

EXPLORING STUDENTS' RESPONSE TO PEER FEEDBACK STRATEGY IN EFL WRITING CLASS AT STATE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL 1 SUSUKAN

Anni Rachmayani

IAIN Syekh Nurjati Ciebon
annirachmayani@gmail.com

Ahmad Rifai

IAIN Syekh Nurjati Ciebon
Smart.rifai @gmail.com

Tedi Rohadi

IAIN Syekh Nurjati Ciebon
traincrbn@gmail.com

Abstract: Peer feedback strategy doubted by experts and teacher to be applied in the class because its effectiveness and students' lack ability to give feedback. Therefore, the purposes of this study were to explore the phenomenon occurred during peer feedback strategy and to explore students' response to feedback offered by peers in EFL writing class at State Senior High School 1 Susukan. This descriptive qualitative research data obtained through classroom observation, documents, mixture questionnaires and interview. Then, the findings of the first research questions revealed that teacher as an active figure who managed, instructed, guided, and observed the class and students, and students also actively gave feedback and asked teacher, peers, and friends, then, the class condition were conducive but it was noisy because chatting and asking activity, teacher and students communicated by used native language, then teacher changed the seating arrangement overtime and students' desks full of phones. In addition, the findings of the second research question showed students' response to feedback offered by peers were objective and relevance, they also understand it, but students still disbelief to feedback given by peers, however, students have positive opinion to peer feedback but still prefer teacher feedback than peer feedback, students also felt shy to show their writing but felt motivated after knew their writing mistakes and felt enthusiast during peer feedback even though students felt difficult to give feedback, and students also have good expectation on teacher when applied peer feedback strategy.

Keywords: Peer Feedback, Phenomenon, Students' Response, EFL Writing Class

BACKGROUND

Teacher has an old perspective that viewed writing as a product and not as a process. Moreover, teacher did not give feedback either by applied peer feedback or teacher feedback strategy in the class because doubted its effectiveness and students' lack ability to give feedback to peers. Therefore, students did not have good writing skills yet because they did not know their writing mistakes and could not improve their writing quality and skills. In addition, Seow (2002: 137) even asserted that the failure of many writing programmers in school today probably ascribed to the fact that responding done by teacher in the final stage of writing when the teacher simultaneously responds, evaluates and even edits students' final texts, and it giving students the impression that nothing more needs to be done by students. Instead, feedback effectively should give by teachers in

responding stages of writing process. Feedback could be applied in responding stages of writing process when teachers or peers are responding by giving feedback and correcting students' writing verbally or in writing (Seow, 2002: 316). Therefore, by giving feedback in students' final product and in not drafting stages of process writing was a wrong step done by teacher.

In addition, writing is the part of language that human can use as the medium to express ideas, feeling, and thought. However, it is not an ability that people could be master from one nights training, but need long process, time, hard effort, and a skill that gained from rich experience of reading and writing habitual, last but not least, it skills that could be mastered by always received every critics and advices given by readers, that's why a writer able to know readers' perspective for their own writing. However, students demand to be able to write an academic writing, such as short answer test responses, reports, essays, papers, theses and books (Brown, 2002: 302), because it will determine their academic performance and score. Furthermore, Hyland (2003: 1091) said that academic writing is not just about conveyed the ideational 'content' but also mind representation, so students should represent their ideas and mind into their writing confidently. Therefore, feedback given by readers is so important for a writer to develop their writing.

Furthermore, feedback developed from Vygotskian's scaffolding and collaborative learning theory. Feedback is a key element of the scaffolding provided by the teacher to build learner confidence and the literacy resources to participate in target communities (Hyland & Hyland, 2006: 83). In addition, Hyland & Hyland (2006: 83) stated that feedback is importance acknowledged in process-based classrooms. In addition, writing process has several stages, such mentioned by Seow (2002: 315-320) that there are seven writing processes are planning, drafting, responding, revising, editing, evaluating and post-writing. Then, feedback applied in responding stages when students tried to revising by give feedback and correcting their peers' writing. So, it can be concluded that teacher as a key person in teaching and learning process had to change his attitude to peer feedback and writing process approach, because teacher is the one who responsible to manage and operate class.

