
STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON ONLINE PEER FEEDBACK PRACTICE IN EFL WRITING

I Gede Krisna Meialldy Putra*, Made Hery Santosa, Ni Putu Astiti Pratiwi

Ganesha University of Education, Indonesia
(meialldyputra@gmail.com)

Received: 02nd July 2021; Revised: 29th October 2021; Accepted: 27th December 2021

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the implementation of online peer feedback practice, the students' perceptions toward online peer feedback practice, and the students' challenges toward online peer feedback practice. The study employed a mixed-method design with SMA PGRI Blahbatuh students as the population, while the sample was 132 students. The data were collected through observing the online classes using an observation checklist, conducting a survey using a questionnaire, and conducting an interview using an interview guide through focus group discussion. The study's findings imply several strengths and weaknesses in the online peer feedback practice. It was also revealed that the students had positive perceptions toward the online peer feedback practice. Meanwhile, the interview results revealed several contradictory results regarding the students' challenges. The students preferred the teacher's feedback after the practice since it would make them feel safe. The students also suggested anonymous peer feedback practice since they could give the comments honestly, with details, and specifics. Through this study, students can learn to improve their skills in communicating and collaborating with their peers. The study also provided the teacher information to create more effective and efficient online peer feedback practice.

Key Words: peer feedback; remote teaching context; writing in EFL

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini didesain untuk menyelidiki penerapan praktik umpan balik rekan secara daring, persepsi siswa terhadap praktik umpan balik rekan secara daring, dan tantangan siswa terhadap praktik umpan balik rekan secara daring. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain kombinasi dengan siswa SMA PGRI Blahbatuh sebagai populasi, sedangkan sampelnya hanya 132 siswa. Pengumpulan data dilakukan melalui observasi kelas online menggunakan lembar observasi, survei menggunakan kuesioner, dan wawancara menggunakan pedoman wawancara melalui diskusi kelompok terfokus. Temuan penelitian menyiratkan bahwa ada beberapa kekuatan dan kelemahan dalam praktik umpan balik rekan secara daring. Terungkap pula bahwa siswa memiliki persepsi positif terhadap praktik umpan balik rekan secara daring. Sementara itu, hasil wawancara mengungkapkan beberapa hasil yang kontradiktif terkait tantangan siswa. Siswa lebih menyukai masukan dari guru setelah latihan karena akan membuat mereka merasa lebih aman. Para siswa juga menyarankan praktik umpan balik rekan anonim karena mereka dapat memberikan komentar dengan jujur, dengan detail, dan spesifik. Melalui penelitian ini, siswa dapat belajar meningkatkan keterampilannya dalam berkomunikasi dan berkolaborasi dengan teman sebayanya. Penelitian ini juga memberikan informasi kepada guru untuk menciptakan praktik umpan balik teman secara daring yang lebih efektif dan efisien.

Kata kunci: umpan balik rekan; penulisan pada EFL; pembelajaran jarak jauh

How to Cite: Putra, I G. K. M., Santosa, M. H., Pratiwi, N. P. A. (2021). Students' Perceptions on Online Peer Feedback Practice In EFL Writing. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 8(2), 213-231. doi:10.15408/ijee.v8i2.21488

* Corresponding author

INTRODUCTION

Teaching and learning activities in the 21st century do not always require teachers and students doing interaction directly. It means they can be separated in time and distance. These teaching and learning activities are well-known as online remote teaching. Boholano (2017) states that students in the 21st century grow up in a rapidly-paced digital world where they easily tune out of the traditional lecture-based classroom. The implementation of remote teaching is usually facilitated using a synchronous or asynchronous online discussion forum that allows people to interact remotely. Various practices can be taught by implementing online remote teaching, and one of them is feedback practice. Students recognize their strengths and weaknesses through feedback provided after achieving a particular goal in the learning process. According to Narciss (2008), feedback can be defined as all post-response information provided to the students to inform them of their actual state of learning or performance. (Hattie & Timperley, 2007) emphasize that one of the most powerful influences on learning and achievement is feedback. There are several feedback functions, such as identifying, verifying, or improving accurate answers or high-quality learning

outcomes. Doing so can promote the acquisition of the knowledge and cognitive operations required to carry out learning tasks (Kaya & Yılmaz, 2019). Criticism comments identify where a learner needs improvement. By providing criticism comments, students can practice specific revision skills, such as problem detection, problem diagnosis, and selecting the appropriate solution to solve the problem (Patchan & Schunn, 2015).

