



## **Peer Feedback in Action: Insights from English Education Students on Writing Development**

**Dila Prila Jayuna**

Universitas Siliwangi  
dilaprilajayuna@gmail.com

**Santiana Santiana**

Universitas Siliwangi  
santiana@unsil.ac.id

**Corresponding author: Santiana Santiana<sup>2\*)</sup> santiana@unsil.ac.id**

### **Abstract**

Peer feedback serves as a valuable strategy for improving students' writing proficiency. Over the past forty years, peer assessment, review, and feedback have been widely promoted, with a significant body of research emerging in both first language (L1) and second language (L2) writing. Nevertheless, limited studies have delved into how students perceive and respond to their peers' written work in varying contexts, as well as the underlying reasons for their reactions. This study aims to explore students' perspectives on the implementation of peer feedback during the writing of expansion texts. Specifically, it examines students' emotional responses, their engagement in the feedback process, their reactions to feedback received, and whether the benefits of peer feedback established in earlier research remain relevant to current learners. Employing a qualitative approach and a case study design, the study draws on questionnaire responses and archived materials from two English education students at one of the universities in West Java who participated in peer feedback activities. The findings reveal that self-confidence affects students' engagement with feedback, while an organized peer feedback process helps in correcting mistakes and improving writing quality. For future research, it is recommended to include a larger sample size, explore different educational levels, and examine the long-term impact of peer feedback on students' writing development.

**Keywords:** peer feedback, writing, students' insight, L2 learner

### **A. Introduction**

Peer feedback is an alternative way to develop writing to be better. According to Fithriani (2018), the challenge of L2 writing is doubled for L2 learners because they must transfer concepts from their first language into the target language and organize those thoughts into new and distinct patterns than in their first language (L1). Therefore, one of the most effective strategies to help L2 learners learn to write is to provide feedback (Hyland & Hyland, 2006 cited in Fithriani, 2018). In addition, feedback is viewed as a vital component of the writing process since it can help students improve their writing skills (Kusumaningrum, Cahyono, & Prayogo 2019).

Peer feedback is feedback given by the peer, usually in writing activities. Er, Dimitriadis, & Gašević (2021) argue that peer feedback is a group learning activity in which peers engage in three separate phases of feedback discussion. In addition, peer feedback is a great way to improve pupils' writing skills (Kusumaningrum, Cahyono, & Prayogo, 2019). Moreover, as teachers assist students in becoming more self-reliant writers—self-critical and skilled in self-editing and revising their writing—peer feedback is a good opportunity for students to practice becoming critical readers (Lumabi & Tabajen, 2021). Therefore, it is beneficial for learning English, especially in writing.

Peer feedback helps individuals become critical readers, a skill that is essential for developing into better writers. To enhance one's ability to revise their writing effectively, peer feedback serves as a valuable opportunity to practice critical reading (Lumabi & Tabajen, 2021). This is because it allows them to broaden their perspectives and improve their ability to identify similar mistakes, which, in turn, helps them write with more accurate grammar (Zheng, 2012). Therefore, peer feedback activities are beneficial for both writers and readers.

Writing activities are closely connected to feedback. Providing feedback is a form of support that helps improve the quality of written work. Lee (2017) suggests that feedback in the writing classroom can be seen as a form of mediation. Furthermore, Kuyyogsuy (2019) describes it as a collaborative and cooperative learning practice that can influence students' behavior and enhance their motivation to learn in writing classes. This is also supported by Sri (2019), who states that peer feedback can help students improve their writing. Therefore, peer feedback plays a crucial role in writing lessons.

In addition, students' writing skills can be developed by engaging in peer-feedback activities. A number of experts emphasize the importance of feedback from classmates in the development of students' writing skills (Apriani, et al., 2022). In the words of Kusumaningrum et al. (2019), peer review from fellow students enhances the quality of writing produced by the students. This is consistent with the findings of Hojeij & Baroudi (2018), who claim that peer review improves the overall quality of writing done by students. There are benefits for both parties in every peer review; the students whose work is reviewed are able to receive suggestions, while the reviewers get new insights from analyzing other students' works (Hojeij & Baroudi, 2018). Thus, it can be noted that feedback from classmates greatly impacts the quality of students' writing skills.

