

Collaborative Written Feedback Experience: A Case Study of Indonesian EFL Students in an Essay Writing Class

Yanti Sri Rezeki

(yantisrirezeki@gmail.com)

Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Universitas Tanjungpura

Abstract: Implementing collaborative written feedback instruction is a way to develop students' awareness of writing as a process, the benefits of peer review and feedback, and the important roles of peer interaction for learning. The current research aimed at understanding students' experiences of providing and responding to written feedback in group. It specifically sought to answer these questions: 1.) What are students' perceptions toward collaborative written feedback experience? 2) What are students' collaborative written feedback practices? and 3). What factors affect students' collaborative written feedback experience? Conducted as a qualitative case study, the research reported the collaborative written feedback experiences of a group of three undergraduate EFL students in Essay Writing course. Data were drawn from observations, focus group interview, student reflective essay, and collection of related documents and artifacts. The findings show that students have positive perceptions toward collaborative written feedback instruction citing that it helps them improve their writing and develop their interpersonal skills. The study also reveals that changing roles in the group and the use of media platform to communicate are among the strategies employed in collaborative written feedback practices. Factors such as peer's characteristics, level of confidence and task seemed to have affected these practices. Suggestions on the ways in which collaborative written feedback instruction can be implemented effectively are also provided.

Keywords: *peer feedback, collaborative writing instruction, collaborative written feedback, EFL writing*

INTRODUCTION

English academic writing is an integral part of academic life of students who particularly major in English language. It is the main way lecturers use to assess the students' knowledge, competence, and performance (Tang, 2012). When taking courses, for example, lecturers usually assign students with written assignment or tasks, be it an essay, a paper, a proposal, or even a thesis. To perform such tasks well, students must be able to develop thorough and justified arguments in the manners that meet the rules or conventions of the language. To put it in other words, writing well in English means being able to produce a text with good unity, coherence, and cohesion while

conforming to the grammatical and syntactical rules as well as the mechanics of writing. Thus said, students' good command in academic writing is one of the parameters that determine success in their study.

Such tasks as mentioned above are especially challenging for students in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) higher education context because English is not the language with which they are familiar (Celce-Murcia, 2001; Richard & Renandya, 2002). This situation has urged writing teachers or instructors to implement various writing instructions to assist students to write in English better. Advocated by theories such as sociocultural theory (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Vygotsky, 1978), interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996) and output hypothesis (Swain, 2000), one such instruction is collaborative writing. When used in class, collaborative writing instruction requires students to write together with their peers either in pairs or in groups (Storch, 2013).

Collaborative writing especially in L2 (English is additional language) context has been researched quite extensively either in the classroom or online mode of learning. Researchers focused their investigations on its effectiveness toward students' writing quality, students' perceptions regarding its benefits and challenges, influential factors, as well as group dynamic during collaborative writing activities (e.g., Fernández Dobao, 2012; Mutwarasibo, 2013; Pathinathan & Yong, 2012). Among other findings, these studies present evidence that L2 collaborative writing affords learners with opportunities to develop their English oral as well as written skills by interacting with one another to discuss and negotiate ideas (Storch, 2013; Rezeki, 2016). In addition, a study by Fernández Dobao (2012) showed that students perceived working collaboratively in small groups more effective than in pairs arguing that more members meant more ideas to share. They reported that this led to more opportunities to use the target language. Research conducted by Pathinathan and Yong (2012) and Rezeki (2016) also add support to L2 collaborative writing in that in addition to language learning, collaborative writing also has influences on students' affective skills. Specifically, it allowed learners to increase their confidence to contribute to the group and develop their social or interpersonal skills including being responsible, open-minded, and respectful.

Nonetheless, while writing (and thus reviewing it) individually might require one to utilize his or her own knowledge and skill, writing collaboratively compel writers to negotiate ideas and come to an agreement (Storch, 2013). This process of collaborative writing might be challenging as conflicts due to individual differences possibly occur. Learners' learning styles and their level of English language proficiency might either promote or inhibit learning through collaboration (Rezeki, 2016; Mutwarasibo, 2013; Storch, 2013). Thus, students' familiarity to collaborative writing activities is key to its effective implementation (Storch, 2013).