There are several classifications of feedback in writing, namely, in terms of the way it is provided (direct feedback and indirect feedback), the mode (written feedback and oral feedback), and the one who delivers the feedback (teacher feedback and peer feedback) ((Wihastyanang et al., 2020). Peer feedback refers to feedback given by fellow students (Cahyono & Amrina, 2016). Students engage in learning of each other and thereby gain a deeper understanding and appreciation for their peers' experiences and perspectives by providing feedback on the work of their peers (van Popta et al., 2016). Learning in the 21st century also requires students to be more independent while the teacher mainly acts as the facilitator. Peer feedback provides the students the opportunity to be more independent and improve the collaboration and communication skills in 4C elements of the 21st skills

since they learn their weaknesses and strengths from each other. The 4C elements of 21st-century skills are critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and communication.

The implementation of peer feedback practice in the learning process is based on Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) theory. ZPD can be understood as the difference between what the students can do without help and what they cannot do without help. Vygotsky (1978) emphasizes that the essential feature of learning is that it creates the zone of proximal development, which means learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that can operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and cooperating with his peers. Thus, ZPD is the basis of peer feedback practice since the activities of peer feedback help the students realize and learn their mistakes with the help of their peers.

Peer feedback practice is appropriate to be implemented in the writing practice. Since the process of writing takes time, starting from outlining to publishing, it makes writing becomes more complex. Indonesian context writing is the subject that most students avoid (Kusumaningrum et al., 2019). Thus, an

efficient, attractive, and effective method needs to be considered to improve the students' writing skills. Online peer feedback practice allows the students to improve their writing skills effectively and efficiently since they can do the activity remotely. It also allows the teacher to design attractive activities since the peer feedback can be provided in many interesting online discussion forum platforms such as Google Classroom. The act of providing peer feedback encourages students to engage in problem detection and encourages them to engage in problem diagnosis and then contemplate solutions before proposing the revisions (Huisman, Saab, van Driel, & van den Broek, 2018). Students who provide peer feedback gain experience in problem detection, become more aware of types of writing problems, and may discover different revision strategies as a result (Patchan & Schunn, 2015). Peer feedback practice through online discussion forums in remote teaching contexts also shows several advantages in its utilization. Razi (2016) emphasizes that digital feedback allows a range of innovations that are not available in conventional practice, such as digital technology can remove student identification for anonymous peer review and provide review tools for the students.

Several studies have been conducted in the same field as the present study. Research using Moodle was conducted by Mwalongo (2013) that revealed that asynchronous discussion forums encourage peer feedback. The students' reflection showed that they were optimistic about using peer feedback for assessment purposes because they learned about the assessment process, recognized bias problems, promoted collaboration, made them autonomous learners and facilitated their critical thinking. Miftah (2016) conducted a study that revealed that concerning the writing instruction, it was found that the process steps of implementing peer response activities via Facebook can be implemented through the process writing approach, namely, prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing. It also showed the students' abilities in writing argumentative essays enhanced, which is indicated by the enhancements of the percentage of the students' scores and the percentage of their involvement in the writing activities during the peer response activities via Facebook. Razi (2016) conducted a study, and the results showed that students' relations with their classmates impact the quality of feedback in open peer review, and students preferred lecturer feedback after the peer feedback.

Saeed et al. (2018) conducted a study. The results showed that asynchronous peer feedback fosters learners' engagement in revision-oriented feedback, helps the students to understand the global and local issues in writing, but lack of motivation, embarrassment, and fear to exchange feedback with peers still being challenges for the implementation of peer feedback in writing courses. Another research was conducted by Aydawati et al. (2018). It revealed that peer review activities could improve the students' writing skills, especially in the grammar aspect, which are limited on the kinds of the clause, run-on sentence, subject-verb agreement, the noun form, verb form, pronoun form, and pronoun reference. The students may do it both synchronously and asynchronously, as both activities have increased their writing scores. However, the increase of the score is higher when they do it synchronously where they can share their thought directly. A research was conducted by Wahyudin (2018) which showed improvement in the writing ability of the students from the experimental group. It was also revealed that the use of online peer feedback with Facebook had more positive impacts on the students' writing ability than any teaching method used in the control group. Another research was conducted

by Chuaphalakit et al. (2019), which revealed that the anonymous online peer feedback allowed the students to realize their mistakes from their friends' comments and writing and then use the feedback to improve their work.

