean (2004) remind us the connection between meta-cognition and Vygotsky’s internalization:

Another source of metacognitive development is the interiorization that both Vygotsky and Piaget talked about, which occurs when forms that are originally social become covert within the individual. If students participate in discourse where they are frequently asked, “How do you know?” or “What makes you say that?” they become more likely to pose such questions to themselves. Eventually, we hope, they will interiorize the structure of argument as a framework for much of their own individual thinking. They will think in terms of issues or claims, with facts summoned in their service, rather than the reverse—storing up facts with the idea that some conclusion may emerge from them. (p. 270)

According to Vygotsky, any higher mental functions first appear on the interpsychological plane and only later on the intrapsychological plane:
‘Any higher mental function was external because it was social at some point before becoming an internal, truly mental function. It was first a social relation between two people. The means for influencing oneself originally were means of influencing others or others’ means of influencing an individual’ (as cited in Wertsch, 2008, p. 67).

That is, in the initial stage of development, learners accomplish a task through the interaction with experts, but as they internalize the task along with the necessary skills, they are able to perform the same task alone.

Wertsch (2008) laments that many researchers have ignored the origin of metacognition. That is, the transition from the interpsychological to the intrapsychological plane, and he suggests the following developmental stages of children’s internalization:

1) The child’s understanding of the task situation is so limited that communication is very difficult.
2) The interaction at the second level is not as restricted by the child’s limited understanding of the task situation as is the case for the first level.
3) The third level in the transition from other to self-regulation is characterized by the fact that the child can function adequately in the other regulation language-game.
4) The fourth and final level in our scheme is the level at which the child has taken over complete responsibility for the problem-solving effort.

(PP. 75-76)

To date, sociocultural studies on feedback have focused on the third level, that is, how teachers or peers provide assistance to student writers (Carson & Nelson, 1994; Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Lockhart & Ng, 1995; Nelson & Murphy, 1992; Villamil & Guerrero, 1996), but very few studies have explored how these student writers develop move from the third to the fourth level. According to Wertsch (2008), however, at the fourth level, the learning process shifts from other-regulation to self-regulation, and internalization is completed.

In order to examine how Korean learners of English develop as second language writers through interaction with others, this study adopts Aljaafreh and Lantolf’s (1994) levels of language learning. Relating this process of internalization with learners’ error correction, Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) suggested five levels of language learning:
1) The learner is not able to notice, or correct the error, even with intervention from the tutor.
2) The learner is able to notice the error, but cannot correct it, even with intervention.
3) The learner is able to notice and correct an error, but only under other-regulation.
4) The learner notices and corrects an error with minimal, or no obvious feedback from the tutor and begins to assume full responsibility for error correction.
5) The learner becomes more consistent in using the target structure correctly in all contexts. (p. 78)

Aljaafreh and Lantolf interpret the first three levels as representing other-regulation, in which learners depend on others such as tutors, peers, or teachers, but the final level indicates the stage of self-regulation. The fourth level is the transitional level from other-regulation to self-regulation and represents partial self-regulation. In this level, learners can correct their errors without outside help, but this performance has not been automatized yet. Adopting these developmental stages into second language writing development, this study compares two Korean learners of English to answer the following research questions:

1) To what extent do learners internalize feedback from peers and teachers?
2) What is their current level in the developmental stages of internalization?
3) How does the extent to which they internalize feedback affect their revision?

IV. METHOD

1. Participants and Setting

The participants are Jeong-soo and Jee-min, two students enrolled in an intermediate-level writing class I taught. In order to take this intermediate writing course, all students are required to take College English or to have earned scores exceeding 700 in

---

1 I have been teaching this course to Korean learners of English for about three years.
TEPS (Test of English Proficiency developed by Seoul National University), which is equivalent to around 94 in TOEFL iBT. The class aims to teach academic writing and guide students from paragraph to essay writing. In the class, the students completed four major writing assignments: a one-paragraph text exhibiting logical division of ideas, a one-paragraph text explaining a process, a one-paragraph text of comparison and contrast, and an opinion essay. For each of these writing assignments, the students were required to turn in two drafts, and between these two drafts, they received both teacher and peer feedback. After receiving these two different kinds of feedback from the teacher and their peers, the students were supposed to revise their first drafts and turn in second drafts. Out of 16 students in the same class, the two participants were selected because their levels of internalization are presented quite explicitly during their interview and in their revision, and they are in remarkable contrast with each other in these levels of internalization.