In essence, peer feedback is a form of collaborative act as it involves collaboration between two or more individuals. Feedback from and to peers has also characterized collaborative writing activities. It is one of the writing stages the students must do when they produce a piece of writing together as a group. Nevertheless, the previous body of research has examined collaborative writing as a whole writing process (i.e., from the

beginning stage of collaboration until the text is produced). Moreover, these studies were mostly conducted in L1 or ESL settings. Little has been done to explore specifically the ways in which students provide and respond to feedback on the collaboratively produced writing (henceforth called collaborative written feedback), particularly in EFL higher education context. To bridge these research gaps, this study reported tertiary EFL students' perceptions toward collaborative written feedback, the ways in which they went about the collaborative written feedback experiences, and factors that influenced their meaning making of these experiences.

In general, peer feedback is defined as an activity in which students work together in pairs or in groups to provide feedback or suggestions on their peers' writing (Hirose, 2008; Yu & Hu, 2016). Peer feedback is believed to offer several benefits to students. This strong justification toward peer feedback especially in L2 writing instruction is offered by various theories including sociocultural theory, collaborative learning theory, interactionist theories, and process writing theory (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Liu & Hansen, 2002; Yu & Hu, 2016). In addition to practical reasons such as saving teachers' time to provide feedback on students' writing, these theoretical perspectives suggest that peer feedback can increase students' self-direction, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills as they engage in scaffolding activities and negotiation of ideas (Burkert & Wally, 2013; Yu & Hu, 2016). Additionally, peer feedback provides a sense of audience to student writers as they read and comment on one another's writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Lundstorm & Baker, 2009; Rezeki, 2016). This sense of real audience is expected to enhance students' awareness and willingness to produce a good quality piece of writing. Furthermore, several studies have shown that peer feedback activities also increased students' editing skills (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Storch, 2005).

Despite the benefits claimed by the research above, many teachers particularly in EFL writing context are still hesitant to implement peer feedback in their classes (Yu & Lee, 2014). Amongst the cited concerns are students' English language proficiency, their limited knowledge about writing and lack of feedback skills that could prevent them from giving useful feedback to their peers (Burkert & Wally, 2013; Hu & Lam, 2010; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Yu & Hu, 2016). Furthermore, there are also worries about whether peer feedback can be embraced by lower and higher English language proficiency learners. These lead to more research conducted to find out factors that affect peer feedback activities and its effectiveness toward student learning and writing.

The literatures surveyed above indicate that writing collaboratively is beneficial for L2 learners and that providing feedback to one another's writing affords those learners more opportunities for language learning and writing development. Nevertheless, the fact that teachers still have concerns regarding the effective implementation of peer feedback and that evidence is limited to peer feedback conducted on individual's work, the claim made in the current study is that more research is needed to investigate peer feedback in various contexts and classroom settings. Additionally, an in-depth understanding on EFL learners' peer feedback experience when providing and responding feedback to writing that results from group collaboration may provide sound evidence on the ways in which peer feedback can be further explored for more learning

opportunities. This study served these purposes by answering the following research questions:

1. What are students' perceptions toward collaborative written feedback experience?
2. What are students' collaborative written feedback practices?
3. What factors affect students' collaborative written feedback experience?

THE STUDY DESIGN

The best way to understand the students' experiences in collaborative written feedback is by understanding the ways in which students' perceive the roles of collaborative written feedback toward their learning, the ways in which they go about giving and responding to feedback collaboratively, and factors that affect their experiences. Hence, a qualitative case study approach was employed in this research. Yin (2014) highlights that a case study is "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the "case") in depth and within real-world context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident" (p. 10). Qualitative case study design enabled the researcher to answer the 'how' and 'why' questions of the topic under investigation (Yin, 2014). The bounded case presented here was collaborative written practices and perceptions of one collaborative group in a one semester EFL Essay Writing class.

Research context and participants

As part of a larger study on collaborative written feedback in an EFL class, this research was conducted in a teacher training institution of a state university in West Kalimantan, Indonesia. The study involved eighteen third semester student-teachers majoring in English language education enrolled in the Essay Writing class. Their ages ranged from 18 to 23 years old and only three of them were male. Based on the results of TOEFL-like placement test administered at the beginning of their study, the majority of these students can be categorized into low to high intermediate level of English language proficiency.

Essay Writing was one of the compulsory subjects for bachelor degree completion in the department. Before taking Essay Writing, these students have passed two prerequisite writing subjects offered earlier, that is, Writing for General Communication and Paragraph Writing. Essay Writing was a two-credit course and comprised of 100 minute-weekly meeting. In total, there were 16 meetings in one semester including mid term and final exam.