However, peer feedback was a popular strategy used in ESL writing class, but it rarely used in EFL writing class because students did not master English language skill as good as ESL learner. Moreover, the researchers and experts, especially in Indonesia did not take deep interest to peer feedback. However, even though there are some researchers that did not support peer feedback such as Saito & Fujita (2004), but there are also researchers who interested and conducted the research about peer feedback such as Siregar & Murni (2013), Noor (2016), Kurihara (2017), Hyland & Hyland (2006) and Alwasilah & Alwasilah (2013).

Furthermore, Hyland & Hyland (2006) and Alwasilah & Alwasilah (2013) supported the concept of peer feedback strategy. Hyland & Hyland (2006: 90) explained that the effectiveness of peer feedback is a key element to helping novice writers to understand how readers see their work. Alwasilah & Alwasilah (2013) also pointed out that collaborative writing where students give feedback to their classmate is the alternative way to improve students' writing quality. Alwasilah & Alwasilah (2013: 28) explained that if students' writing read by their classmates, and they give their classmates feedback, then, so many readers that give those comments, then so many lessons those students can get and of course students' writing product will also be better than before.

Furthermore, the previous studies also proved that peer feedback strategy is an alternative and effective strategy to improve students' writing quality and skills, such as research conducted by Siregar & Murni (2013) entitled '*The Application of Peer Feedback Strategy to Improve Student's Writing Achievement in Narrative Text*'. The purpose of their study was to investigate to what extent the application of peer feedback strategy in teaching English could improve students' achievement in writing narrative text. The subject of their study was the first grades students of Senior High School 18 Medan that was consisted of 34 students, where their study was consisted of two cycles and categorized as classroom action research. Then, the findings of the study showed the improvement in students' writing narrative text and students' enthusiast and positive attitude to the EFL writing class. So, it can be concluded that the previous study who explored peer feedback strategy applied in EFL writing class showed that students writing skills improved and students' have positive and enthusiast attitude to peer feedback strategy.

METHOD

The purposes of this research were to explore the phenomenon occurred during peer feedback strategy and students' response to feedback offered by peers in EFL writing class at State Senior High School 1 Susukan. This research used descriptive qualitative research method. Then, it was conducted since January 22nd until April 05th 2018. In addition, the participants of this researcher were 35 students of X MIPA 2 at State Senior High School 1 Susukan and 3 students of X MIPA 2 as the purposive samples to be the respondents in interview section. Then, the techniques of collecting the data in this research were classroom observation checklist and fieldnotes, documents, mixture questionnaires, and interview. In addition, mixture questionnaires could be unfamiliar, instead it was the other kind of questions beside open-ended and close-ended, and indeed mixture questionnaires is simply the combination of open and close ended questions. Creswell (2012: 220) then modelled mixture questionnaires design, that is closed-ended question that show the predetermined response categories and followed by open-ended question where participants indicate the reason of their response and give chance to make other responses.

Meanwhile, the instruments used by the researcher were the researcher herself as the human resource instrument, video recording during conducted classroom observation, documents transcription from students' drafting and revising narrative text, mixture questionnaires transcription, and transcription of interview from audio recording. Then, the technique of data analysis followed the data analysis step of the descriptive qualitative researcher designed by Creswell (2013: 236) that consisted of six stages involved in analyzing and interpreting qualitative data, are preparing and organizing the data, exploring and coding the database, describing findings and forming themes, representing and reporting findings, interpreting the qualitative findings meaning, and validating the accuracy of the findings.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher used the theory from Byrne (1989), Hadfield (1992), Brown (2002), Hyland & Hyland (2006), and Alwasilah & Alwasilah (2013) in order to answer the first and second research questions that explored the phenomenon occurred during peer feedback strategy and students' response to feedback offered by peers in EFL writing class at State Senior High School Susukan.

