

The Effectiveness of Peer Feedback in Collaborative Writing Viewed from Self-Confidence

Hesty Puspita Sari¹, Azza Jauhar Ahmad Tajuddin², Miftachus Sholikah³

¹ Universitas Islam Balitar: English Education Department, Education and Training Faculty, Balitar Islamic University, Blitar, Indonesia, 66131

² Universiti Malaysia Terengganu: Pusat Pendidikan Asas dan Lanjutan, Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Terengganu, Malaysia, 20050

³ IAI Pangeran Diponegoro: Islamic Early Childhood Education, Education and Training Faculty, Pangeran Diponegoro Islamic Institute, Nganjuk, Indonesia, 64311

*Corresponding author. Email: hestypuspita1403@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Interactional practice is the core of collaborative writing. Peer feedback as a way of interactional practice plays a very crucial activity in conducting collaborative writing. Most University students tend to be shy to correct his/her partner's draft. To fully comprehend the impact of peer feedback on collaborative writing improvement, a deeper analysis of self-confidence is required. This paper is aimed to provide the level of peer feedback effectiveness viewed from self-confidence in collaborative writing using google docs among 21 students in the province of East Java in Indonesia where English is taught as a foreign language. One class pre-test post-test was applied in the English course and participated in a four-month English writing program using google docs. The students worked in pairs and were asked to complete a self-confidence questionnaire before and after completing the task. Quantitative data were analyzed through activities recorded using the google docs system, including edits and comments posted, and students' peer writing. Google docs page history shows information about revisions that occurred and different types of feedback as well as resulting in actual revisions, which may result in better group writing. The findings of this study can explain how google docs could provide support for students' collaborative writing processes and how it could show the importance of emotional, social, material, and temporal aspects related to collaborative writing outcomes and improving collaborative writing outcomes for students who have high self-confidence. The aforementioned analysis findings revealed that the t-calculated test's t-value was 7.79, while the required critical t-value was at $p > .05$ level of significance of two-tailed test is 2,086 (df = 20), $p > .01$ level. The significance of the two-tailed test is 2,845 (df = 20). The analysis of the data reveals that the results of the student's score improvement on the pretest and posttest differ. The questionnaire has shown that self-confidence have an influence on the ability of students' writing improvement.

Keywords: *peer feedback, collaborative writing, self-confidence*

1. INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of English teaching is to prepare students to be able to communicate in either spoken or written form. Meanwhile, the teaching of English is undoubtedly the most important single responsibility of the curriculum. There are four skills in English, which should be mastered by learners, namely: listening, reading, speaking, and writing while the language elements are pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, structure, and fluency.

Writing is one of the most often used skills by teachers in teaching English. The writing skills are complex and difficult to teach, requiring mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also conceptual and judgment elements. [1] the most difficult language skill which requires a higher level of productive language control than the other skills is writing. Additionally, writing requires careful planning and revision, processes which in themselves worry students to create anxiety.

Among the four skills and the language elements above, writing is one of the most essential parts to be able to communicate. Writing is considered an enormous challenge to write in one's second language in a cogent, fluent, lengthy piece [2]. This is made worse by the fact that English writings' organizational, stylistic, and structural conventions frequently diverge from those of other languages. [3]–[5]. Writing is the creation of the written word in the form of text, yet written communication cannot occur unless the text is read and understood. [1].

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing is a fundamental linguistic ability that is just as crucial as speaking, listening, and reading [6], [7]. These abilities are necessary for numerous jobs and professions as well as for academic success. Writing is a skill that adults require for both professional and personal reasons. Writing created in a professional or institute capacity, such as that of a businessperson, teacher, or student, and that adheres to

institutional conversations is referred to as institutional writing. Personal letters and creative writing are both examples of personal writing. [8], [9]. The development of pupils' writing abilities is crucial for these reasons in order to prepare them for the working world.

Writing is the rendering of ideas in the printed symbols of a given language [10]. Writing is an encoding of a message of some kind that is, we translate our thoughts and ideas into language [11], [12]. Writing thus serves as a kind of representation of our thoughts and ideas. What one thinks inspires one to write in the form of sentences, and by structuring the words into a narrative that flows smoothly, we are able to effectively connect with our readers.