For more than four decades, peer assessment, review, and feedback has been recommended (Bruffee 1980; Chang 2016 cited in Gao, Schunn, & Yu, 2019), and there has been a growing collection of research in both first (L1) and second language (L2) writing over the last three decades (Hyland and Hyland 2006; Zheng 2012; Yu and Lee 2016 cited in Gao, Schunn, & Yu, 2019). Peer feedback, in particular, is widely questioned for its usefulness (Gao, Schunn, & Yu, 2019). According to Fithriani (2018), many research on the impact of written feedback on students' L2 writing have found that receiving written feedback helps students improve their writing quality.

However, only a little amount of research has been done on how students react to their peers' writing in different situations and why they react the way they do (Yu & Hu, 2017). It is in line with the argument by Fithriani (2018) who state that few studies have looked into how pupils react to feedback. On the other hand, in recent years, several studies have emerged on students' perceptions and experiences of peer feedback activities (e.g., Misiejuk, Wasson, & Egelanddal, 2021; Lumabi & Tabajen, 2021; Stančić, 2021). Thus, the use of peer correction feedback in writing activities is an interesting thing to continue to explore from time to time.

With this background, this research investigates and explores students' voice regarding peer feedback activities in writing expansion text. The research focuses on the exploration on how students feel when they do peer feedback, how they do peer feedback, how they respond to the results of peer feedback, and the investigation whether the benefits of peer feedback found from previous research are still relevant to students today.

## **B. Research Methodology**

A qualitative research design is utilized in this research and used case study method. According to Yin (2018), a case study is an empirical method for studying a current phenomenon (the "case") in depth and in its context in the real world. In addition, "case study is one of the most frequently used qualitative research methodologies" (Yazan, 2015, p. 134). Therefore, this research design is suitable for use in this study which aims to investigate and explore students' voice regarding peer feedback activities in writing expansion text.

The participants of this study were two fourth-semester students majoring in English Education at one of the universities in West Java who engaged in peer feedback activities in writing expansion texts. They were selected because they had previously

participated in peer feedback tasks as part of their writing assignments and still retained the files used during those activities. Furthermore, they were willing to participate in this research, which fulfilled the study's criteria. Academically, their involvement in peer feedback reflects their exposure to collaborative learning and critical analysis in writing, making them suitable participants for examining the effectiveness of peer feedback in enhancing writing skills.

Research data were collected through open-ended questionnaires and archives of peer feedback activities. There are six open-ended questions that must be answered by participants via google forms. Here are the questions:

1. How did you feel when doing peer feedback?
2. How was your level of confidence when correcting your friend's work?
3. How did you do the peer feedback process?
4. How did you apply the results of your friend's correction to your work?
5. How clear was the result of feedback given by your friend?
6. What are the benefits of doing peer feedback?

Then, the participants were asked to give the archive of the peer feedback activities they had done, in this case, their writing expansion text, peer feedback for their friends, and a confirmation sheet whether they understood the results of the feedback from their friends or not.

In this study, the researcher employed thematic analysis based on the approach proposed by Braun and Clarke (2012). This method is used to systematically identify, organize, and interpret patterns of meaning (themes) within a data set (Braun & Clarke, 2012). Thematic analysis follows six key phases: becoming familiar with the data, generating initial codes, identifying themes, reviewing potential themes, defining and naming themes, and finally, producing the report.