The Phenomenon Occurred during Peer Feedback Strategy

The researcher used classroom checklist and field notes observation and interview to answered the first research questions and classified the phenomenon occurred during peer feedback strategy into three categories were teacher performance, students' performance and class condition, as the three aspects consisted in class and determined how peer feedback strategy occurred in class.

a. Teacher Performance

Brown (2002: 200) points out that teacher has to play many roles, such as authority figure, leader, knower, director, manager, counsellor, guide and even a role such as a friend, confidant and parent. Then, even though peer feedback facilitated students to work independently, but Watcyn-Jones & Howard-Williams (2002: 11) confessed that when teacher applied pair or group work activity so that teacher has to let students to work independently, and the role of teacher is to monitor or observed the students' progress by walking around the classroom. In addition, through classroom observation the researcher found that teacher played significance performance during peer feedback strategy because he was an active figure in class and played many roles such as a manager, instructor, guide and observer.

Teacher as an active figure who observed students in the class by walking around the class, came to every group, and helped students by answered every question asked by students, and he also could position himself because when he wanted to give instruction he stood in the middle front of class to attracted students' attention. In addition, Griffiths (2005) also explained that teacher' role in class was quite connected with teacher's position in class, and teacher should stand where students could see teacher, including the position when teacher give instruction that should make sure that the whole class saw him.

Teacher also played his role as a manager who planned the lesson by made a lesson plan that adapted peer feedback activity. Then, teacher by applied peer feedback strategy in class also means that he implemented writing process that most of teacher did not done it, because Seow (2002: 137) pointed out that teacher simultaneously responds, evaluate and even edits students' final texts, which is means teacher did not applied writing process. He also designed peer feedback guideline based on collaborative guidance of Reading – Writing Connection by Alwasilah & Alwasilah's collaborative theory (2013: 26-38). Then the crucial thing was he made an ideal size that consisted of four members, and Alwasilah & Alwasilah (2013: 26) stated the ideal group in collaboration was consisted of three or four students, because if teacher made a large group so the collaboration tends to did not effective, then he also determined the members of peer feedback group that consisted of multiple proficiency level because it will determined the successfulness of peer feedback strategy, because Byrne (1989: 78) pointed out that teacher should make a mixed ability group in order to make a better fluency work well because they will help each other.

In addition, teacher also played his role as an instructor who lead the learning process. Teacher as a director means that teacher has a job to keep the process of teaching and learning flowing smoothly and efficiently (Brown, 2002: 1667). Then, the researcher through classroom observation found that teacher lead and direct the learner, including what should be done by students to give feedback to peers and instructed students to shifted give feedback to peers.

Then, teacher also played his role as a guide who give guidance to students by answered students' question when they felt difficult to found the writing mistakes and gave feedback to peers. Byrne (1989: 77) explained that teacher has to act as a guide when students haven't understood something and asked them. Then, through interview and mixture questionnaires, it also revealed that most of students need teacher guidance to help them correcting their peers writing, moreover they realized that they did not mastered English language skills yet.

Last but not least, teacher also played his role as an observer who observed by walked around the class and watched students in order to know students' performance during peer feedback strategy., because even teacher did not take the control of the class anymore when applied group work activity but still has a big responsibility to make sure that students know how to do peer feedback (Byrne, 1989: 77).

b. Students Performance

The other figure consisted in the class beside teacher of course is a student. Then, through classroom observation the researcher found that most of students actively give feedback to peers in the class but they gave it in different styles there are some of them who collaboratively, communicatively and even silently give feedback to peers. Hadfield (1992: 123) argue that this activity gave such necessity to talk because they have something to say to their peers, there was to tell, ask, confirm, and share the mistakes found by them in their peers' writing. So, the point is that students who work calmly does not mean they did not actively work in class, because they indeed talked when they want to give feedback but read their peers' writing silently.