Writing is largely a norm for encoding speech and strengthening the language's grammatical and lexical qualities. [13]. Writing is an extraordinarily difficult cognitive activity that requires the writer to show control over a variety of variables, according to Bell and Burnaby. [3]. Control over the content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, and letter formative are among the variables at the sentence level. Beyond the sentence, the author must be able to organize and incorporate material into a paragraph and text that are seamless and coherent. To write something, a few requirements must be met.. Writing is not only writes ideas into a form of sentences but to form sentences, it needs rules to arrange each word and sentence.

To get better writing result, collaborative writing with peer feedback is suggested [14]–[16]. Peer feedback provides feedback comment on each other draft. The pair could write some comments on the partner's draft based on the checklist given [17]. The comment of feedback may take several forms of a counter-suggestion to promote an expression idea of the draft, a correction of formulation, and reformulation of jotting words feedback to learners, whether in the form of written comments or error correction, must be acknowledged as one of the most significant duties of writing. Peer feedback, as one learning strategy in collaborative writing, provides fresh understanding in jotting collaboratively in an EFL context. Feedback is a central learning to write, the strongest learning factors, and gives advantageous for both the writer and the peer to collaborate in assessing the draft become a complete text [18]. He adds that if the lecturer applies such peer feedback strategy in collaborative writing appropriately, the collaborative writing practice will give significant effects for long and short time to enhance the students' writing skill.

One of the supporting factors in conducting peer feedback on collaborative writing is the student's personality. While one of the characteristics of personality is a high sense of self-confidence [19]. Having good self-confidence effect on how to give comments to the draft, write some corrections, and feel obliged her/himself to pay attention to the draft.

The process of teaching and learning shows that self-confidence is very essential. It influences the students' achievement, especially in achieving writing ability. Self-confidence is strong sense of one's self-worth and capabilities. When the process approach was implemented, the students felt more confident with their writing although

their writings were still imperfect. They felt satisfied because they could create their own text. Knowing that you can do something well gives you self-confidence. Knowing the task at hand from firsthand experience, being aware of your strengths and shortcomings, using your skills in any scenario, and being able to change course swiftly as the situation develops are all factors that contribute to self-confidence. People that are self-assured are not afraid of failure because they feel they have what it takes to handle challenging conditions. (Liz Jones, Definition Self-Confidence: 1). The students who have high self-confidence can follow some stages in the writing process, they are more enthusiastic, assertiveness, optimistic, independent, trusted, and brave to do mistakes in every stages. They have good ability to handle criticism from their friends in editing stage and have emotional maturity in the publishing stage. They have strong enthusiasm and intention in learning that makes them understand the lesson more easily. As a result, students with high self-confidence generally enjoy and have a realistic assessment of their strengths and weaknesses, especially in

Google docs as one of the platforms used in collaborative writing, offers the opportunity to have collaboration and give suggestions either in pairs or in group. Among many technologies nowadays, google docs is very beneficial for the teacher to be implemented in a writing environment [20]. To teach writing, lecturer can use the collaboration feature so that he/she can monitor the students' progress on the task given. Using this model, the students or the lecturer can get a very fast reply. In this context lecturer can let the students discuss and share their draft to her/his pair and when we want to print out it, it has been checked/proofed and read by the pair.

In the case of peer feedback, Google Docs enables students to easily connected among themselves and allow peers to gain valuable feedback on their writing in a timely fashion [21]. Using google docs enables students to receive immediate feedback through document sharing and comments [22] document-sharing facilitates the students who try to express what they have known/learned/experienced to a real use when the peer challenge it.

3. METHOD

The researchers used a quantitative approach. A quantitative approach to research employs numerical data, investigates a limited number of variables, and is concerned with explaining cause-and-effect correlations. [23], [24]. Using an experimental research design, the researchers are applying the quasi-experimental design to improve students' argumentative writing collaboratively by using peer feedback. A class is designed as one group pre-test and post-test. The students were not using the peer feedback before. Peer feedback is applied to get the improvement of argumentative writing quality by applying peer feedback.