Those findings from the previous studies showed that online peer feedback in writing practice had given many advantages and challenges for the students to improve their writing ability in several aspects of writing as they learned from each other. The utilization of several online discussion forums from the previous studies also gave many advantages since the students can provide and receive feedback remotely. However, those previous studies did not investigate the students' perceptions and challenges toward online peer feedback practice, which made it different from this study. This study was designed to investigate the implementation of online peer feedback practice, the students' perceptions toward online peer feedback practice, and the students' challenges toward online peer feedback practice. This study also used a bigger sample to investigate the students' perceptions and provided several solutions for the students' challenges.

METHOD

Research Design

This study conducted a mixed-method design. Creswell (2012) states that a mixed-method research design is a type of research design where the qualitative and quantitative designs are combined. The mixed-method design was suitable for this study since the combination of qualitative and quantitative data gave more detailed information to reach the study's aims. The quantitative data were collected through a survey using a questionnaire consisting of 18 items. The qualitative data were collected through observation and interviews. The observation used observation checklist consisted of 7 items, while the interview used interview guide consisted of 18 items.

Population and Sample

The study was conducted at SMA PGRI Blahbatuh in the academic year of 2020/2021. The population of the study was the SMA PGRI Blahbatuh students. The sampling technique used in the study was purposive sampling which means the study sample was chosen from a particular group as the representative of the research population (Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Razavieh, 2010). There were two criteria for the sample: the sample must be high

school students from SMA PGRI Blahbatuh. They must be the students who have experienced the peer feedback practice through online discussion platforms such as Google Classroom in their writing practice. Regarding those criteria, the X Bahasa dan Budaya classes with a total of 132 students were chosen as the study sample. The interview used focus group discussion with eight students from the sample as the volunteers.

Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher observed the Google Classroom online classes to investigate the peer feedback practice implementation using an observation checklist as the instrument. The observation checklist was designed based on the seven principles of good feedback practice by Nicol and MacFarlane-Dick (2006, p. 205). The students' perceptions were investigated through a survey using a questionnaire as the instrument, while the students' challenges were investigated through interviews using an interview guide. Both questionnaire and interview guide items which consisted of 18 valid items were adapted from Strijbos et al. (2010) based on four scales, namely; Perceived Adequacy of Feedback (PAF), Willingness to Improve (WI), Positive Affect (PA), and Negative Affect (NA). The interview guide consisted of PAF,

WI, and NA scales since it focused on investigating the students' challenges.

All the instruments were checked in terms of content validity, while in the prior data collection, the questionnaire was also checked in terms of empirical validity and reliability. The content validity check showed that all the instruments were valid. Furthermore, using Pearson Product Moment, the empirical validity showed that all the questionnaire items were valid. The reliability checks also showed that the questionnaire items were reliable. The content validity, empirical validity, and reliability check results can be seen in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

Table 1. Content Validity Results

No	Instrument	Content Validity
1.	Observation Checklist	1
2.	Questionnaire	1
3.	Interview Guide	1

Table 2. Empirical Validity Results

Scales	Number of Items	r	rcv	Decision
PAF	1	0.693	0.304	Valid
	2	0.868	0.304	Valid
	3	0.784	0.304	Valid
	4	0.908	0.304	Valid
	5	0.866	0.304	Valid
	6	0.893	0.304	Valid
	7	0.796	0.304	Valid
	8	0.776	0.304	Valid
	9	0.783	0.304	Valid
	10	0.809	0.304	Valid
WI	11	0.930	0.304	Valid

Scales	Number of Items	r	rcv	Decision
PA	12	0.907	0.304	Valid
	13	0.869	0.304	Valid
	14	0.869	0.304	Valid
	15	0.815	0.304	Valid
NA	16	0.967	0.304	Valid
	17	0.971	0.304	Valid
	18	0.956	0.304	Valid

Table 3. Reliability Check Results

Scales	Cronbach's Alpha
PAF	0.937
WI	0.859
PA	0.807
NA	0.959

The obtained data from the questionnaire results were analyzed using descriptive statistics analysis with four classifications, namely very negative, negative, positive, and very positive. The results of the observation and interview were used to compare the questionnaire results. Table 4 shows the criteria to determine the perceptions of the students.

