ORAL PEER FEEDBACK IN ONLINE SPEAKING CLASS: IMPLEMENTATION, STUDENTS' ATTITUDES, PREFERENCES, AND USEFULNESS

Shelia Anjarani[1*], Yupita Alvianingrum[2]
[12] Muhammadiyah University of Purwokerto
(shelia.anjarani@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

This study examines the views of students studying English in one of the English Language Education Study Programmes on the oral peer feedback they gave and received in an online English-speaking class. The online speaking class was observed to know the implementation of oral peer feedback. Thirty-eight students who were enrolled in the course completed a questionnaire, and afterward, four of these students participated in a semi-structured interview. The results obtained from the questionnaire indicated that students derived satisfaction from both giving and receiving oral feedback. Students also preferred to give and receive positive feedback. The students found that providing and receiving oral feedback benefited their learning process. In contrast, it was found that students indicated a stronger preference for providing affective feedback than cognitive and constructive feedback. The interview responses shed light on the reasons underlying these perceptions. The study also offers pedagogical insights related to implementing oral peer feedback in online speaking classes.

Key Words: oral peer feedback; students' attitude and practice; virtual speaking class

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini mengkaji pandangan mahasiswa yang belajar Bahasa Inggris di salah satu Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris terhadap umpan balik lisan yang mereka berikan dan terima pada kelas berbicara secara daring. Kelas berbicara daring diobservasi untuk mengetahui implementasi umpan balik lisan. Tiga puluh delapan mahasiswa yang terdaftar dalam mata kuliah berbicara melengkapi kuesioner, dan setelah itu, empat mahasiswa berpartisipasi dalam wawancara semi-terstruktur. Hasil yang diperoleh dari kuesioner menunjukkan bahwa mahasiswa memperoleh kepuasan baik dari memberi dan menerima umpan balik lisan. Mahasiswa juga lebih suka memberi dan menerima umpan balik yang positif. Para mahasiswa juga menyampaikan bahwa memberikan dan menerima umpan balik lisan bermanfaat bagi proses belajar mereka. Sementara itu, mahasiswa menunjukkan preferensi yang lebih kuat untuk memberikan umpan balik afektif dibandingkan umpan balik kognitif dan konstruktif. Respons dari sesi wawancara menjelaskan alasan yang mendasari persepsi ini. Studi ini juga memberikan wawasan pedagogi terkait dengan penerapan umpan balik lisan di kelas berbicara daring.

Kata Kunci: umpan balik lisan; sikap dan praktik siswa; kelas berbicara daring

How to Cite: Anjarani, S., & Alvianingrum, Y. (2024). Oral Peer Feedback in Online Speaking Class: Implementation, Students' Attitudes, Preferences, and Usefulness. IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 11(1), 105-114. doi: 10.15408/ijee.v11i1.34995

INTRODUCTION

As class sizes continue to increase annually in higher education, it becomes increasingly difficult for teachers to provide individual feedback (Noroozi & Hatami, 2019). This means that in classes with many students, feedback from teachers is impractical due to their heavy workload (Er et al., 2021). Thus, peer feedback can be used instead of teacher feedback. Peer feedback as a process-oriented pedagogical activity can create a challenging and collaborative learning environment for students to learn from one another. Peer feedback as a process-oriented pedagogical activity can create a challenging and collaborative learning environment for students to learn from one another (Nicol et al., 2014). Using peer feedback in higher education can improve students' learning (Reinholz, 2018), critical thinking (Novakovich, 2016), engagement (Fan & Xu, 2020), motivation (Hsia et al., 2016); and satisfaction (Donia et al., 2022).

Topping (1998) stated that peer feedback is an essential element of peer assessment, consisting of the information one student provides to another. During the peer feedback process, students are required to critically evaluate their peers' work and identify any issues present. Additionally, they are expected to provide constructive suggestions for development while offering emotional support to their peers (Latifi et al., 2021). This sort of assessment is a method that allows students to engage in a reflective critique of the output of other students and gives them feedback based on set parameters; the evaluation may be delivered in a single event or over several occasions (Falchikov, 2004). Peers make decisions based on pre-defined criteria that the teacher may set. Integrating peer feedback opportunities in a course facilitates active learning among students, enabling them to assess their peers' work, receive prompt feedback on their work, and transform the learning experience from an individualistic to a collaborative one (Liu & Carless, 2006). Students develop their knowledge through the peer feedback process by implementing and explaining ways for others to perform better on tests that follow.