- 1. Becoming familiar with the data:** In this stage, the researcher gained a deeper understanding of the collected data. This began with listening to the participants' interview recordings and thoroughly reading the interview transcripts multiple times to become more acquainted with the data to be analyzed. During the re-reading process, the researcher also took note of sections that might be significant for analysis.
- 2. Generating initial codes:** Researchers generated initial codes by identifying the locations and occurrences of patterns in the data. This process involved condensing the data into labels to form categories for more effective analysis. At this stage, the

details of the data were refined, and the researcher began interpreting the meaning behind the codes.

**Table 1 Generating Initial Code**

Transcriptions	Initial Code
P1: When I performed peer feedback, I feel delighted and excited. I'm grateful that someone can help me check my assignments and provide feedback.	Positive Emotions
P2: I feel a little bit afraid when giving feedback to my peer because I'm worried that I'm giving the wrong feedback.	Negative Emotions
P1: I'm confident enough because I choose a peer that seems to have the same level of understanding with mine	Confidence Level

The participants' interview transcripts revealed 12 (twelve) initial codes, each representing a unique aspect. The initial codes along with their frequencies are outlined below.

**Table 2 List of Initial Codes and Their Frequency**

Initial Codes	Total
Positive emotions	1
Negative emotions	1
Confidence level	1
Medium confidence	1
Structured process	1
Detailed feedback process	1
Verification of feedback	1
Documentation of feedback	2
Clear feedback explanation	2
Supportive feedback	2
Improved assignment quality	2
Error identification and learning	2

3. **Identifying themes:** In this stage, the researcher organized related codes into themes. The themes were constructed based on the research questions of the study.

**Table 3 Process of Searching for Themes**

Self-confidence	Peer Feedback Process	The Benefits of Peer Feedback
Positive emotions	Structured process	Clear feedback explanation
Negative emotions	Detailed feedback process	Supportive feedback

Self-confidence	Peer Feedback Process	The Benefits of Peer Feedback
Confidence level Medium confidence	Verification of Feedback Documentation of Feedback	Improved assignment quality Error identification and learning

4. **Reviewing potential themes:** At this stage, the emerging themes were reviewed in relation to the coded data and the entire dataset through a recursive process. This phase focused on quality control, where themes might be refined or removed if considered unsuitable.

**Table 4 Reviewing Themes**

Themes
Self-confidence
Peer Feedback Process
The Benefits of Peer Feedback

5. **Defining and naming themes:** In this stage, the researcher needed to clearly understand each theme, the data components collected, and the elements that made the themes engaging.

**Table 5 Defining and Naming Themes**

Themes
The Role of Self-Confidence in Peer Feedback
The Structured Process of Peer Feedback
The Impact of Peer Feedback on Learning and Assignment Quality

6. **Producing the report:** The researcher needed to determine which themes genuinely contributed to understanding the data when preparing the report. Additionally, the researcher carried out investigations, revisiting the original samples to ensure the accuracy of the descriptions.

## C. Results and Discussion

### 1. Results

This section presents the findings from the thematic analysis of the participants' responses. The data collected from the questionnaire were analyzed using the thematic analysis approach proposed by Braun and Clarke (2012). Through a rigorous process of familiarization, coding, and theme identification, three main themes emerged; The

Role of Self-Confidence in Peer Feedback, The Structured Process of Peer Feedback, and The Benefits of Peer Feedback in Writing Activities. Moreover, there are two abbreviations indicated by each participant. P1 is an abbreviation for the first participant. P2 is the second participant.

### The Role of Self-Confidence in Peer Feedback

This study found that self-confidence affects students' feelings when doing peer feedback. This study involved two students who became partners in the task of writing expansion text in the Grammar in Written Discourse course. The participants had different feelings when doing peer feedback. This is influenced by their self-confidence.

P2 revealed that her confidence level was at the medium level.