Table 4. The Classification of Perception

No	Criteria Formula	Classification
1.	$X \geq Mi + 1.5 SDi$	Very Positive
2.	$Mi + 1.5 SDi > X \geq Mi$	Positive
3.	$Mi > X \geq Mi - 1.5 SDi$	Negative
4.	$X < Mi - 1.5 SDi$	Very Negative

Where:

Mi = Mean ideal

SDi = Standard Deviation ideal

X = Total Score

The calculations are:

$$Mi = \frac{1}{2} (\text{Max score} + \text{Min score})$$

$$SDi = \frac{1}{6} (\text{Max score} - \text{Min score})$$

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings on the Implementation of Online Peer Feedback Practice at SMA PGRI Blahbatuh

The observation data were collected through Google Classroom online classes made by the teacher which the students practiced the online peer feedback. The key questions in the observation checklist were used as the guidelines to collect the data. The data of the observation are presented in the form of descriptions based on the seven key questions. The first online peer feedback practice was done when the students learned about the descriptive text. After making a descriptive text, the students were told to give feedback to their peers' works. The teacher provided the instructions and an example of the feedback for the students. The students needed to give their peers' works feedback by analyzing the global and local writing issues, namely content, organization, vocabulary, and language use. The teacher divided each issue's criteria score into four classifications: excellent, good, poor, and very poor. After giving scores to their peers' work, the students needed to give feedback in the form of a description by focusing on the strengths, weaknesses, corrections, and suggestions for their peers' works. The second online peer feedback practice

was done when the students learned about biographical recount text. The rules and instructions of the peer feedback practice were still the same as the previous one, but the teacher added one more issue that the students' needed to analyze in their peers' works, namely neatness. Both sections of the online peer feedback practice showed similar results, especially in the quality of the feedback given and received by the students since the instructions and rules were still similar.

The findings revealed several strengths and weaknesses in the online peer feedback practice. It was found that the instructions and rules of the practice helped the students identify the writing issues in their peers' works, namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and neatness. It guided the students to recognize the good and bad works. The practice also facilitated the development of self-assessment followed by reflection. The students were motivated to learn their strengths and weaknesses when they corrected their works after receiving the feedback even though there were no following activities after the practice. It allowed the students to evaluate themselves through the feedback. The teacher also had the opportunity to monitor all the activities of the peer feedback practice since it was done in the online learning platform. Thus, the

practice process gave the teacher information regarding the teaching strategy that can be improved in the future.

There are also some weaknesses in the implementation of online peer feedback practice. It was found that the feedback did not deliver high-quality information regarding the students' works since the feedback provided was based on the criteria score determined by the teacher and then followed by the general comments of the works. The teacher's example was also inadequate since only one example was provided, and the teacher provided an example of the feedback. Several of the students only modified and changed a few words from the example and used it to provide feedback for their peers' works, especially in the overall comment parts. The online peer feedback practice also did not allow the students to do peer dialogue with their peers since there was no discussion session in the Google Classroom online classes. The students submitted their feedback through the submission provided by the teacher, and then the feedbacks were forwarded by the teacher to the students. The unavailable peer dialogue section made the peer feedback practice give fewer chances for the students to improve their communication and collaboration skills which belong to 4C elements in 21st-century skills. The peer feedback

practice also did not allow the students to close the gap between current and desired performance. There were no following activities after the students checked and revised their works individually.

Findings on EFL Students' Perceptions on Online Peer Feedback Practice

The questionnaire results regarding the students' perceptions were calculated into the classification criteria score in general and also based on the four scales, namely, Perceived Adequacy of Feedback (PAF), Willingness to Improve (WI), Positive Affect (PA), and Negative Affect (NA). Firstly, the calculation of the students' perceptions, in general, is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. The Frequency of Online Peer Feedback Practice in General

Classification	Frequency	Relative Frequency
Very Positive	77	58.3 %
Positive	47	35.6 %
Negative	7	5.3 %
Very Negative	1	0.8 %

Regarding the frequency data of online peer feedback practice in general, the frequency percentage of "very positive" perception was 58.3%. It means 77 students responded positively to the statements related to online peer feedback practice. The percentage of

"positive" perception was 35.6% which means 47 students responded positively to the online peer feedback practice. Only 7 students who gave negative responses with the percentage of 5.3% for the "negative" perception, while there was only 1 student who gave a response very negative with the percentage 0.8% for the "very negative" perception toward the online peer feedback practice. Thus, the students' perceptions toward the online peer feedback practice in general was positive based on the calculation of the perceptions.