Then, the researcher also found that students actively asking teacher, peers and friends from the other group to give feedback. Students asked other people if they confused or just confirmed the writing error found by them. Asking other people or in Vygotskian's theory (1978) called as asking help from More Knowledgeable Other (MKO), and it was an activity that will happen when teacher applied process-based approach, and peer feedback is a strategy that support students to communicate with teachers, peers and friends in order to help and share knowledge and information each other.

Then, students' chatting activity during and after give feedback was the cause of noisy sound in class. However, students' reason to chatting during feedback because they asked help from teacher, friends or peers and had to communicate with peers to give feedback. Then, students have different purpose when they chatting after give feedback that was because their task to give and received peer feedback has been done by them. In addition, in peer feedback strategy, teacher will find that there are students who finish to give feedback first (Berčíková, 2007: 24), and it gives students opportunity to chat each other, therefore Berčíková (2007: 24) suggested that teacher should make activities for the quick finishers, and should set a clear time limit (Berčíková, 2007: 24), so students will not waste times to chat with their friends.

In addition, the researcher also found that students gave incorrect feedback to peers, Byrne (1989: 78) pointed out that student might could not work properly and they make mistakes, but it does not mean teacher could give up to applied group work or peer feedback because students did not make mistakes all the time, and they actively correcting their peers' writing. However, even though students make mistakes, but then their peers remind them the wrong feedback given by them, and

that's the art of collaborative work, because Alwasilah & Alwasilah (2004) stated that the principle of collaborative work is that everyone has strengths and weaknesses, and if they found mistakes, so they have to remind it with good manner.

c. Class Condition

The researcher through classroom observation found that the class condition during peer feedback strategy was conducive. In addition, the biggest disturbance during peer feedback activity was when students asked friends from the other group about feedback, because they disturb the other friends' concentration and focus. Then, the noisy sound in the class produced by students, but Byrne (1989: 31) explained that indeed in pair work or group work, students will make noise, but it was not problem as long as students did not shout each other, then students did not merely noisy because random reason, but because they asked and communicated with teacher, friends or peers that related with feedback.

In addition, the researcher also found that students and teacher communicated by used native language and it included Javanese language as their mother tongue and Indonesian language even though they learnt a foreign language. However, Brown (2002: 179) pointed out that in group work students will communicate each other used native language, but it turns out that students-teacher communication was also build through the use of native language.

Then teacher often changed the seating arrangement that appropriate to be applied in peer feedback activity because teacher required to walked around the class to observed and watched students. Berčíkova (2007) stated that teacher should consider seating arrangement as one of the aspects in group work. Then it found that 'L' shape was effective and good seating arrangement because it did not make teacher tired and ease to move and reach every student. However, students could not stay away from phones by place their phone on the desks even though they did not play and required it in learning process, then it required teacher clearness by instructed students to put their phones in bag and did not activate their phones during the class.

Students' Response to Feedback Offered by Peers

The researcher used mixture questionnaires and interview to answered the second research questions and classified it into four categories are students' response, opinion, feeling and expectation. Furthermore, some experts always pointed out that students have negative attitude to peer feedback, then teacher also make it as an excuse to did not applied peer feedback. Therefore, the researcher explored students' response to peer feedback strategy in EFL writing class at State Senior High School 1 Susukan.

a. Students' Response to Feedback Offered by Peers

Students expressed that they understand feedback offered by peers because it was relevant and objective. The researcher asked students in mixture questionnaires, '*Did you understand the feedback offered by your peers?*'. Then, most of students expressed that they understand feedback offered by peers because they give clear explanation to them. In addition, Orsmond et al., (2013) said that good feedback help students to understand the subject are and gives clear guidance on how to improve their learning. Which is means, students will understand feedback given by peers if peers give good feedback.