In general, the participants were used to doing pair or group work in their courses and giving feedback to their peers. However, at the time the study was conducted, none of them had experienced writing and doing peer feedback collaboratively as a group. During the semester, the students were assigned to write four types of essay

collaboratively in pairs and in small self-formed groups and due to time constraints, they were allowed to finish the writing outside the class. The instructor allocated some time in between the writing assignments of different types of essay to train students how to do peer feedback across pairs or groups. The instructor provided guidelines and explanation on how and what to focus when students did collaborative written feedback activities. The students also went through different designs of collaborative written feedback tasks. The one reported here was when all groups posted their group writing on the wall and they took turn to evaluate and provide feedback collaboratively on other groups' writing. There were six groups of three students in the class but the current report focused only on one group's collaborative written feedback perceptions and experiences. The group consisted of one male and two female students of slightly different English language proficiency. To maintain the confidentiality of the research participants, they were presented using pseudonyms: Ijul, (male, 20), Soraya (female, 19), and Krisda (female, 18).

Data collection and analysis

Data for this research were collected through classroom observation, group interviews, reflective essays, and document and artifact collection. The classroom observation took place during the semester and data were recorded through field notes and documentation of class artifacts (images and students' texts). Additionally, focus group interviews were held once at the end of the semester to obtain data about students' perceptions and the ways they made meaning of their collaborative written feedback experience in the Essay Writing class. Using a semi-structured interview guided by several main questions (Marshall & Rossman, 2011), the participants were interviewed in groups in which they used to work together during the collaborative written feedback activities. The researcher herself conducted the interviews which were audio-recorded and then transcribed verbatim. The interviews were held for 30 to 45 minutes for each group and the language mostly used in the interviews was English. However, the participants were free to respond in English, Indonesian, Malay, or a combination of these languages. Furthermore, to triangulate the data collection and analysis, the researcher also collected students' reflective essays on their collaborative written feedback experience, sample of their collaborative work, and classroom artifacts.

Furthermore, qualitative data analysis was employed in the study in which the researcher coded, explained, understood, and interpreted the data that has been collected. The process also involved simultaneous coding of raw data, reorganization, categorization into themes, as well as comparison of information (Creswell, 2014), all aiming at understanding the participants' meaningful experience in collaborative written feedback. Moreover, implementing the analysis technique into the present study, the researcher analyzed the transcribed narratives that came from the observation of participants' collaborative written feedback practices, their reflective essays, their accounts in the interviews and the documents or artifacts collected. Then, the researcher derived with common themes and interpretation and used them to answer the research questions. To maintain the readability of evidence quoted from the interview and reflective essays, the researcher carefully translated and made some grammatical as

well syntactical adjustments on the quotations without changing the original message the participants were trying to convey.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Students' Perceptions on Collaborative Written Feedback

The first research question asked the participants' perceptions about their collaborative written feedback experience during the Essay Writing class. The findings showed that all participants in the reported group had positive perceptions on giving and taking written feedback collaboratively. Ijul, Soraya, and Krisda mentioned in the reflections as well as in the interviews that collaborative written feedback was interesting, beneficial, and fun. For example, when talking about his collaborative writing experience that also included giving feedback collaboratively, Ijul wrote in his reflection that it is "one of the effective ways to improve our skills in writing because in collaborative writing, we will have more chances to share our ideas with our friends" (Ijul, Reflective essay). With regard to doing collaborative written feedback activities, Ijul stated in the focused-group interview:

I think that's cool because you know, we tried to analyze the errors in our friends' work and we also learned from it... and we collaborate with our friends. Sometimes I couldn't find the errors but my friends told me it is the wrong thing and you know, we collaborate to find the mistakes, not only one person correct the mistakes. If we only work by ourselves, we cannot find the mistakes because we only have two eyes, right?
(Focused group interview)

Ijul's statement reveals his good perception toward collaborative written feedback particularly as he viewed it as a channel to improve his essay writing skills and ideas development. Ijul's experience proves that whereas reviewing a piece of writing individually might be daunting to learners, having peers affords extra eyes and thoughts to identify errors more quickly and to work on them more effectively (Fernandez Dobao, 2012). Ijul's point of view about the richness of ideas that he and his peers could share also resonate with his other group member, Krisda. Krisda stated that with more minds working on a project, there were likely more ideas and varieties of perspectives which could prevent them from getting writer's block (Reflective essay). In addition to diversity of opinions, Krisda added in her note that numerous writers mean better division of labor and multiple proofreaders. This goes in line with the benefit of working collaboratively which offers opportunities to pool knowledge from wider sources, that is peers in the group (Fernandez Dobao, 2012; Shehadeh, 2011, Storch, 2013).