For this article, there are two different types of variables: independent variables and dependent variables. The usage of peer feedback in producing argumentative essays served as the research's independent variable.. The dependent variable

was the students' skill in writing argumentative. The population of the researcher was 21 students in the province of East Java in Indonesia where English is taught as a foreign language. It is the second-semester students of EFL in Islamic Early Childhood Education of IAI Diponegoro Nganjuk. The sample is collected using total sampling. Overall sampling is a method of data collection when the total sample size is equal to the total population. [25]

On the other hand, the students having low self-confidence tend to be pessimistic, exert less effort in the some stages. They worry to make mistake when they are writing text in freewriting and drafting stage, especially challenged to follow some stages in writing process, demanding ones, and it causes to achieve less success. A lack of confidence, or being under-confident, will prevent a person to take risks in editing stage, they refuse new challenges to publish their written text with friends or school magazine. The students with of low self-confidence are feeling of guilt, fear, depression, and doubt. They are lazily involved in the class discussion and they do not have enough enthusiasm in learning (Dorothy Lafrinere, Self-Confidence: 3). Since low self-confidence exaggerates one's limitations in ability, quality, and possibility for progress, it might be categorized as a negative emotion or hallucination.. Some consequences of having low self confidence, they are: fear and even paralyze to inaction, avoid making the wrong decisions, have no trust that your decision was the best for the circumstance (Thubten Chodron, 6 ways to overcoming low self-confidence: 4). Therefore, the students who have high self-confidence are supposed to have better writing ability than the students who have low self-confidence.

The students in one class treated jotting the argumentative writing by applying peer feedback. Data collection involved using a pre-test, treatment, and post-test technique. The pre-test and post-test were used to compare the writing abilities of the students in the collaborative writing class before and after the implementation of peer feedback. To determine whether integrating peer feedback on collaborative writing had a meaningful impact, the pre- and post-test scores were computed using a t-test. According to [26] the formula of the test is

$$t = \frac{\bar{MD}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - (\sum D)^2}{N(N-1)}}}$$

the formula describes the following; t means computation score, Md stands for Means of difference. The term means of difference here is between pre-test and final-test, $\sum D^2$ means the addition of the squared distinctive score, N is the Subject of the research, and db means the subtraction of N-1. The

hypothesis states that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) stated that the significant effect of peer feedback implemented in argumentative collaborative writing is accepted. Null Hypothesis (Ho) stated that there is no significant effect of peer feedback on collaborative writing.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The implementations of the peer feedback were viewed from students' self-confidence. There was different treatment applied for both groups. For the experimental group: First, the teacher explained what peer feedback is, how to do peer feedback, and what elements of writing they had to revise. Second, the researchers explain the material of argumentative writing, and how to write structured argumentative text. After that, the teacher asked students drafts change their draft with a partner. Then, the teacher gave a feedback checklist and a peer-feedback form to each student. Next, students responded to their partner's draft in written form. Lastly, the teacher asked students to give the text back to their partner who had commented. The control group was a different treatment from the experimental one. The experimental group was given feedback from each pair while in the control group, the teacher gives feedback to each draft written by the students.

Before giving treatment to each group, the researchers conducted pre-test of the experimental group as follows:

S	Pre	Post	D	D2
1	72	80	8	64
2	80	100	20	400
3	60	80	20	400
4	72	72	0	0
5	60	72	12	144
6	66	70	4	16
7	80	80	0	0
8	70	82	12	144
9	72	80	8	64
10	62	80	18	324
11	76	83	7	49
12	60	75	5	25
13	80	88	8	64
14	82	90	8	64
15	80	88	8	64
16	72	88	16	256
17	75	85	10	100

18	60	85	25	625
19	72	82	10	100
20	56	70	14	196
	80	90	10	100
	$\sum X_1$ 1487	$\sum X_2$ 1720	$\sum D$ 233	$\sum D^2$ 3399

The researcher calculated mean of difference (MD) between variabel X dan Y, as the result below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 MD &= \frac{\sum D}{N} \\
 &= \frac{233}{21} = 11.09 \\
 D^2 &= 11.09^2 \\
 &= 122.98
 \end{aligned}$$