Previous research has demonstrated the usefulness of peer feedback (Lee, 2017; Mawlawi, 2010). It has been suggested that peer feedback can involve peer contact and active engagement with language, resulting in significantly enhanced revision outcomes. In contrast, students selectively utilize peer feedback (Yang et al., 2006). How students assess the quality of peer feedback influences their approach to revising and improving their work. Consequently, it is crucial to comprehend how students perceive peer feedback activities. The students' beliefs have consistently held significant importance for teachers in investigating their students' perspectives on factors thought to improve the acquisition of a new language. Meanwhile, teachers rarely implement peer feedback in online teaching (Sumardi et al., 2022). Peer feedback in virtual classrooms has received significantly greater attention in primary and secondary school; its application in higher education may be irregular and slightly weak because this instructional method has not been as heavily incorporated into college curricula (James, 2003; Yorke, 2003).

Previous studies on peer feedback emphasized peer feedback in writing courses (Nelson & Carson, 1998). Consequently, additional research is required to investigate the context of peer feedback and evaluate student perspectives of peer feedback, particularly in speaking class. Additionally, several issues must be investigated. First, students' attitudes toward peer feedback. In the Chinese context, students enjoyed reading their peers' comments (Tsui & Ng, 2000). Meanwhile, this result reveals students' perceptions of written feedback in writing class. Therefore, there is a need for extensive research on the attitudes of EFL students towards peer feedback in virtual speaking classes. Second, it was reported that students from a so-called collective culture were reluctant to criticize

the work of their peers ((Van Rompay-Bartels & Geessink, 2023). This raises the question of whether students from the same cultural background are more likely to critique their classmates' work. There is still a need for an in-depth and exhaustive comprehension of students' preferences for positive and negative comments and the reasons behind their selections. Third, there is a compelling need to examine the changing roles of peers in peer feedback activities, both as providers and as receivers of feedback. This involves evaluating their perceptions of these roles and their perspectives on the utility of peer feedback in an online speaking course.

Thus, this study responds to the need to explore how students perceive a novel form of interactive peer feedback that entails giving and receiving feedback. The primary objectives of this study were to analyze the practice of peer feedback, students' attitudes toward implementing peer feedback, students' preferences regarding positive and negative peer feedback, and students' views of the usefulness of peer feedback in online speaking classes.

METHODS
Research Design
This research was carried out within a specific context. Thus, it employed a case study methodology that allowed for in-depth comprehension (Yin, 2009) to explore the implementation and students' views of peer feedback in the online speaking course.
Research site and participants
This study was conducted in one English Language Education Study Program in Central Java, Indonesia. During this research, the speaking course was offered in an online setting. This speaking course is offered as a compulsory course program. The course was taught through the university's learning management system and the Zoom meeting application. All teaching and learning were conducted online (in both asynchronous and synchronous modes). The course under this research was called the "speaking class" throughout this study to maintain anonymity. Peer feedback in this speaking course was conducted synchronously through the Zoom meeting breakout room.

There were 38 research participants chosen based on purposive sampling. They were chosen because they experienced peer feedback in an online speaking course. Then, four students were selected to be interviewed. The interview participants were identified as Student 1 to Student 4 to ensure participant anonymity and for this study's objectives.
Data Collection and Analysis
Data collection involved combining online observations, questionnaires, and interviews. The observation was conducted to know the implementation of oral peer feedback in the online speaking class. In addition, the observation aims to know the setting of the classroom atmosphere, the actual situation in the online class, and how the students implemented peer feedback in the online speaking course as the receiver and provider of feedback. Participants were given a questionnaire containing 24 questions at the end of the semester. The questionnaire was adapted from Tian and Li (2018). The questions on the survey refer to students' perceptions of oral feedback in an online speaking course, their preferences for positive and negative feedback, and their perceptions of peer feedback's usefulness. A five-point Likert scale ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly concur). Subsequently, semi-structured interviews were undertaken to understand students' perspectives on oral peer feedback and the underlying factors influencing their perceptions.