The average of students' perceptions toward online peer feedback practice based on the four scales; Perceived Adequacy of Feedback (PAF), Willingness to Improve (WI), Positive Affect (PA), and Negative Affect (NA) were calculated and checked using the criteria score and the four classifications afterward. The frequency and relative frequency data for each scale can be seen in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6. The Frequency of PAF, WI, PA, and NA Scales

Classification	Frequency			
	PAF	WI	PA	NA
Very Positive	77	96	97	90
Positive	47	28	29	28
Negative	6	6	5	9
Very Negative	2	2	1	5

Table 7. The Relative Frequency of PAF, WI, PA, and NA Scales

Classification	Relative Frequency (%)			
	PAF	WI	PA	NA
Very Positive	58.3	72.7	73.5	68.2
Positive	35.6	21.2	22.0	21.2
Negative	4.5	4.5	3.8	6.8
Very Negative	1.5	1.5	0.8	3.8

The Frequency data of students' perceptions on the online peer feedback practice based on the four scales show that the PAF scale, which covered the adequacy of feedback that the students received and given, had 58.3% of "very positive" perception, 35.6% "positive" perception, 4.5% "negative" perception, and 1.5% of "very negative" perception. The WI scale, which covered the students' willingness to improve their writing skills, had 72.7% of "very positive" perception, 21.2% "positive" perception, 4.5% "negative" perception, and 1.5% "very negative" perception. The PA scale, which covered the positive affect that the students felt toward the online peer feedback practice, had 73.5% of "very positive" perception, 22.0% of "positive" perception, 3.8% of "negative" perception, and 0.8% of "very negative" perception. The NA scale, which covered the negative affect that the students felt toward the online peer feedback practice, had 68.2% of "very positive" perception, 21.2% of

"positive" perception, 6.8% of "negative" perception, and 3.8% of "very negative" perception. Thus, the students' perceptions toward the online peer feedback practice based on the four scales were positive based on the calculation of the perceptions.

Findings on EFL Students' Challenges on Online Peer Feedback Practice

Even though the students had positive perceptions of the online peer feedback practice, they still faced several challenges in their practice. Because the interview data collection took place at the time of the COVID-19 pandemic, the researcher asked for permission to invite the students to the school for the interview. The interview has followed the health protocol rules to prevent transmission of COVID-19. There were two significant results that emerged from the interview results.

The first major challenge of the students is regarding their satisfaction from the adequacy of the feedback received and given. They admitted that the feedback was not enough for them. Instead of only giving scores such as "good" or "excellent" in the issues of their peers' writing such as "organization" and "vocabulary", they thought that they could provide more detailed information regarding the issues in writing, such as for the

grammar or the quality of the paragraph. Student E stated:

"All the comments are similar sometimes. So, it becomes not enough because the others still can be given comments such as the structure or how is the paragraph."

The students also admitted that they disagreed with the feedback provided by their peers sometimes. They rechecked their works after receiving the feedback. They disagreed when they thought their works were correct, but their peers commented wrong. They also worried that the feedback given seemed to be careless. Those feelings made the students think that the teacher's feedback is essential after the peer feedback. Student G commented:

"After I corrected my work and I felt that I was right, I felt disagree with the comments given by my peer."

The second challenge is regarding the negative effects that the students felt during the practice. The students admitted that they felt unconfident with their ability after receiving negative feedback from their peers. Student T commented:

"Sometimes I felt unconfident, but after that, I corrected myself. But I believe more with my own ability."

Besides, the students worried that they would get bad scores because of the negative feedback even though they knew that the teacher would correct their works after the peer feedback practice. Student C stated:

"I ever felt that my score would be bad because of my peer's comment that said my work was not good. But it was only temporary because the teacher will correct it again later on."

The students also stated that they sometimes felt offended when the feedback they received was not what they expected. The students' feelings also depended on the relationship between the students, and the students would feel less offended if their close friends gave negative feedback. This effect also came up with the students' statement that emphasized anonymously practicing online peer feedback. Student D commented:

"There is a little bit of offended feeling, but it also depends on who gave the comments."