On another occasion, the last group member, Soraya, reflected in her essay that collaborative written feedback was beneficial to her in that it advanced her understanding about conventions in essay writing and enabled her to learn from others' mistakes. She elaborated:

When I did collaborative written feedback with my friends in group, it helps me understand the rules of writing an essay. My friends explained to me the appropriate grammar and sentence to complete the paragraph of essay. It gives me a lot of knowledge to be a better writer... When I proofread people's essay with my group, they help me to find out the mistakes in the essay. They explain to me why it can be wrong and what is right. Seeing other people's mistakes in writing helped me to avoid those mistakes from being done in my writing.

(Soraya, Reflective essay)

Writing is supposed to be purposeful in way that it should meet the needs of targeted audience. Having peers who could help identify mistakes in a piece of writing and assist with ways to revise it equal to having projected readers (Storch, 2013) and this may increase learner's awareness of audience (McAllister, 2005). Ijul, Soraya, and Krisda all agreed in the group interview that collaborative written feedback activities affected their own writing and thinking skills. They stated that providing and responding to feedback collaboratively had built their awareness to think more carefully when writing in order to avoid mistakes, for example related to parallel structure, mechanics of writing, and inappropriate use of transition words.

In addition to evidence related to language learning, the participants' accounts also indicate affordances of increased interpersonal or social skills through collaborative written feedback activities. For example, Krisda observed the possibilities of collaborative written feedback activities to improve their sense of responsibility and accountability through job divisions (Krisda, Reflective essay). She also reiterated that collaborative written feedback activities could be a good means to develop better skills to interact with others. Furthermore, an important aspect to create good relationship and collaboration in a group is member's ability to control his or her emotion. In line with this, Ijul expressed his weakness when working with others and how doing repeated collaborative written feedback activities helped him decrease such drawback. He explained:

It goes without saying that appreciating my friends' ideas is still difficult for me. I sometimes become selfish to listen to my friends' saying. However, because it was a group work, I always tried not to see only from my point of view, but also from friends. According to my previous collaborative writing, I found it difficult due to my selfish way in accepting my friends' arguments. I could not believe their opinion because I always thought that mine is always better. But, by the time, I tried to solve it by asking suggestion from my classmates. Finally, I could make it.

(Focused group interview)

Ijul's explanation points to the role of collaborative written activities in helping learners to be open-minded (Pathinathan, 2012; Rezeki, 2016) while also being analytical to others' point of view.

The findings presented above enabled the researcher to conclude that overall, students have good perceptions about collaborative written feedback. As reported, collaborative written feedback experiences were valuable for them because they could learn how to

improve their essay writing skill and to work with others well. These positive findings yielded more implementation of collaborative written feedback instruction especially in EFL writing context.

Students' Collaborative Written Feedback Practices

While the participants in this class were assigned the same types of tasks when doing collaborative written feedback activities in class, they seem to have displayed various strategies or ways to work on the tasks. The most noticeable strategies that the students' employed when doing collaborative written feedback activities were proofreading all sections and discussing feedback together as a group from beginning to end. They also discussed and verified what and how to respond to others' feedback on their group writing together. In addition, since sometimes these students had to continue working outside the class, they tackled difficulties to maintain contact by creating group chat on various platforms such as Line and BBM. Finally, the ways in which the participants went about the collaborative written feedback was visible from the types of feedback they provided on other groups' essays. All these practices are evident in the case of Ijul, Soraya, and Krisda's group as discussed below.

First, while the participants occasionally divided jobs to write a specific part of an essay (Lai, 2011) on individual basis and later to be discussed together as a group, they approached the collaborative written feedback quite differently. Ijul, Soraya, and Krisda asserted that they went about proofreading, reviewing, and providing feedback collaboratively without labor divisions. They all worked at the same time, paying attention to various aspects of writing including the content, organization, grammar, and mechanics of writing. In other words, they did not assign members a specific element of writing to work on individually. Each member attempted to review others' essays while at the same time discussed the appropriate feedback they should give. Soraya contends, "We didn't divide the job, we just read the writing together, step by step. Then, we were like, oh, this is wrong, this is correct. We discussed together" (Focused group interview). Likewise, Ijul supported Soraya's statement, saying: "We don't have prior agreement so we just see other group's writing and find whatever mistakes we can find" (Focused group interview). Moreover, the researcher's observation also confirmed that these three participants engaged themselves in peer reviewing collaboratively in that each had his or her own pen, trying to evaluate the other groups' essays together, and talked to one another to discuss their thoughts (10/04/17/ Fieldnotes).