**Table 6 Low Confidence Level**

<b>Excerpt</b>	<b>Open-Ended Questionnaire Responses</b>
P2	<p>“Maybe my confidence level is at medium level when correcting my friend’s work.”</p> <p>“I feel a little bit afraid when giving feedback to my peer because I’m worry that I’m giving the wrong feedback.”</p>

This relates to the feelings P2 feels when giving feedback to P2 peer’s work. P2 felt that she was worried about giving the wrong feedback. This phenomenon in line with research by Fitrihani (2018) which found that students valued teacher feedback more than peer feedback, indicating the hierarchical culture’s influence.

Unlike P2, P1 admitted that she felt quite confident because P1 chose a peer who had the same level of understanding as her. Therefore, P1 feels happy when doing the peer feedback.

**Table 7 Enough Confidence Level**

<b>Excerpt</b>	<b>Open-Ended Questionnaire Responses</b>
P1	<p>“When I performed peer feedback, I feel delighted and excited. I’m grateful that someone can help me check my assignments and provide feedback. That way, I can fix if there’s any errors in my assignment. I’m excited because I’ll be able to apply my understanding that can help me in checking my friend’s assignment.”</p>

P1 expressed a positive emotional response to the peer feedback process. P1 described feeling *delighted* and *excited*, appreciating the opportunity to receive feedback and to help a peer in return. P1 also highlighted the gratitude they felt for

having someone assist in reviewing her assignment, allowing her to identify and correct potential errors. The excitement stemmed from the ability to apply their own understanding in reviewing a peer's work, which further enhanced their learning experience.

Based on the responses from P1 and P2, it can be seen that self-confidence plays a crucial role in the peer feedback process. When individuals feel confident in their abilities, they are more likely to engage positively in the peer feedback activity, enjoying the process rather than feeling anxious or hesitant. This confidence allows them to provide and receive feedback more effectively, which in turn helps them recognize areas for improvement in their own work. The sense of accomplishment and self-assurance gained from this exchange not only enhances their writing skills but also contributes to their overall learning experience, making them more receptive to constructive criticism and better equipped to tackle future assignments.

### **The Structured Process of Peer Feedback**

Based on the answers to the questionnaire, the process that participants did in peer feedback tended to be the same. Briefly, there are five steps they do. First, they pay attention to the instructions from the lecturer regarding their assignments, and also study the provided templates that will be used.

## **Expand the underlined nouns using:**

### **a. Premodifier**

- Adjective

e.g. I am a student.

I am a diligent student.

**Figure 1 Instruction and Example from The Lecturer**



**Instructions:**

This grammar log is filled after you get corrective feedback from your peer. Fill in this form using the following conditions:

1. No : fill with the number of the sentence.
2. Error : write down each sentence that consists of a/some error (s).
3. Type : write down the type (s) of the error (you can see it from your grammar correction codes form)
4. Correction : rewrite your sentence using appropriate grammar.
5. Error frequency : write down how often you make errors using its error type.  
Error frequency:
  - a. Always (A)
  - b. Often (O)
  - c. Usually (U)
  - d. Sometimes (So)
  - e. Seldom (Se)
  - f. Rarely (R)
6. Understand : write yes/no/maybe whether you have understood or not about your error (s)

**Figure 2 Instruction from the lecturer**

Second, they carry out a correction process on their peer assignments. At this stage, they correct and provide feedback on their peer's writing according to the guidelines given by the lecturer. The process can be seen in Figure 3 below.

2. The dog was really expensive.  
**Answer :** The twenty incredibly charming bulldog<sup>s/pl</sup> dogs were really expensive.

**Figure 3 Example of Correction**

At this stage, they focus on correcting various aspects of their peer's writing, including grammar, spelling, tenses, word choice, and other elements that are essential for improving the quality of the assignment. These areas of correction are all clearly listed in the grammar log rubric provided by the lecturer, which serves as a guide for the peer feedback process. By following the rubric, the participants ensure that they are thoroughly reviewing the key components of the writing. This process is reflected in the Open-Ended Questionnaire Responses, where participants describe their approach to providing feedback and correcting their peers' work.