2. Procedure

In order to see what levels these two participants are in the process of internalization, I operationalize the study as follows:

1) Interpsychological Plane

From these two participants, I collected both peer feedback forms and teacher feedback forms to see what kinds of intervention they received in their process of writing. Peer feedback was given in the format of answering questions from the textbook about each peer group member’s draft (see Appendix A). Since the peer group members rotated four times during the semester, each participant had the chance to receive feedback from almost all of their classmates. All of teacher feedback was provided in English in two forms—annotated comments on the first draft and comments on a separate feedback sheet regarding the topic, elaboration, and grammar points (see Appendix B). Based on these comments, I had a five-minute teacher conference with each participant for their writing assignments. During the conference, I basically explained why I provided those kinds of feedback in Korean.

---

2 The class was taught in English, and all the feedback was provided in English since that was the classroom policy. In order to facilitate students’ understanding of feedback, however, the conferences were conducted in Korean the mother tongue for both the teacher and the students.
2) Intrapsychological Plane

In order to see to what extent these two participants internalize the feedback from the peers and the teacher, I conducted a 30-minute interview before the end of the semester, which was audio-taped. During this interview, the participants were interviewed regarding their thoughts and feelings about feedback (see Appendix C).

Lastly, I compared these two participants’ first and second drafts for the last writing assignment. After the interviews, the two participants revised their opinion essays and turned in revised drafts. The cross-analysis of these drafts shows whether the participants incorporated feedback into the revisions and made any self-initiated changes additionally. This will show whether the participants move from other-regulated to self-regulated learners.

3. Data Analysis

The first part of this study presents qualitative analysis of the two focal participants’ interview data in order to see to what extent they internalize feedback from their teacher and peers. I first transcribed the audio-taped materials and reviewed them several times as recommended by Leki (2006) to figure out “particularly salient or interesting comments as potential themes or categories to be cued against transcripts” (p. 270). I then compared the transcripts rigorously with the interview questions, “with straightforward responses tabulated and elaborations examined for themes and potential analytic categories to be correlated with themes and categories noted in the oral recordings” (p. 270). In addition, because this study compares the two participants in their orientations and perceptions toward feedback, their interview transcripts were contrasted with each other so that I could analyze any differences in the levels of internalization.

The second part of this study compares the first and second drafts of the two focal students in order to see how they incorporated feedback they received both from the teacher and from their peers. Examination of the extent to which they respond to feedback confirms their different levels of internalization. I conducted a close-analysis of their texts, in particular, the first and second drafts of their last writing assignment. Since this final revision was completed after the interview, the comparison of the last writing assignment drafts reveals whether their levels of internalization are represented in the revision. I counted how many corrections were made in the revision, how many of them were initiated by others (such as peers and the teacher), how many of them were initiated by the writer himself, and finally, what types of changes were made.
V. RESULTS

1. Interpretation of Feedback

Before the exit interview with the teacher, Jeong-soo and Jee-min received both teacher and peer feedback three times. As mentioned earlier, because peer feedback was provided in a very controlled way, by answering questions on a worksheet, peers rarely made suggestions about corrections. This limitation notwithstanding, some peers pinpointed what they did not understand in Jeong-soo’s and Jee-min’s writing assignment or suggested changes they could make in revision. Table 1 is the summary of the peer and teacher feedback Jeong-soo received before the exit interview with the teacher.