Then, the objectivity of feedback related with students' feeling and relation to their peers, meanwhile peer feedback is a way to increase learning (Keppell and Carless,

2006), but if students who give feedback evaluate and revise their peers' writing objectively (Özdemir, 2016: 1860). Therefore, the researcher asked students in mixture questionnaires, *'Did you think your peers gave an objective feedback on your writing?'*. Then, students expressed that their peers gave objective feedback because they knew the writing mistakes such as in spelling, understand peer feedback strategy, followed the instruction given by teacher and even they believe that their peer is an honest person that will give objective feedback.

Furthermore, the researcher asked students in mixture questionnaires, *'Did your peers give a relevance feedback with the task?'*. Then, students expressed that peers gave relevance feedback that relevant with the task because peers correcting the spelling mistakes well, they understand to give feedback and understand the tasks, and peers also followed peer feedback guideline that contained all of points should be correcting by students. In addition, Brown (2002) stated that feedback is most effective when it is timely, relevance and meaningful. Therefore, the relevance feedback offered by peers was one of the parameters to value that feedback is an effective or ineffective strategy in class.

Then, even though students stated that peers gave relevance and objective feedback and they understand the feedback, but they still disbelief to feedback offered by peers, the researcher asked students in mixture questionnaires, *'Do you believe in your peers' skill to give feedback?'*, and they expressed that they did not believe because considering peers who did not have good English language skills yet. However, Nicole & Macfarlane-Dick (2006: 205) explained that teacher should encourage positive motivational beliefs and self-esteem, so students could believe their friends more and teacher should give understanding to students about the purpose and benefit of peer feedback strategy for themselves.

b. Students' Opinion to Peer Feedback Strategy

Students confessed that peer feedback is an effective strategy, they also have positive opinion to peer feedback, but students still prefer teacher feedback than peer feedback. The researcher through mixture questionnaires, asked students, *'Based on your opinion, did you prefer teacher or peer feedback to be applied in class?'*. Then, students prefer teacher feedback even though they could give feedback because saw teacher's figure that more knowledgeable to give feedback than them, teacher know the correct spelling, and teacher mastered English language skill well. Nelson (1996) even dictated that peer feedback activities were not effective strategy for Asian students and country that used teacher-dominated pedagogies and prefer teacher feedback because teacher reputed as an expert and the only source of authority in class.

In addition, the researcher asked students, *'State your opinion about peer feedback that applied by your teacher in EFL writing class?'*, and the results showed that students have positive opinion to peer feedback because they thought that peer feedback is an effective strategy, it facilitate them to share information and knowledge, support them to communicate and interact with friends, make them more understand the material, teach them how to give good feedback, support them to not only know the writing mistakes in peers' text, but also make them did self – evaluation to their own writing and enhance their knowledge to writing better and make a good writing. Moreover, Bijami, et al. (2013: 93) also pointed out that peer feedback will enhance students' writing skill and improve students' learning achievement, and it is a strategy that supported sociocultural theory where people learn and develop through the interaction with the world around them (Vygotsky, 1978).

Furthermore, the researcher asked students, *'Did you think peer feedback activity applied effectively in class?'*, and they expressed that peer feedback is effective strategy because students stimulate to asked, it is an easy strategy to be understand, students enthusiast to take a part in this strategy, teacher give clear guidance and good instructions so that peer feedback activity worked well and applied effectively in class. Therefore, the response expressed by students proved that teacher action will determine the successfulness of teaching and learning process. However, Biri (2014) also confessed that peer feedback stimulated students to develop critical thinking skills, for example, by critically ask during learning process.

c. Students' Feeling during Peer Feedback Activity

Alwasilah & Alwasilah (2013: 28) pointed out that student writers tend to felt shy to show their writing to read by their friends. Therefore, the researcher asked students through questionnaires, *'How is your feeling when your writing read by your peer?'*, and most of students expressed that they felt shy to show their writing because there are so many mistakes in their writing, the spelling was wrong and incorrect, their handwriting was bad untidy, unclear and uneasy to read, so they felt shy and afraid if peers will make fun of it and did not want to read it. Bijami, et al. (2013: 92) expressed that feedback is cognitive and affective strategy, where in affective feedback, it concentrated on works quality and either teacher and student readers have to used affective language to bestow praise when student writers well written and criticism them when has a bad written, or even uses non-verbal expression such as emotional tones and facial expression gestures.