**Table 8 Correction Process**

Excerpt	Open-Ended Questionnaire Responses
P1	"I usually refer to the template provided by my teachers and follow the steps to perform peer feedback."
P2	"I do peer feedback by paying attention to several aspects such as spelling, tenses, word choice and others where it is all listed in the grammar log rubric given by the lecturer."

After that, they held a discussion phase regarding the results of the correction and re-checked. The next step is discussion with other peers, if there are still peers who find it difficult to analyze and correct. This is a recommendation from a lecturer. At the last stage, they began to revise their work according to the results of their peer feedback.

**Table 9 Process of Peer Feedback**

<b>Excerpt</b>	<b>Open-Ended Questionnaire Responses</b>
P1	“I usually refer to the template provided by my teachers and follow the steps to perform peer feedback.”
P2	“After correcting the wrong part, I also gave the correct analysis result to my friend. After that, when my peer feedback and I were finished, we discussed the results we had done. If one of us has an inaccurate check, we will re-check and discuss with other friends who are not my peer feedback partners (where this is also a rule from the lecturer, if our peer feedback is lacking or difficult to analyze, then we can discuss with other peer feedback groups). After that, the results of the peer feedback are entered into the grammar log that has been provided by the lecturer.”

After completing the corrections, students proceed to the discussion and re-check phase, engaging with their peer feedback partners to review the results. If any inaccuracies are identified, they re-check the corrections for clarity and accuracy. If difficulties arise during the analysis or correction, students are encouraged to consult with other peer feedback groups as recommended by the lecturer. This collaborative step allows them to gain new perspectives and address challenging issues effectively. Following this, the results of the peer feedback are documented in the grammar log provided by the lecturer, serving as a structured record of the corrections made. Finally, students move to the revision stage, where they apply the feedback and corrections to their own assignments, improving the overall quality of their writing.

### **The Benefits of Peer Feedback in Writing Activities**

This research found that clear peer feedback will help the students in their task. Huisman et al (2018) argue that the presence of explanatory remarks was positively connected to students' perceptions of how adequate peer feedback was. In practice, both participants provide feedback as clearly as possible, the corrections they provide are accompanied by explanations including references (*see figure 4*) that they can use to study material that is still wrong in their work. This helps them understand each

other's mistakes and assists in the revision process of their assignments. This process is reflected in the Open-Ended Questionnaire Responses Table 10.

**Table 10 The Benefits of Peer Feedback in Writing Activities**

Excerpt	Open-Ended Questionnaire Responses
P1	"It is pretty clear because both of us has committed to explain any corrections we give to each other and if possible, we also give references to make it clearer."
P2	"It is very clear because my peer feedback provides an explanation of the error with a description as well as the correct result. In addition, my peer feedback also in correcting include sources that support the results of the correction."

Explanation:

- Unnecessary word in the sentence: The twenty incredibly charming bulldog<sup>s/pl</sup> dogs were really expensive.  
The term "bulldog" is enough to indicate that it is a dog breed name. So, you don't have to add the word dog after it.
- As a consequence of that correction, the word "bulldog" should change into a plural form, that is "bulldogs." Here is the reference of uses of the term bulldog.  
<https://www.petfinder.com/dog-breeds/bulldog/>
- Punctuation in the sentence: The seminar of Education spent one hour for each presenter<sup>P</sup>.  
It seems that you forgot to put a dot at the end of the sentence.
- Rephrase the sentence: I have no answer to give an explanation of<sup>R</sup> your question.  
This is just a suggestion to make the sentences more concise. You may change it to: I have no answer to **explain** your question.

**Figure 4 Example of Peer Feedback**

With clear feedback, the participants can apply feedback from peer by checking, confirming the correction results, making a grammar log table (*see figure 5*) to compare which one is wrong, which one has been justified.