Descriptive statistics were employed to analyze the questionnaire data, while the interview data were transcribed verbatim. After collecting data through various methods

such as observation, questionnaires, and interviews, the obtained data was classified into distinct categories. These categories encompassed the implementation of oral peer feedback practices, students' attitudes towards oral peer feedback, students' preferences regarding positive and negative feedback, and the evaluation of the usefulness of oral peer feedback. The findings of the survey were displayed in a tabulation. In the findings section, the evidence derived from various data sources was triangulated to determine convergence (similarities) and divergence (differences) among the analysed data (Creswell, 2009).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Oral Peer Feedback Implementation in Virtual Speaking Class
The speaking class was conducted online and integrated several learning platforms, such as the Learning Management System called OnClass, designed by the university using a Moodle-based program and Zoom application. Those learning platforms were used for different purposes. For example, OnClass uploaded and shared learning materials, discussion forums, and assignment platforms before the class. While Zoom was used to conduct synchronous learning in the speaking course. The research was conducted for a month in a speaking course in one of Indonesia's English Language Education Study Programs. Before the class started, students were asked to create a short presentation about their start-up company related to English teaching and learning, which must cover the start-up company's name, the start-up's logo and its meaning, and the type of the start-up business model. The short presentation was recorded and uploaded on YouTube. Students shared the YouTube link on OnClass, making it easy for their classmates to access. Students were assigned to find a partner and watched their partner's video presentation before the class started. In the Zoom meeting, the lecturer explained and provided the feedback guideline to the students that must cover three aspects: Tell some things they like about their friends' speaking (I like how you...; the best part of your work is...; etc.), ask thoughtful questions (why is...; what you meant by...; etc.), give positive suggestions: you might change (I think you should add...; etc.). After the lecturer explained the guidelines for providing oral feedback, students were divided into several groups in the breakout rooms. In each breakout room, there were four students. Students were asked to watch the video presentation of their friends in the same breakout room. They shared their YouTube link on the Telegram group, making it accessible to everyone. At first, students were reluctant to give feedback to their peers, but when one student started to give feedback, the other students also began to be enthusiastic about it. The atmosphere in the breakout room changed to be more dynamic when students participated in this activity. During the oral peer feedback activity, students only addressed body language, expressiveness, pronunciation, filler, delivery method, and explanation of the main topic. Students also followed the lecturer's feedback guidelines regarding three aspects of providing feedback to their peers. Meanwhile, they rarely remark on grammar and vocabulary because they know their proficiency.

Students Attitudes of Peer Feedback in Online Speaking Class
When peer feedback is implemented in an online speaking class, students' attitudes as feedback providers indicate that they enjoy providing feedback on their peers' speaking performance (mean = 3.53). Students also assume they have given objective feedback (mean = 4.34) through a careful process. The four students' comments may explicitly

explain it; for example, Student 2 commented, *"The class atmosphere, which was initially silent because students were reluctant to start being the first, then turned more energetic because students took an active role in giving comments to their friends when their friends started to become the first to provide feedback."* Student 4 added, *"the academic ambiance is dense. Everyone actively participated in online discussion"*.

Table 1. The mean scores of students' attitudes towards peer feedback in online speaking class.

Role Type	Statement	N	Mean	SD
Feedback Provider	I enjoy providing oral peer feedback on the performance of my peers.	38	3.53	0.725
	I carefully gave verbal comments on my peers' performance.	38	4.34	0.669
Feedback Receiver	I like listening to the feedback given by my friends regarding my speaking performance.	38	4.34	0.589
	I carefully listened to all of my peers' oral feedback.	38	4.24	0.786
	When I disagree with my peer's oral feedback, I will keep silent.	38	2.79	0.777

As receivers, students prefer actively engaging with their peers' criticism (mean = 4.34) in a manner that reflects a high level of seriousness (mean = 4.24). However, as feedback receivers, students remain silent when disagreeing with their peers' oral feedback. For example, student 1 commented, "In *one of the feedback sessions, I disagreed with my friend's comment. Meanwhile, I kept silent because I didn't want to have a conflict with my friend and was not confident giving feedback on grammar*". In their opinion, remaining silent could prevent a conflict, and further explanation could disrupt social harmony. Another reason is that they are not confident enough to provide detailed feedback, especially on grammatical aspects.