**TABLE 1**

Feedback to Jeong-soo
(Italics indicate overlapping between peer and teacher feedback.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Feedback from peers</th>
<th>Feedback from teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$P1$: “There are many figure examples, but writer reveals only one source.”</td>
<td>$T$: Add citations about outside sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“What is ‘arable land’ and ‘areas’ is correct expression?”</td>
<td>$T$: Clarify how outside sources support the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$P2$: “As intro is too short and too weak, paragraph fails to give interest readers. I think it is better if there is interesting fact, statistics or comparison.”</td>
<td>$T$: Develop the conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I want more information about how much meat consumption we should reduce.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$P3$: “I cannot understand why higher supply cause price increase.”</td>
<td>$T$: Provide more background knowledge about the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I cannot understand exactly why the sales of goats from the banks cause price decrease.”</td>
<td>$T$: Restrict the topic to Mongolian nomads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jee-min: “No words that tell this paragraph a process paragraph.”</td>
<td>$T$: Explain technical terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$P5$: “I wondered how Mongolian nomads bankrupted.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I wonder what a ‘security value’ means.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Also the higher supply makes increased price? Not demand?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$P6$: “I don’t know what ‘anomalous’ means. It would be better if you put</td>
<td>$T$: Find a common cause to cover the supporting points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
some explanation about difficult concept.”
“*The two reasons seem like almost same thing.*”
“It would have been easier to read if you highlighted the topic words, weather and climate.”
P7: “If you studied Earth science, this paragraph might seem to be commonplace.”
“I *don’t understand the second difference.*”
“*Anomalous*’ means abnormal?”

T: *Clarify what the supporting points are*

As we see in Table 1, the most common type of feedback Jeong-soo received from both his peer and teacher asks for clarification. Out of 16 incidents of feedback, 10 incidents involve clarification remarks about vocabulary, phrases, explanations, and ideas, such as “I don’t understand,” “I cannot understand,” or “I wonder.” Even out of eight general remarks made by the teacher, four comments ask for clarification on vocabulary, supporting points, and topic.

The analysis of the interviews with the students reveals that Jeong-soo is outstanding in the extent to which he internalizes this feedback from the peers and the teacher. He shows awareness of the feedback he received from peers and teacher and constructs it as being his own problem to some extent:

When I read my own writing, the biggest problem is that I have background knowledge of the topic. I oftentimes make this kind of mistake. Because I have background knowledge, I do not notice that there is logical jump between sentences. Although the transition is not smooth in writing, I do not catch it since I know the topic. But those who do not have the same amount of knowledge as me may have difficulties with understanding my writing. Also, I have a problem with grammar, since my grammar is not perfect. (December. 6, 2010)

Jeong-soo points out his lack of attention to the audience as the biggest problem in his English writing. Because he already knows the topic well, he assumes that the audience may know some of the information as well, and he therefore chooses to omit it. As can be seen in his peer and teacher feedback, this problem was first pinpointed by the peers and the teacher, but Jeong-soo seems to internalize this lack of attention to audience and expresses it as his own problem.

In comparison with Jeong-soo, Jee-min seems to be at a lower level of internalization,
for transition from other to self-regulation has not been noticed yet. Table 2 shows the feedback Jee-min received from his peers and the teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Feedback from peers</th>
<th>Feedback from teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P6: “I want some examples of last supporting point - difference in depth of friendship between high school and university.” “Removing the sentence is better.” “The word ‘there’ should be changed into ‘their.’”</td>
<td>T: Restrict the topic to either high school or university. T: Avoid overgeneralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P9: “I think Jee-min’s paragraph doesn’t have the topic sentence that is composed of topic and controlling idea, either.” “I think there aren’t any example about the last supporting point. And while the second and third examples are specific as his own experiences, the first example seems weak.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jeong-soo: “What does ‘Have you puppy eaten’ mean?”</td>
<td>T: Clarify the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: Explain why these steps are necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: Tailor the supporting points to the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P6: “I think that your second distinguished characteristic can be changed to difference of density because you used components as cause and density as result.”</td>
<td>T: Find a common cause to cover the supporting points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: Explain what you want to argue about these two different types of planets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of Jee-min, his peers were more likely to ask for corrections rather than clarification. They tended to indicate problems by using words like “Jee-min should,” “he doesn’t,” or “there aren’t.” Five of the six peer feedback comments refer to what Jee-min does not do or what he should do in his writing. Only one of them (“what does ‘Have you puppy eaten’ mean?”) asks for clarification. In addition to peer feedback, the teacher comments also ask for more correction and changes rather than clarification (seven out of eight incidents). The one clarification request is even at a very global level—“clarify the topic”—not just clarification of words or phrases as in Jeong-soo’s case.
Unlike Jeong-soo, Jee-min does not seem to internalize these types of feedback he received from his peers and teacher as his own problem.