Discussion

Based on the questionnaire results, the students' perceptions showed the students had positive perceptions toward the online peer feedback practice in general. It means that a majority of students thought that the implementation of online peer feedback

practice is essential to improve their writing skills. It is supported by the observation result, which revealed that the online peer feedback practice helped the students realize their strengths and weaknesses in their writing mainly based on the global and local issues in writing (content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and neatness). Saeed et al. (2018) reported that online peer feedback facilitated the students' understanding of global and local issues in writing, while Aydawati et al. (2018) also reported that the students understand more about the local issues in writing, especially grammar, after implementing the online peer feedback. The findings proved that the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) theory by Vygotsky (1978) is the basis of online peer feedback practice implementation since the students realized their strengths and weaknesses through the feedback provided by their peers. Besides, the observation results also proved that the online peer feedback practice gave the teachers information regarding the teaching strategy that can be improved since they could monitor all the peer feedback practice through the online learning platform.

The frequency distribution from the PAF scale shows that the majority of the students had positive perceptions toward the adequacy of feedback. It

shows that a relatively fair number of students felt that the implementation of online peer feedback practice through *Google Classroom* was adequate to improve their writing skills. Even though the students thought that the online peer feedback practice was adequate, the interview result, which focused on the students' challenges, revealed several contradictory results. Students thought that they could give more detailed information to their peers' works instead of only giving "good" or "excellent" in the writing issues such as the "organization" or "vocabulary". For example, the teacher could add the other writing issues that could be assessed, such as the grammar or the quality of the paragraph. The interview result was also consistent with the observation result, indicating that the online peer feedback practice did not deliver high-quality information about their learning. This finding aligns with what Vu and Alba (2007) found in their study. The students also appreciated more critical comments and practical suggestions for improvement in their peer feedback practice. The observation results also revealed no opportunity for the students to do peer dialogue since there was no discussion session. There were also no following activities after the students received the feedback. The discussion session would also allow the

students to deliver high-quality and detailed information. At the same time, the following activities would allow the students to check whether their works are correct after the revisions. Mwalongo (2013) supported it, who reported that through discussion with peers, the students learned to develop new knowledge, treat mistakes as opportunities for learning, and understand difficult concepts. The peer dialogue sections would also allow the students to improve their communication and collaboration skills since they are two elements of 4C in 21st-century skills. Thus, the teacher needs to allow the students to do peer dialogue and plan the following activities.

Interview results also revealed that students admitted they sometimes disagreed with their peers' feedback, and they thought that the feedback was a lack of responsibility. Chuaphalakit et al. (2019) also reported that some feedback givers lacked responsibility. Furthermore, Vu and Alba (2007) found that the students were worried about the quality of the feedback. Mwalongo (2013) study also revealed that the students reported they needed to be prepared before the peer feedback practice to reduce the negative attitudes toward the practice and increase its effectiveness since the students will be more responsible. The teacher needs to

determine the rules regarding the expected attitudes and behaviors of the students before implementing the online peer feedback practice. It led to the students' thought that teacher's feedback is important after the peer feedback. It is also supported by Razi's (2016) finding that the students commented that teacher feedback should be provided after the peer feedback because the students thought it would make them feel much safer. The teacher also only provided an example of the feedback for the students. It made the students only have a few references and many of the students also only modified and changed a few words from the example to provide feedback for their peers. The teacher should provide various kinds of examples for the students' references and provide the consequences for the irresponsible actions done by the students.

The feedback examples provided by the teacher can consider the feedback burger as the guide to show the students how to provide good constructive feedback. The feedback burger is started by giving positive feedback at the beginning, such as mentioning what the students did well in their writing. The second part is giving constructive feedback by pointing out what they need to improve in their writing. The feedback provider

should provide suggestions for the issues that need improvement, but they need to avoid giving negative feedback. The last part is by giving positive feedback again emphasizing the good points in their writing and mentioning the positive results the feedback receivers gain after revising their writing by considering the suggestions.

The average percentage of each item and the calculation of the perceptions into the criteria score in the WI scale also indicated a relatively fair number of students who were motivated to improve their writing skills after the online peer feedback practice. It is in line with Mwalongo's (2013) finding that revealed the students were motivated by the use of peer feedback and suggested it should be implemented in the other courses as well. The interview and observation results were consistent with the questionnaire analysis based on the students' perceptions. It was found that the online peer feedback practice provided the opportunity for the students to do self-assessment then followed by reflection and the interview result also emphasized that the students corrected and checked their works after receiving the feedback. It also encouraged positive motivational beliefs and self-esteem for the students because they felt motivated to revise after receiving

feedback. All of those findings contradict what Saeed et al. (2018) found in their study, which indicated that the students were lack of motivation in exchanging feedback with their peers in writing courses. To overcome the problem, Janssen et al. (2007) suggested that the students also need to feel the sense of respecting each other, social support, friendship, and feeling of attachment to one another. It can be done by providing the students with the opportunity to do peer dialogue since it is considered one of the principles of good feedback practice, according to Nicol and MacFarlane-Dick (2006, p. 205).