Students' Preferences of Positive and Negative Feedback

Table 2. The mean scores of students' preferences for positive and negative feedback

Role Type	Statement	N	M	SD
Provider	I like to give positive oral feedback.	38	4.21	0.991
	I like to give negative oral feedback.	38	2.16	1.079
	When giving oral feedback about my peers' performance, I will give my full attention to help improve their performance.	38	4.26	0.760
	When giving oral feedback, I will be careful to avoid making negative comments that could embarrass my peers.	38	4.13	0.991
	When my peers did not understand the negative comment I made, I immediately explained it in more	38	4.21	0.875

	detail to make it easier for them to understand.			
	When my peers disagree with the negative comments I make, I will explain them using polite language so as not to be offended.	38	4.37	0.751
	When I give oral feedback about my friend's performance, I will use the words "I feel" or "I think."	38	3.92	0.969
	When I gave oral feedback about my peers' mistakes, I avoided saying insulting words.	38	4.58	0.722
Receiver	I enjoy listening to positive feedback from my peers.	38	4.42	0.758
	I enjoy listening to negative feedback from my peers.	38	3.00	1.230

All participants preferred providing positive feedback (m = 4.21) on their peers' speaking over negative feedback (m = 2.16). Two reasons could be extracted from the qualitative responses to the interview. First, providing positive feedback means appreciating their friend's work and effort. Student 2 mentioned, "*I prefer giving positive feedback because I think giving positive feedback can appreciate the work my friend has done*." Second, providing positive feedback can positively impact their learning and relationship; for example, Student 4 commented, "*Positive feedback can inspire and encourage my friend to be better in their speaking*." Student 1 claimed, "*Negative feedback could harm our close relationship as friends*". As feedback providers, they are highly concerned about giving negative feedback to their friends. They do not want to make their friends feel embarrassed and attacked. In addition, they pay attention to their friends' speaking performance. When providing oral feedback, students also pay attention to helping their peers improve their speaking (m = 4.26). Student 2 added, "*The rubric given by the lecturer helps me to provide feedback and assess my friend's speaking*." Students also provide detailed explanations to make their friends understand the feedback given (m = 4.21). In addition, they used strategies such as using polite language (m = 4.37) and avoiding insulting words (m = 4.58). Student 3 mentioned, "*Using those strategies in providing feedback is crucial to making good relationships with my friends*." As feedback receivers, they enjoy listening to positive comments from their peers (m = 4.42). Student 4 claimed, "*Providing positive comments can create good relationships. In addition, the positive comment can help my friends to learn from the feedback given*".

The Usefulness of Oral Peer Feedback

Table 3. The mean scores of the usefulness of oral peer feedback

Role Type	Statement	N	M	SD
General	Oral peer feedback in online speaking class can improve my speaking skills.	38	4.24	0.751
Feedback provider	I enjoy providing oral feedback on the performance of my peers because it helps me develop my speaking skills.	38	3.92	0.749

Feedback receiver	I know and understand peer feedback that was given to me.	38	4.03	0.788
	I know how to improve my speaking skills because I listen to all the oral feedback I get.	38	4.21	0.622
	I implemented all of the comments I got.	38	4.26	0.860
	The oral feedback I got is helping me get better at speaking.	38	4.18	0.766

Students believe oral peer feedback in online speaking class can improve their speaking ability (M = 4.24). Their comments support it, for example, Student 1 commented, "*I learned what to improve from the feedback I received.*" Similarly, Student 2 mentioned, "*The oral peer feedback I received was based on the indicators provided by the lecturer, so I think the feedback is useful for me.*" Student 4 added the perspective of a feedback provider, "*When I assessed my friend's speaking, I also learned from their speaking. So, providing feedback is also a learning process for me*". In addition, student 3 commented, "*Getting feedback is an opportunity for me to learn from my friends.*"