Then, in the mixture questionnaires, the researcher also asked students, *'How is your feeling when your peers found mistakes in your writing?'*. Then, most of students expressed that peer feedback motivated them to write better when they found their writing mistakes because they positively thought that did mistakes was a normal thing for learners. Biri (2014) also pointed out that peer feedback improves self-confidence and motivation for lessons.

Furthermore, the researcher asking students' enthusiast feeling, *'Do you feel enthusiast when your teacher applied peer feedback strategy in class?'*. Then, the researcher found that most of students felt enthusiast because they motivated to writing better, students did not feel bored because teacher design the class well, it enrich their knowledge about peer feedback and how to give feedback, they could learn writing more effectively, make them knew their writing mistakes and how to make a good writing, enhance their vocabulary and supported them to communicate with friends, their teacher was enthusiast and patience to handle them. In addition, the researcher found that every reason pointed out by students have the same pattern of answers. However, students felt enthusiast because this strategy was designed well by teacher and teacher showed positive attitude during peer feedback activity. Therefore, how feedback was designed and given to students will give effect to the class and students positively or negatively (Musa et al, 2012).

In addition, the researcher found that students found difficulties when they have to give feedback to peers. Then, the researcher asked students in mixture questionnaires, *'Did you feel difficult to find the mistakes in your peers' writing?'*. Students then expressed that they difficult and confuse to read and understand their peers' text because the handwriting is bad, unclear, too long did not follow the correct spelling, and peers did not know how to writing well, moreover they did not master English language

skill yet and only knew some vocabularies. In addition, teacher and peers have a task to help and remind each other because students still in learning process. Alwasilah & Alwasilah (2013: 214) also pointed out that student writers will build their awareness and sensitivity if there are critical dialogue between student writers and readers in class, and this is the essence of collaborative learning. Everyone is reminding, sharing knowledge and build the understanding together.

d. Students' Expectation to Teacher and Peer Feedback

The researcher would like to know students' expectation on teacher and peer feedback strategy in order to make this strategy could effectively work in the class by asking students in mixture questionnaires, '*What is your expectation when your teacher applied this method?*'. Then, students confessed their expectation that teacher could applied this strategy often because it was an interesting strategy because it enriched their knowledge, and they know their mistakes in writing and motivated them to improve their writing, and it also facilitated them to communicate with their friends, students will guide and more understand students, check and control the class more, and be more patience to handle the students, then teacher also not only explained the material but also explained the instruction more detail and give them example such as how to writing well with correct spelling, and students also expected that the class that applied peer feedback strategy will improve and conducive. So, it can be concluded that students have good attitude and expectation to teacher and peer feedback strategy that applied in their class. Moreover, Zariski (1996) explained this as the improvement of lifelong learning and metacognitive skills.

CONCLUSION

Peer feedback strategy is an effective strategy to be applied in the class, it facilitates students to communicate with teacher and friends, actively give feedback in class and asking teacher, friends and peers, students also enthusiast to involved during peer feedback activity in class, peer feedback also enriched students' knowledge about the correct spelling and to know how to give good feedback, enhance their vocabulary, support and motivate them to improve their writing quality and writing skill. Students also have positive attitude to peer feedback who expressed that feedback given by peers was effective and objective, students also could give feedback to peers and it was proved by the fact that students understand feedback given by peers. Moreover, students also have good expectation on teacher and peer feedback strategy.

In addition, teacher should consider some consideration when would like to applied this strategy, that revealed in the first and second findings of this present study, because students still prefer teacher feedback than peer feedback, they also feel shy to show their writing, students also still disbelief to feedback offered by peers, teacher also should guide students because students still feel difficult to found the writing mistakes, and moreover there are some students who make noise and be disturbance in the class. Therefore, teacher should maximize their roles as a manager, an instructor, a guide and an observer in the class.