The average percentage of each item and the calculation of the perceptions into the criteria score based on the PA and NA scales indicated that most of the students felt that the online peer feedback practice gave them more positive effects than negative effects. Even though the perceptions were perceived positively, the interview results indicated that the online peer feedback practice still negatively affected the students. After receiving negative feedback, the students admitted that they were unconfident with their abilities. This feeling was only temporary since they knew that the teacher would also correct their works after the peer feedback. The students also reported that they

sometimes felt offended by the feedback they did not expect. This problem was also affected by the relationship between the feedback provider and receiver, which came up with the student's statement that they prefer the anonymous online peer feedback practice. They thought that they would feel free to give feedback in detail if their identity was protected. Chuaphalakit et al. (2019) also found that the anonymous online peer feedback practice allowed the students to improve the quality of the feedback. Besides, Razi (2016) also emphasized that anonymous peer feedback enables the students to give more honest comments on their peers' works.

Conclusively, this study revealed several prominent findings and solutions for the challenges. According to Miftah (2016), peer feedback can be a helpful source of information where the students read and comment on each other's works. Thus, creating a discussion section during the online peer feedback practice implementation must be considered since the students are expected to give more details and specific information. It also facilitates them to deliver a higher quality of information. Teacher feedback should also be given after the peer feedback practice since it will make the students feel safer because they know the teacher will assess their works afterward. In

terms of motivation, the online peer feedback practice motivated the students to revise their works after self-assessment followed by reflection. Besides, Hattie and Timperley (2007) state that the students can develop their skills in detecting errors and lead to their self-feedback to reach the goal. Even though the students were motivated, they still mentioned that they disagreed and sometimes felt offended when they got feedback that they did not expect. Thus, the teacher should prepare the instructions and the students properly by considering the seven principles of good feedback practice by Nicol and MacFarlane-Dick (2006, p. 205) to prevent the students from giving the feedback carelessly. The teacher should also provide various kinds of feedback examples for the students by considering the feedback burger consists of three parts: positive feedback, constructive feedback, and ended by positive feedback again.

Furthermore, the method of anonymous online peer feedback practice needs to be considered since the students will have the opportunity to give more honest details and specifics without being afraid it will affect their relationship. Through this study, the teacher could create more effective and efficient online peer feedback practice. The students also could learn to improve their skills in

communicating and collaborating with their peers to achieve the learning goals.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION

Overall, it was proved that the online peer feedback practice helped the students to realize their strengths and weaknesses in their writing mainly based on the global and local issues in writing (content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and neatness). Even though the students' perceptions were perceived positive neither in general and based on the four scales; Perceived Adequacy of Feedback (PAF), Willingness to Improve (WI), Positive Affect (PA), and Negative Affect (NA), the observation results revealed several strengths and also weaknesses that still can be improved in the implementation. The interview results also showed some contradictory results regarding the students' challenges.

There are several solutions for students' challenges and weaknesses in the implementation. Providing the discussion session in Google Classroom will allow the students to do peer dialogue and deliver high-quality information. The peer dialogue section will also give bigger chances for the students to improve their communication and collaboration skills

since those two skills belong to the 4C elements of 21st-century skills. It is also essential for the teacher to prepare the whole activities, including the following activities, to reduce negative attitudes from the students. Providing feedback examples for the students for their references also needs to be considered. The examples can consider that the feedback burger consists of positive feedback, constructive feedback, and positive feedback. The students' unconfident and offended feelings can be solved by implementing anonymous online peer feedback practice. Through this study, students can learn to improve their skills in communicating and collaborating with their peers and provide the teacher information to create more effective and efficient online peer feedback practice.