Discussion

The first finding concerns the practice of oral peer feedback in online speaking class. As known, students could act as a provider of feedback and a receiver of feedback. At the time of observing, the researchers found that at the beginning of doing oral feedback, students were reluctant to start being the first. Still, when one of their friends gave their comments, other students became enthusiastic and excited when giving or receiving feedback. Students who started first encouraged other students to be more confident in providing feedback. It would increase students' motivation to provide feedback and would also increase students' self-confidence. This is also supported by statements from Priyantin et al. (2021) that oral peer feedback can increase students' self-confidence, especially for less active students. The researchers also found that when oral feedback in the classroom was running well, the class atmosphere, which was initially silent because students were reluctant to start being the first, then turned more energetic because students took an active role in giving comments to their friends when their friends started to become the first to provide feedback. This is similar to the statement from Wu & Miller (2020)that if peer feedback is applied properly and correctly, it will improve students' learning autonomy and learning outcomes. Meanwhile, several challenges were encountered during peer feedback in the online speaking class. First, students did not provide any further comment when they disagreed with their friends' feedback. Second, students were not confident in providing feedback on grammatical aspects. Valero Haro et al. (2022) said that students might be unable to offer constructive and detailed feedback because they lack the requisite content knowledge. This indicates that to help students offer thoughtful and constructive feedback, it is important to provide various forms of support within the peer feedback process. This support should encompass educational guidance on delivering high-quality feedback and facilitating the acquisition of domain-specific knowledge related to the topic.

In the preference for positive and negative feedback, students preferred positive comments over negative ones. Students explained that giving positive feedback was easier

for them, and they could also appreciate their friends' work. In addition, they did not want to hurt their friends' feelings by giving negative feedback. They want to maintain a harmonious connection with their friends. The result is the same as the statement from previous research by Tian and Li (2018). They argued that students were also hesitant to start the feedback process. When they did, they tried to avoid criticizing their peers' work and avoiding disagreements with their peers to avoid group disputes and maintain positive connections. If the students who received negative feedback did not comprehend it, the feedback provider would explain it again to their peers. If English cannot be understood, the feedback provider would use mixed language or Indonesian to explain the feedback so that it can be more easily understood by their friends. Besides that, they also used proper language to their friends to avoid embarrassing them. They soften their language in providing feedback. Additionally, this study revealed that students prefer to provide more affective feedback than cognitive and constructive criticism. The results presented here align with the conclusions reported by Cheng and Hou (2015). So, even though students share the same cultural background, they are still unwilling to criticize their friends' works.

Another student's perspective on oral peer feedback that was investigated was the usefulness of oral peer feedback. The researchers found that, in general, according to students, this oral peer feedback activity was beneficial for them in developing their speaking skills. It aligns with research conducted by Sumardi et al. (2022), who mentioned that students could enhance their speaking abilities by receiving oral peer feedback, which could help them learn from their mistakes. This activity is useful because, by receiving feedback, they will know where their mistakes are. They can correct their mistakes to improve their speaking ability. As a feedback provider, this oral peer feedback activity could benefit them because they indirectly learn to speak, especially in English.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION

In the concluding phase of this research, we investigated the various functions peers played. Students actively engaged in two distinct roles while collaborating in triads during feedback sessions, taking on the responsibility of providing and receiving feedback. This multifaceted role arrangement allowed students to gain firsthand experience in these diverse roles and develop a positive perspective of peer feedback activities.

The results of this study lead to the following possible suggestions. Oral peer feedback can also be done in the online classroom. Students can engage in two roles: feedback provider and receiver. Oral peer feedback can help students develop their speaking skills because they take part in learning, such as giving comments to their friends and the students, as a pre-service teacher can learn and practice giving feedback. Meanwhile, the students should be guided to provide good-quality feedback.

This research only focused on oral peer feedback in online speaking class. It is hoped that further research can continue more broadly regarding the types of feedback that can be used or applied in learning, especially in ELT. Furthermore, students' performance on peer feedback can be influenced by interpersonal factors such as feedback attitudes, trust, psychological safety, and social interdependence. It is suggested that the components be considered for future research.