NO	ERROR	TYPE	CORRECTION	ERROR FREQUENCY	UNDERSTAND?
1	The twenty incredibly charming bulldog <sup>s/pl</sup> dogs were really expensive.	s/pl	The twenty incredibly charming <b>bulldog</b> were really expensive.	R (rarely)	Yes
2	The seminar of Education spent one hour for each <u>presenter<sup>P</sup></u> .	P	The seminar of Education spent one hour for each presenter.	R (rarely)	Yes
3	I have no answer to <u>give an explanation of<sup>R</sup></u> your question.	R	I have no answer <b>to explain</b> your question.	R (rarely)	Yes

**Figure 5 The Example of Grammar Log**

The benefits of peer feedback from previous research are still relevant in today's learning. In the peer feedback process carried out by the participants, they admitted that peer feedback helped them a lot in maximizing the assignment for the better result. This process is reflected in the Open-Ended Questionnaire Responses Table 11.

**Table 11 The Benefits of Peer Feedback in Writing Activities**

<b>Excerpt</b>	<b>Open-Ended Questionnaire Responses</b>
P1	"It helps me a lot in maximizing my assignment so that I can get the better result."
P2	"With peer feedback, I can find out my mistakes in writing, especially in grammar. And also, I got enlightenment from my peer's explanation who gave me feedback about my writing errors and how to solve them. In addition, with this peer feedback can also improve my spelling and grammar."

Other advantages include the ability to detect errors in writing, particularly in grammar and spelling, through peer feedback. The participants were also enlightened by their peers' explanations of writing faults and how to correct it.

## **2. Discussion**

The following discussion of this study attempts to describe the findings of the thematic analysis of the participants' responses to the open-ended questionnaire. Three main themes emerged from the analysis: The Role of Self-Confidence in Peer Feedback, The Structured Process of Peer Feedback, and The Benefits of Peer Feedback in Writing Activities. Each theme represents distinct aspects of students' perceptions and benefits from peer feedback in college writing activities.

Self-confidence is also a determining factor in students' perception and engagement in peer feedback. The confidence level was observed to influence students' emotional responses and active engagement in the feedback process in this study. For instance, P2 indicated a medium confidence level in revising their peer's writing, explaining that P2 felt nervous and worried about providing incorrect feedback. This concurs with research by Fitrihani (2018), indicating that students may place more emphasis on teacher feedback than peer feedback because of hierarchical perceptions, causing self-doubt in evaluating peers. This also aligns with Kuyyogsuy's (2019) statement that students tend to prefer teacher feedback over peer feedback because they are often not confident enough to evaluate their peers' work and face

certain language limitations. Contrary to this, P1 showed a greater degree of confidence, which translated into positive feelings like excitement and appreciation while engaging in peer feedback. This is in line with the argument from Schunk and DiBenedetto (2021), which states that feedback is an essential element in the learning context that can influence motivation and self-efficacy. P1's confidence also stemmed from selecting a peer of the same level of comprehension, which contributed to the sense of comfort and excitement during the process. These different levels of confidence significantly impacted the emotional experience of the two participants, suggesting the importance of self-confidence in facilitating the successful engagement in peer feedback exercises.

The variation in the level of confidence among learners suggests that having more self-confidence would render peer feedback more effective. The process of sharing and discussing feedback may have enhanced their confidence in giving feedback, as it is considered a collective decision rather than a personal judgment (Wei et al., 2024). Therefore, encouraging confidence-promoting activities within the classroom, such as familiarizing students with peer review norms and providing constructive feedback workshops, may bridge the gap between confident and shy students and lead to more contently peer feedback discussions. This aligns with Zheng's (2012) argument regarding the benefits of peer feedback, which suggests that a positive and relaxed classroom environment can effectively capture students' attention and interest.