There are several suggestions for the researcher who will research in the same field. The further researcher can conduct another study to investigate the students' perceptions and their challenges on online peer feedback practice in EFL writing in the synchronous online learning environment. The further researcher can conduct another study with a bigger sample such as the whole students in a school.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education* (8th ed). Cengage Learning.
- Aydawati, E. N., Rukmini, D., Bharati, D. A. L., & Fitriati, S. W. (2018). The Effect of Online Peer Review Activities on Students' Academic Writing Performance. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 188, 249–252. <https://doi.org/10.2991/eltlt-18.2019.50>
- Boholano, H. B. (2017). Smart Social Networking: 21st Century Teaching and Learning Skills. *Research in Pedagogy*, 7(1), 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.17810/2015.45>
- Cahyono, B. Y., & Amrina, R. (2016). Peer Feedback, Self-correction, and Writing Proficiency of Indonesian EFL Students. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(1), 178–193. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol7no1.12>
- Chuaphalakit, K., Inpin, B., & Coffin, P. (2019). A Study of the Quality of Feedback Via the Google Classroom-mediated-Anonymous Online Peer Feedback Activity in a Thai EFL Writing Classroom. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 15(5), 103–118. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2019.212.8>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed). Pearson.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Huisman, B., Saab, N., van Driel, J., & van den Broek, P. (2018). Peer feedback on academic writing: undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1424318>
- Janssen, J., Erkens, G., Kanselaar, G., & Jaspers, J. (2007). Visualization of participation: Does it contribute to successful computer-supported collaborative learning? *Computers & Education*, 49, 1037–1065. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2006.01.004>
- Kaya, F. B., & Yilmaz, M. Y. (2019). An Analysis of the In-Class Oral Feedback Provided by the Teachers of Turkish as a Foreign Language. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 14(1), 144–155. <https://doi.org/10.29329/epasr.2019.186.8>

- Kusumaningrum, S. R., Cahyono, B. Y., & Prayogo, J. A. (2019). The Effect of Different Types of Peer Feedback Provision on EFL Students' Writing Performance. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 213-224. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12114a>
- Miftah, M. Z. (2016). Increasing EFL Students' Writing Abilities Using Peer Response Activities Via Facebook. *Indonesian EFL Journal: Journal of ELT, Linguistics, and Literature*, 2(2), 1-27. [https://doi.org/Retrieved from http://ejournal.kopertais4.or.id/index.php/efi](https://doi.org/Retrieved%20from%20http://ejournal.kopertais4.or.id/index.php/efi)
- Mwalongo, A. I. (2013). Peer Feedback: Its Quality and Students' Perceptions as a Peer Learning Tool in Asynchronous Discussion Forums. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 2(2), 69-77. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v2i2.1821>
- Narciss, S. (2008). Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology. In *Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning*. LEA. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_1100
- Nicol, D., & MacFarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- Patchan, M. M., & Schunn, C. D. (2015). Understanding the benefits of providing peer feedback: how students respond to peers' texts of varying quality. *Instructional Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-015-9353-x>
- Razi, S. (2016). Open and anonymous peer review in a digital online environment compared in academic writing context. *Innovative Language Teaching and Learning at University: Enhancing Participation and Collaboration*, 49-56. <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2016.000404>
- Saeed, M. A., Ghazali, K., Sahuri, S. S., & Abdulrab, M. (2018). Engaging EFL Learners in Online Peer Feedback on Writing: What Does It Tell Us? *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 17, 39-61. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.28945/3980>
- Strijbos, J. W., Narciss, S., & Dünnebier, K. (2010). Peer feedback content and sender's competence level in academic writing revision tasks: Are they critical for feedback perceptions and efficiency? *Learning and Instruction*, 20, 291-303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.008>

- van Popta, E., Kral, M., Camp, G., Martens, R. L., & Simons, P. R. J. (2016). Exploring the Value of Peer Feedback in Online Learning for the Provider. *Educational Research Review*, 20, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2016.10.003>
- Vu, T. T., & Alba, G. D. (2007). Students' experience of peer assessment in a professional course. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32(5), 541-556. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930601116896>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (eds.)). Harvard University Press.
- Wahyudin, A. Y. (2018). The Impact of Online Peer Feedback on EFL Students' Writing at Tertiary Level. *BAHTERA: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 17(1), 1-10. [https://doi.org/Retrieved from http://journal.unj.ac.id/unj/index.php/bahtera/](https://doi.org/Retrieved%20from%20http://journal.unj.ac.id/unj/index.php/bahtera/)
- Wihastyanang, W. D., Kusumaningrum, S. R., Latief, A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2020). Impacts of Providing Online Teacher and Peer Feedback on Students' Writing Performance. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 21(2), 178-189. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.728157>.