REFERENCES

Cheng, K. H., & Hou, H. T. (2015). Exploring students' behavioral patterns during online peer assessment from the affective, cognitive, and metacognitive perspectives: a progressive sequential analysis. *Technology, Pedagogy, and Education*, *24*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2013.822416

Creswell, J. W. (2009). Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches The Selection of a Research Design. In *Research Design*.

Donia, M. B. L., Mach, M., O'Neill, T. A., & Brutus, S. (2022). Student satisfaction with use of an online peer feedback system. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *47*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1912286

Er, E., Dimitriadis, Y., & Gašević, D. (2021). Collaborative peer feedback and learning analytics: theory-oriented design for supporting class-wide interventions. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *46*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1764490

Falchikov, N. (2004). Involving Students in Assessment. *Psychology Learning & Teaching*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.2304/plat.2003.3.2.102

Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *50*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100775

Hsia, L. H., Huang, I., & Hwang, G. J. (2016). Effects of different online peer-feedback approaches on students' performance skills, motivation and self-efficacy in a dance course. *Computers and Education*, *96*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.02.004

James, R. (2003). Academic standards and the assessment of student learning: Some current issues in Australian higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *9*(3). https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2003.9967103

Latifi, S., Noroozi, O., & Talaee, E. (2021). Peer feedback or peer feedforward? Enhancing students' argumentative peer learning processes and outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *52*(2). https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13054

Lee, I. (2017). Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts. In *Classroom Writing Assessment and Feedback in L2 School Contexts*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9

Liu, N. F., & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: The learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *11*(3). https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582

Mawlawi Diab, N. (2010). Effects of peer- versus self-editing on students' revision of language errors in revised drafts. *System*, *38*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.12.008

Nelson, G. L., & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *7*(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90010-8

Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2014). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: a peer review perspective. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *39*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.795518

Noroozi, O., & Hatami, J. (2019). The effects of online peer feedback and epistemic beliefs on students' argumentation-based learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *56*(5). https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2018.1431143

Novakovich, J. (2016). Fostering critical thinking and reflection through blog-mediated peer feedback. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *32*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12114

Priyantin, T., Lengkanawati, N. S., & Suherdi, D. (2021). Oral Peer Feedback in Online Settings to Foster Self-Regulated Learning. *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 2020)*, *546*. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210427.092

Reinholz, D. L. (2018). Three Approaches to Focusing Peer Feedback. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *12*(2). https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2018.120210

Sumardi, Anisa, K. D., & Aniq, L. N. (2022). Oral Peer Feedback in A Flipped Speaking Job Interview Class: Practice And Learners' Attitudes. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, *7*(2). https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v7i2.214

Tian, L., & Li, L. (2018). Chinese EFL learners' perception of peer oral and written feedback as providers, receivers and observers. *Language Awareness*, *27*(4).

https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2018.1535602

Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, *68*(3). https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543068003249

Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do Secondary L2 Writers Benefit from Peer Comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00022-9

Valero Haro, A., Noroozi, O., Biemans, H., & Mulder, M. (2022). Argumentation Competence: Students' Argumentation Knowledge, Behavior and Attitude and their Relationships with Domain-Specific Knowledge Acquisition. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, *35*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/10720537.2020.1734995

Van Rompay-Bartels, I., & Geessink, J. (2023). Exploring peer feedback on behaviour in the international classroom: a case study on students' experiences and perceptions. *Journal of International Education in Business*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1108/JIEB-07-2020-0063

Wu, J. G., & Miller, L. (2020). Improving English Learners' Speaking through Mobile-assisted Peer Feedback. *RELC Journal*, *51*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688219895335

Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *15*(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.004

Yin, R. K. (2009). Case study research: Design and methods (4th Ed.). *The Canadian Journal of Action Research*, *14*(1).

Yorke, M. (2003). Formative assessment in higher education: Moves towards theory and the enhancement of pedagogic practice. *Higher Education*, *45*(4). https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023967026413