Since I wrote the first and the second writing assignments very short and concisely, I felt that there were not many things to fix in revision. But this time, you [the teacher] gave me clear instructions about what to correct, so I reflected on them in revision. This time I came to think I needed to change the order of the contents and to combine some parts. (December 7, 2010)

As can be seen in his understanding of revision, Jee-min did not think he needed to revise the first and second writing assignments a great deal, although he received suggestions that asked for corrections than clarifications. Unlike Jeong-soo, who internalizes his own difficulties as a writer from the feedback he received, Jee-min explicitly indicates that his revision was initiated by an outside source like the teacher. It is highly probable that Jee-min is at a lower level of internalization than Jeong-soo’s.

2. Revision

After the interview, both Jeong-soo and Jee-min revised their final writing assignment (i.e., the opinion essay) and turned in the second drafts. The analysis of these written texts confirms the different levels of internalization which Jeong-soo and Jee-min have attained by showing us what they actually did with the feedback and whether they initiated some corrections on their own. Here, I compare how Jeong-soo and Jee-min responded to both peer and teacher feedback and what kinds of changes they made in revision. Table 3 shows the feedback Jeong-soo received from his peers and teacher about his opinion essay about the importance of breakfast.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback from peers</th>
<th>Feedback from teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P8: “I think if writer shorten this part or eliminate some sentences, it could seem more unified.”</td>
<td>T: Provide more background information about the topic T: Use outside materials to support the topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After receiving this type of feedback, Jeong-soo made 42 changes in his revision. While 23 changes are initiated by others—one by peer 8 and 22 by the teacher, 19 changes are self-initiated. Most of these changes are rephrasings of the original words and expressions, as in “decreases” instead of “drops,” but in many cases, this new wording clarifies the original meaning. For example:
All these metabolism consume 300–500 kcal which is same amount to that of a single meal. (Original)

The entire metabolism for the body consumes 300–500 kcal which is same as the energy received from a single meal. (Revised)

Out of these 19 self-initiated corrections, one of them is to clarify the meaning. In the original sentence, Jeong-soo wrote “eating late-night meal leads to obesity, high level of cholesterol and even drops the appetite of next breakfast which makes you fall into the vicious circle.” While neither his peers or the teacher asked Jeong-soo to explain what the vicious circle means, in revision he added its explanation: “Even if you eat fruits or vegetables as late-night snacks, it can cause intestine problems and insomnia, because time that you eat is late.” According to Aljaafreh and Lantolf, these changes initiated by Jeong-soo himself confirms that he is at the fourth stage, “the learner notices and corrects an error with minimal, or no obvious feedback from the tutor and begins to assume full responsibility for correction.”

On the other hand, in the case of Jee-min, all the changes he made in his revision were first initiated by his peers and teacher. Jee-min wrote about the impossibility of North and South Koreas’ reunification. Table 4 shows the feedback Jee-min received from his peers and teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback from peer</th>
<th>Feedback from teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2: “The introduction does not explain the problem.”</td>
<td>T: Make transition from sentence to sentence smooth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T: Avoid assumptions. Provide proper evidence to support the argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I think these sentences disturb unity.”</td>
<td>T: Clarify the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The ending is not effective.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10: “I think this sentence has no reason in the essay.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11: “The introduction does not explain the problem.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of his peers marked “no” to the questions, “Does the introduction explain the problem?” and “Is the ending effective?” In addition to these problems, Peer 2 points out that the beginning part disturbs unity while Peer 10 stated that Jee-min cannot argue that North should adopt the South’s [political] system, which overlaps with the teacher’s feedback that requests Jee-min to base his argument on facts, not on assumptions. Drawing on these kinds of feedback, Jee-min made 17 changes in his second draft, but
only one of them was self-initiated; the remainder were other-initiated—two by peers and 14 by the teacher. The only self-initiated incident is as follows:

Because of the geopolitical importance of the Korean peninsula, many world powers such as USA, China, Japan largely intervene in the relation between North and South. (Original)

Because of the geopolitical importance of the Korean peninsula, many world powers such as USA, China, Russia, and Japan greatly intervene in the relation between North and South. (Revised)

In the example, Jee-min made two changes—the addition of Russia to the countries which have influenced Korea and the replacement of the word “largely” with “greatly.” While the second change was suggested by the teacher, the addition of Russia to the list of the neighboring countries to Korea is self-initiated, which is the only self-initiated change in his revision. That is, in most cases, Jee-min made changes because his peers and teacher asked him to do so. In Aljaafreh and Lantolf’s (1994) model, Jee-min is at level 3: “The learner is able to notice and correct an error, but only under other-regulation.” He corrected errors only in those instances in which his peers and teacher asked for corrections.

VI. DISCUSSION

As seen in the above, Jeong-soo seems to be situated at a higher level of internalization than Jee-min. Jeong-soo internalizes the feedback from the peers and teacher and interprets it as his own problem, which can be evidenced in his revision. He not only clarified what was pointed out by his peers and teacher, but he also tried to clarify wording and concepts on his own, even in instances in which it was not problematized by his peers or teacher. That is, Jeong-soo is moving from an other-regulated towards a self-regulated state. On the other hand, this kind of transition from the interpsychological to the intrapsychological plane cannot be found in Jee-min. He has not internalized the feedback as his own problem as in the case of Jeong-soo, and he fails to infer what he should develop or improve from the feedback, which can be represented in his revision. Although he corrected everything the teacher asked him to correct, and some of the things his peers critiqued, Jee-min did not initiate any further corrections on his own.

The comparison between Jeong-soo and Jee-min shows different levels of
internalization in regard to feedback, which can be further attested to through examination of their revisions. The learners’ internalization process revealed through their interviews and confirmed in their revisions may provide a more comprehensive view on learner response to feedback by bridging two different methods. Recently, Ferris (2003) mentioned that very few studies on student reactions to feedback actually examine student revision. In line with her, Goldstein (2001) urged scholars to investigate both learners’ attitudes and perceptions and their revisions by asking these questions: “What are students’ underlying motivations for using or not using teacher-written commentary? How do individual students revise (as opposed to groups of students) in response to feedback? What is the relationship between students’ attitudes and reactions to teacher commentary and how they actually revise?” (p. 78)

Internalization, the key idea posited by sociocultural theorists, may help scholars to approach learners’ minds—how they think of feedback—through the medium of their writings as well as their perceptions. According to Vygotsky, learners can accomplish a task with the help of experts such as parents and teachers in the zone of proximal development. As the learners move from this other-regulated state to a self-regulated state, they are able to perform alone what they could perform only with others’ help. When applied to an EFL writing classroom, this interaction with experts is represented in interaction with peers and teachers, including the feedback they receive from their peers and teachers. Additionally, the transition process from other- to self-regulated can be confirmed by the comparison of their written drafts. From this sociocultural perspective, the issues of how learners perceive feedback and how they incorporate feedback into their revisions cannot be separated from each other. In actuality, they should be studied at the same time in order to obtain a fuller view of the learners’ process of internalization. As we observed in the cases of Joeng-soo and Jee-min, the transition from other- to self-regulated state varies depending on learners’ perceptions of feedback.