Furthermore, the findings of this study indicate that the students experienced a systematic peer feedback process that involved some essential stages. First, paying attention to the instructions from the lecturer regarding the assignments, and also studying the provided templates that will be used. Second, carrying out a correction process on peer assignments. At this stage, correcting and providing feedback on peer's writing according to the guidelines given by the lecturer. After that, holding a discussion phase regarding the results of the correction and re-checking. The next step is discussion with other peers, if there are still peers who find it difficult to analyze and correct. This is a recommendation from a lecturer. At the last stage, beginning to revise the work according to the results of peer feedback. This systematic approach served to guarantee that feedback was not only organized but also comprehensive, covering important areas such as grammar, spelling, tenses, and word choice. This is

in line with the argument by Adebayo (2024) that Peer feedback in EFL writing identifies four key areas where it was most beneficial: grammar, rules and concepts, meaning, and emotional aspects.

The structuring of the peer feedback process plays a significant role in guaranteeing consistency and clarity in student evaluation. By utilizing a pre-established rubric and mutual discussion, students were better able to identify errors and learn from the feedback of their peers. This is in line with the argument from Quinton, Nesbitt, and Bock (2025), which states that improving the structure of feedback forms can enhance the trustworthiness and usefulness of peer feedback. The process also allowed students to reflect on their own work, which encouraged self-assessment and critical thinking. The sequential process was also reflective of research by Huisman et al. (2018), who noted that systematic peer feedback encourages deeper learning and writing principle understanding. This also aligns with the study by Tsai & Piamsai (2025) which said that their participants recognized the advantages of receiving peer feedback for their personal development. In this way, the structuring of peer feedback activities is vital to ensure its pedagogical gains are maximized.

The final theme that was revealed through the analysis is the immense benefits of peer feedback on students' writing development. Students expressed that clear and constructive feedback helped them better understand their mistakes and improved the quality of their work. Furthermore, Aprilianti and Hidayatulloh (2021) said that peer feedback encourages students to enhance their critical thinking skills and adopt diverse perspectives, as it demands objectivity in identifying the strengths and weaknesses in someone else's work. For example, P1 and P2 both acknowledged that peer feedback helped them become more aware of grammatical mistakes and provided clarity through clear explanations and reference materials. This is also supported by a study conducted by Lundstrom and Baker (2009) stating that peer review not only strengthens writing capability but also strengthens students' understanding of writing mechanics through collaborative learning.

Moreover, the findings show that peer feedback in writing courses can be of tremendous benefit, particularly if the students are led through a guided and nurturing process. Not only does this explain grammar rules and writing conventions to them, but it also gives them confidence and promotes a sense of community in the class. In general, the result demonstrates that self-confidence, structured processes, and

learning values of peer feedback are key factors in enhancing students' writing competencies. Addressing confidence barriers, consolidating structured feedback protocols, and highlighting learning values of peer learning may further optimize peer feedback as a pedagogical tool in writing classrooms.

#### D. Conclusion and Suggestion

The findings of this research indicate the central role of self-confidence, structured peer feedback processes, and the pedagogical value of peer feedback in enhancing students' writing skills. Self-confidence affects how students react to and engage with peer feedback, their emotional experiences, and active engagement. An organized peer feedback process, guided by clear instructions and methodical steps, facilitates efficient correction, discussion, and documentation, and allows students to recognize and understand their mistakes methodically. Furthermore, the benefits of peer feedback extend beyond mere error correction; it promotes self-awareness, improves writing quality, and improves learning of grammatical rules.

For future research, it is suggested that there be a larger number of participants to gain more diverse opinions and make the results more generalizable. Having the study across various levels of education and various fields of study may also provide more information on how peer feedback is perceived and how effective it is in various learning settings. Also, further investigation into the long-term effects of peer feedback on the development of student writing would be valuable in knowing its ongoing educational value.