The researcher calculated standard deviation of differences (SD_D):

$$\begin{aligned}
 SD_D &= \sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2}{N} - D^2} \\
 &= \sqrt{\frac{3399}{21} - 122.98} \\
 &= \sqrt{161.85 - 122.98} \\
 &= \sqrt{38.87} = 6.23
 \end{aligned}$$

The Researchers found the standard error by calculating the mean of differences (SEMD) from both variables X and Y:

$$\begin{aligned}
 SEMD &= \frac{SD_D}{\sqrt{N-1}} \\
 &= \frac{6.23}{\sqrt{21-1}} \\
 &= \frac{6.23}{\sqrt{20}} \\
 &= \frac{6.23}{4.47} = 1.39
 \end{aligned}$$

The result of observation (to) has been found by the researchers. The finding is based on the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 to &= \frac{MD}{SEMD} \\
 &= \frac{11.09}{1.39} = 7.97
 \end{aligned}$$

The researcher stated the degree of freedom (df):

$$df = N - 1$$

$$= 21 - 1$$

$$= 20$$

The calculation of scores gotten by the researcher as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 N &= 21 & \sum D^2 &= 3399 \\
 \sum D &= 233 & SD &= 6.23 \\
 D &= 11.09
 \end{aligned}$$

The above mentioned analysis findings revealed that the t-calculated test's t-value was 7.79, while the required critical t-value was at $p > .05$ level of significance of two tailed test is 2,086 (df = 20), $p > .01$ level. The significant of the two tailed test is 2,845 (df = 20). The analysis of the data reveals that the results of the student's score improvement on the pretest and posttest differ.

Data collection techniques for self confidence is done by spread the questionnaire. The shape of the scale used in the study is the scale Likert model, with four alternatives answer choices consisting of positive statement and statements.

From processing results Initial score calculation shows that students who have self high-confidence have as good progress in collaborative writing and giving peer feedback but in vice versa students who have low self-confidence have the ability to write argumentative writing is not as good as one who have high confidence. This shows that self-confidence have an influence on ability of students writing improvement.

No	SC_score	Pre T score	Post T score	Imprv
1	62	72	80	-
2	90	80	100	V
3	90	60	80	V
4	60	72	72	-
5	85	60	72	V
6	64	66	70	-
7	60	80	80	-
8	85	70	82	V
9	60	72	80	-
10	88	62	80	V
11	70	76	83	-
12	65	60	75	-
13	68	80	88	-
14	64	82	90	-
15	70	80	88	-
16	87	72	88	V
17	70	75	85	-
18	95	60	85	V
19	67	72	82	-
20	86	56	70	V
21	65	80	90	-

CONCLUSION

21 students of the second-semester in English Foreign Language of Islamic Early Childhood Education of IAI Diponegoro Nganjuk were taught the argumentative writing text collaboratively using peer

feedback. Those who have high self-confidence were very enthusiastic in giving feedback to the peer's draft. While those having low self-confidence were felt not confident and afraid of being wrong to write the comment on pair's draft. The student's self-confident greatly affect the writing draft. The increasing result of pre-test to post-test indicates the improvement of EFL students writing quality. The findings of this study can explain how google docs could provide support for students' collaborative writing processes and how it could show the importance of emotional, social, material, and temporal aspects related to collaborative writing outcomes and improving collaborative writing outcomes for students who have high self-confidence. And for further researcher can explore another platform for conducting collaboration in writing such quip or other notes.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