Although the findings of this study cannot be generalizable to other populations and other contexts, this study implies that writing instructors should not merely deal with students’ written texts but also facilitate their understanding and internalization of feedback so that students grow into self-regulated learners. They can prepare their students better to learn from feedback by examining what kinds of experiences they have had in relation to feedback and how they think of it. Also, scholars should broaden their perspective of learner reaction to feedback and go beyond examining whether students accept feedback or merely counting the percentage of feedback the learners address in revision to incorporate learners’ developmental stages of internalization into their analysis. The key concern for both researchers and writing instructors should be how to help learners move from other-regulated to self-regulated learners, because if
learners do not arrive at this intrapsychological level, they may not be able to be fully responsible for their learning after they exit a writing class.
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**APPENDIX A**

**Peer Feedback**

(Peer 6’s Feedback to Jee-min’s 1st Assignment)

Peer-Editing Worksheet: Logical Division of Ideas

Peer Editor: Peer 6
1. Is the paragraph interesting? yes
   Write a comment about a part that is especially interesting to you.
   →In that most of them are what I can agree, and not new information, not a part is especially interesting. But I should choose one, I like third supporting point. That's because difference from hometown is what I felt best.

2. Do you understand everything? yes, he wrote so friendly that I could read easily.
   Circle or underline any part that you do not understand, and write a comment about it.

3. Copy the topic sentence here, and circle the topic and underline the controlling idea.
   →Attending University for a semester, I felt some differences of friendship between High school and University.

4. How many supporting points are there in the paragraph? there are 4 supporting points
   Is each point introduced by a transition signal? yes
   Is there at least one example for every supporting point?
   →ummm. I don't think the last supporting point contains examples...

5. Would you like more information about anything? yes.
   If your answer is yes, write down what you would like to know more about.
   →Just one, I want some examples of last supporting point - difference in depth of friendship between high school and university.

6. How many transition signals can you find? I found 14 of them.
   Are there too many or just about the right number of transition signals?
   →I think the number of transition signals is adequate, but if used a little more, it would have been better.

7. In your opinion, what is the best feature of this paragraph? In other words, what is this writer's best writing skill?
   →Firstly, he got a topic that I could sympathize easily. After that, his writing made me feel friendly and easy to understand. There are other good things, but I think that is the best feature of this paragraph.

On the 5th row from bottom, the sentence 'Naturally, friendship in university becomes shallower than that in high school.' is the repetition of the things already said, so I think removing that one is better.
On the 7th row from bottom, the word 'there' should be changed to their, I think.
(in the phrase, 'because of there different time table'.)

APPENDIX B

Teacher Feedback

(Jeong-soo, 1st assignment)

Dear Jeong-soo,

The information you cited from outside sources to support your point really helps me to understand your paragraph. If you work on the following things in your revision, I think your draft will be much more improved.

Topic & Elaboration
It is a good idea to use outside sources to support your point of view, but whenever you introduce them, you need to indicate where the information comes from in your writing.

You need to clarify how the outside sources are related to the supporting point. Now it seems that you only introduced the outside information without explanations.

You seem to conclude your paragraph in a sudden. As we learned in class, I hope you can summarize your points or restate your topic in the conclusion. You can conclude your paragraph with some of your opinions or insightful comments on the problem you’ve discussed.

Grammar
No major mistakes, but some of your words need additional explanations. For example, what are ‘overgrazing,’ ‘compaction,’ ‘erosion,’ or ‘replenishment of above and below ground water’? If you think it is burdensome to provide explanations for each of these terms, you can replace some of them with more commonly-used terms.
APPENDIX C
Interview Protocol

1. Which of the drafts do you think you revised the most? Which of the drafts did you put the most effort into for revision?

2. What kinds of things did you try to focus on when you revised the draft?

3. What kinds of changes did you make in revision?

4. What kinds of comments were the most helpful to you both in peer and teacher feedback?

5. Did you usually read the feedback carefully?

6. Are you willing to make changes in your revision? Do you mind making changes on a large scale?

7. What do you think of revision? Do you think it is necessary?

Applicable levels: secondary and tertiary
Key words: response, feedback, writing, sociocultural, and internalization

Sookyung Cho
Baird University College
Soongsil University
369 Sangdo-ro, Dongjak-gu
Seoul 156-743, Korea
Tel: (02) 828-7211/
Fax: (02) 815-5652

Received in June, 2011
Reviewed in July, 2011
Revised version received in August, 2011