REFERENCE

- Alwasilah, A. Chedar, & Alwasilah, Senny, S. 2013. *Pokoknya Menulis*. Bandung: PT Kiblat Buku Utama.
- Berčíková, Pavlina. 2007. *Teacher's Role in Pair Work. A Thesis: Faculty of Education Department of English Language and Literature*. Brno: Masaryk University.
- Bijami, M., Kashef, S.H., & Nejad, Maryam, S. 2013. 'Peer Feedback in Learning English Writing: Advantages and Disadvantages'. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 2013, Vol. 3, No. 4. 91-97. Malaysia: Macrothink Institute.
- Biri H. 2014. *Contribution of Peer Assessment Method to Teacher Education*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Karadeniz Technical University Institute of Educational Sciences, Trabzon.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2002. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive to Language Pedagogy* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
- Byrne, Donn. 1989. *Techniques for Classroom Communication*. UK: Longman.
- Creswell, John, W. 2013. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Fourth Edition. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Griffiths, B. Teacher Positioning in the Classroom. 2005. *Teaching English*. British Council.
- Hadfield, J. 1992. *Classroom Dynamics*. Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, Ken, & Hyland, Fiona. 2006. Language Teaching: *Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. *Language Teaching 2006, Volume 39, No.2. P. 83-1901* (Available on <http://hdl.handle.net/10722/57356>)
- Keppell M, and Carless D. 2006. Learning-Oriented Assessment: A Technology-Based Case Study. *Assessment Education*, 13 (2): 179-191.
- Kurihara, Noriko. 2017. 'Peer Review in an EFL Classroom: Impact on the Improvement of Student Writing Abilities'. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 4 No. 1, 2017, 58-72.
- Musa, F., Mansor, A. Z., Mufti, N., Aida, N. A., & Dato's Kasim, F. 2012. Negotiation Skills: Teachers' Feedback as Input Strategy. *Procedia- social and Behavioural Sciences*, 59, 221-226.
- Nelson, G. & Carson, J. 1995. Social Dimensions of Second-Language Writing Instruction: Peer Response Groups as Cultural Context. In D. Rubin (Ed.), *Composing social identity in Written Communication* (pp. 89-109). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Nicole, 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.
- Noor, Mochammad. 2016. 'Improving the Ability in Writing Narrative Text of Junior High School Students through Peer Feedback'. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Vol 1, No 1, 11-21.

- Orsmond, P., Maw, S. J., Park, R. J., Gomez, S., & Crook, C. A. 2013. Moving Feedback Forward: Theory to Practice. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(2), 240-252.
- Özdemir, Serpil. 2016. The Opinions of Prospective Teachers on Peer Assessment. *Educational Research and Reviews*. Vol. 11 (20), pp. 1859-1870, 2016.
- Saito, H., & Fujita, T. 2004. *Language Teaching Research*. Characteristics and User Acceptance of Peer Rating in EFL Classrooms. Vol 8 (1), pp. 31–54.
- Seow, Anthony. 2002. *The Writing Process and Process Writing*. Richard, Jack, C. & Renandya, A. Willy. In *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Siregar, M. Ibrahim, & Murni, Sri, Minda. 2013. 'The Application of Peer Feedback Strategy to Improve Student's Writing Achievement in Narrative Text'. *LINGUISTICA Journal of Linguistics of FBS UNIMED*. Vol. 2, No. 1, 2013.
- Vygotsky, L. 1978. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Watcyn-Jones, Peter & Howard-Williams, Deirdre. 2002. *Pair Work 1 (Elementary-Pre-Intermediate)*. UK: Penguin English Books.
- Zariski, A. 1996. Students Peer Assessment in Tertiary Education: Promise, Perils and Practice. In *Teaching and Learning Within and Across Disciplines: Proceedings of the 5th Annual Teaching Learning Forum*, ed. J. Abbott and L. Willcoxson. Perth: Murdoch University.