The title manuscript of "THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PEER FEEDBACK IN COLLABORATIVE WRITING VIEWED FROM SELF-CONFIDENCE". The first author focused on background and literature of the research, the second author is responsible in analysing the data. For collecting data in research field is the responsibility of the third author.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to Early Childhood Education of IAI Diponegoro Nganjuk for the time and the place for conducting the research and doing the research and giving treatment to the students.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Celce-Murcia, "Language teaching approaches: An overview," *Teach. English as a Second or foreign Lang.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 3–10, 2001.
- [2] B. D. Aminovna, "Importance of coherence and cohesion in writing," *Eurasian Res. Bull.*, vol. 4, pp. 83–89, 2022.
- [3] H. Phelan and M. Nunan, "To write or not to write? The contested nature and role of writing in arts practice research," *J. Res. Pract.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. M3–M3, 2018.
- [4] Y. Primasari, H. P. Sari, and N. Sutanti, "The CHAIN WRITING METHOD IN LEARNING WRITING FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FACULTY STUDENTS: The Effectiveness," *JARES (Journal Acad. Res. Sci.)*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 49–58, 2021.
- [5] D. Nunan, *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. ERIC, 1999.
- [6] T. Wallace, W. E. Stariha, and H. J. Walberg, *Teaching speaking, listening and writing*. International Academy of Education, 2004.
- [7] L. M. Sadiku, "The importance of four skills reading, speaking, writing, listening in a lesson hour," *Eur. J. Lang. Lit.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 29–31, 2015.
- [8] A. Ramet, *Creative writing*. Hachette UK, 2011.
- [9] G. Bolton, *Write yourself: Creative writing and personal development*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2011.
- [10] J. Vachek, "Written language," in *Written Language*, De Gruyter Mouton, 2015.
- [11] M. Bachani, "Teaching writing," *Waymade Coll. Educ. Vallabh Vidyanaagar. Available http://http://www.waymadedu.org/StudentSupport/Teaching%20Writing.pdf* *Статья поступила в редакцию*, vol. 1, p. 15, 2015.
- [12] D. Galbraith, "Writing as a knowledge-constituting process," *Knowing what to write Concept. Process. text Prod.*, vol. 4, pp. 139–164, 1999.
- [13] D. Brown, "The Written Corrective Feedback Debate: Next Steps for Classroom Teachers and Practitioners," *TESOL Q.*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 861–867, 2012, doi: 10.1002/tesq.63.
- [14] A. Rouhi and E. Azizian, "Peer review: Is Giving Corrective Feedback Better than Receiving it in L2 Writing?," *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 93, pp. 1349–1354, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.042.
- [15] C. L. Keh, "Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation," *ELT J.*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 294–304, 1990, doi: 10.1093/elt/44.4.294.
- [16] P. Rollinson, "Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class," *ELT J.*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 23–30, 2005, doi: 10.1093/elt/cci003.
- [17] W. Wu, "The effect of blog peer review and teacher feedback on the revisions of EFL writers," *J. Educ.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 125–138, 2006.
- [18] K. Hyland, "Faculty feedback: Perceptions and practices in L2 disciplinary writing," *J. Second Lang. Writ.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 240–253, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.003.
- [19] D. Lestari, H. Susiarno, and H. Sukandar, "METODE PEMBELAJARAN KOMBINASI (SELF DAN PEER ASSESSMENT) EFEKTIF MENINGKATKAN KETERAMPILAN MAHASISWA DI LABORATORIUM KLINIK," *Care J. Ilm. Ilmu Kesehat.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 48–61, 2020.
- [20] X. Cheng and L. J. Zhang, "Teacher written feedback on English as a foreign language learners' writing: Examining native and nonnative English-speaking teachers' practices in feedback provision," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 12, p. 629921, 2021.
- [21] M. K. Stewart, "Communities of Inquiry: A Heuristic for Designing and Assessing Interactive Learning Activities in Technology-Mediated FYC," *Comput. Compos.*, vol. 45, pp. 67–84, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.compcom.2017.06.004.
- [22] M. M. M. Abdelmalak, "Web 2.0 technologies and building online learning communities: Students' perspectives," *J. Asynchronous Learn. Netw.*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2015, doi: 10.24059/olj.v19i2.413.
- [23] O. D. Apuke, "Quantitative research methods: A synopsis approach," *Kuwait Chapter Arab. J. Bus. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 33, no. 5471, pp. 1–8, 2017.
- [24] D. Sugiyono, "Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D," 2013.
- [25] I. Etikan, S. A. Musa, and R. S. Alkassim, "Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling," *Am. J. Theor. Appl. Stat.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–4, 2016.
- [26] S. Arikunto, "Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, Cet," *Ke-13*, 2010.