#### References

- Adebayo, D. O., Nduka, U. C., Onebunne, A. P., Karikari, L., & Obiri, J. A. (2024). Students' development of writing skills on grammatical units through peer and teachers' correction strategies. *Path of Science, 10*(9), 4001-4024.
- Apriani, E., Santiana, S., & Harmi, H. (2022). Investigating the Role of ICT toward Students' Higher Order Thinking in Writing Skills at Islamic University Students. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan, 14*(2), 2213-2224.
- Aprilianti, B. D. A., & Hidayatulloh, S. M. M. (2021). EFL students' voices on digital peer feedback. *Journal of English Language Teaching, 10*(3). <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/elt>

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol 2: Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological*. (pp. 57–71). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-004>
- Bruffee, K. A. (1980). *A short course in writing. Practical rhetoric for composition courses, writing workshops, and tutor training programs*. MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- Chang, C. Y. (2016). *Two decades of research in L2 peer review*. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2016.08.01.03>
- Er, E., Dimitriadis, Y., & Gašević, D. (2021). A collaborative learning approach to dialogic peer feedback: a theoretical framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 46*(4), 586-600.
- Fithriani, R. (2018). Cultural influences on students' perceptions of written feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning, 3*(1), 1-13.
- Gao, Y., Schunn, C. D. D., & Yu, Q. (2019). The alignment of written peer feedback with draft problems and its impact on revision in peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*(2), 294-308.
- Hojeij, Z., & Baroudi, S. (2018). Student perceptions on peer feedback training using a blended method: A UAE case. In *Issues in Educational Research* (Vol. 28, Issue 3).
- 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 & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43*(6), 955-968.
- Hyland, Ken., & Hyland, Fiona. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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/10.29333/iji.2019.12114a>
- Kuyyogsuy, S. (2019). Promoting peer feedback in developing students' English writing ability in L2 writing class. *International Education Studies, 12*(9), 76. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n9p76>
- Lee, I. (2017). Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts. In *Classroom Writing Assessment and Feedback in L2 School Contexts*. Springer Singapore. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9>



- Lumabi, B. M., & Tabajen, R. (2021). College students' experience in online asynchronous peer feedback in writing. *TESOL and Technology Studies*, 2(2), 41–54. <https://doi.org/10.48185/tts.v2i2.250>
- Misiejuk, K., Wasson, B., & Egelandsdal, K. (2021). Using learning analytics to understand student perceptions of peer feedback. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106658>
- Quinton, J., Nesbitt, L., & Bock, J. (2025). Enhancing the structure of feedback forms increases trustworthiness and usefulness of peer feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 50(2), 123–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2025.2468848>
- Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2021). Self-efficacy and human motivation. In *Advances in Motivation Science* (Vol. 8, pp. 153–179). Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.adms.2020.10.001>
- Sri, M. (2019). Investigating collaborative research project in Indonesian undergraduate program: Benefits and concerns. *Journal of Teaching & Learning English in Multicultural Contexts (TLEMC)*, 3(1). <http://jurnal.unsil.ac.id/index.php/tlemc/index>
- Stančić, M. (2021). Peer assessment as a learning and self-assessment tool: A look inside the black box. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(6), 852–864. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1828267>
- Tsai, C. C., & Piamsai, C. (2025). The Use of Peer Assessment and Non-Scripted Role-Play Activities in Improving Thai EFL High School Students' English Oral Performance. *rEFLECTIONS*, 32(1), 436-461.
- Wei, W., Cheong, C. M., Zhu, X., & Lu, Q. (2024). Comparing self-reflection and peer feedback practices in an academic writing task: a student self-efficacy perspective. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 29(4), 896-912.
- Yazan, B. (2015). Three approaches to case study methods in education: Yin, Merriam, and Stake. *The qualitative report*, 20(2), 134-152.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications*. Sage.
- Yu, S., & Hu, G. (2017). Understanding university students' peer feedback practices in EFL writing: Insights from a case study. *Elsevier*, 33, 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016.asw2017.03.004>

- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Peer feedback in second language writing (2005-2014). In *Language Teaching* (Vol. 49, Issue 4, pp. 461–493). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000161>
- Zheng, C. (2012). Understanding the learning process of peer feedback activity: An ethnographic study of exploratory practice. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(1), 109–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811426248>