The next strategy that the students utilized to approach collaborative written feedback tasks especially when they had to continue working outside the class was by chatting through BlackBerry Messenger (BBM). As elicited in the interview, Ijul, Soraya, and Krisda stated that since they had different agenda and that they lived far away from one another, they agreed to create a BBM group chat to facilitate dialogues and collaboration. Soraya and Krisda stated in the interview that it was Ijul's idea to use the BBM group chat for the group work. Krisda explained, "BBM group chat made it easier for us to check our ideas so we don't need to ask others one by one. We can just post them in the group. It saved time" (Focused group interview). From the interview, it was

clear that the communication they had through BBM group chat was in situation in which each of them was responsible to write a specific part of an essay for the group. To put it in another way, their collaborative written feedback practices were mostly done face to face, including when they had to respond to others' feedback on their essay. Ijul confirmed this by saying, "We discuss the feedback not on chat but we meet directly. There should be some considerations" (Focused group interview).

Finally, students' collaborative written feedback practices can be seen from the ways in which they provided feedback and responded to others' feedback on their essay. From the sample texts on which varieties of correction symbols and notes from different groups could be seen, participants had likely addressed various aspects of the essay, including grammar, content or ideas, organization, and mechanics of writing. When they noticed something that they considered needing correction on other groups' essays, Ijul, Soraya, and Krisda would usually put circles or lines. Soraya explained, "We always firstly focused on grammar although we did not make any agreement about [addressing] this aspect...punctuation mistakes, and then the ways they explore the idea. Sometimes my friends don't have focused ideas so I underlined it" (Focused group interview). When asked the type of feedback they gave to their peers, Ijul stated, "So sometimes we provide direct feedback but sometimes we just put circle. For example we circle the words then we said 'this should be made parallel'" (Focused group interview). Soraya added that they usually provide positive feedback to motivate their peers. She asserted, "sometimes we say 'your paragraph is already good but still has some mistakes. To motivate them, not always say negative things'" (Focused group interview). In terms of responding to peer's feedback on their essay, the three participants confirmed that they did not follow all those suggestions. They would discuss them first before responding.

Overall, the group whose members were Ijul, Soraya, and Krisda had experienced collaborative written feedback activities by deploying various strategies based on common goals. Such strategies include addressing all elements of essay writing, creating BBM chat group to bridge communication when working outside the class, providing direct and indirect feedback, and motivating their peers through positive feedback.

Factors Affecting Students' Collaborative Written Feedback Experience

As any other forms of instruction suggest, students' perceptions and experiences in collaborative written feedback might be influenced by various factors. The findings show that member's personal characteristics, confidence due to level of English language proficiency, and types of task were among the major factors affecting participants' ways of making meaning of their collaborative written feedback experiences.

In relation to member's personal characteristics, participants in the study reported that working with peers who are not selfish and willing to accept others' ideas could accommodate them in finishing the tasks. Ijul explicitly confirmed this in his reflection,

stating that the benefits of learning through collaborative written feedback activities can be felt only when all group members are able to work well as a team (Reflective essay). Furthermore, Soraya also described her unpleasant experience with group. She reported:

At the beginning, I actually have had a hard time. I got angry with [Ijul]. Like last time when I asked him, “Should it be like this?” and he was like “No! He told us “It should be like this, like this”. So, I felt very upset. Maybe he had good intention telling us that but everyone must have their ego and that they want to show it, so I felt upset. I said, “Why should we work in group if we don’t want to listen to other people’s ideas?” But then I felt guilty after saying that. I learned that we should be able to hold our ego and I know that [Ijul] is more expert than I am. So the problem is about our own ego, how to agree and accept with others’ ideas.

(Focused group interview).

The conflict between Ijul and Soraya had put Krisda in the middle and affected the ways she experienced collaborative written feedback. Interestingly, being in the middle, Krisda turned out to playing a mediator role to get both her peers back to collaborating in the group. It can be concluded that learners’ ability to avoid individualism and selfishness might interrupt positive learning opportunities during collaborative written feedback activities.

Another factor that appears to have influenced participants’ experiences in collaborative written feedback as evident in the study is learner’s confidence to contribute to the group. Problems with confidence as observed in this study seemed to relate with the learner’s level of English proficiency. Observable in the group was that among the three participants, only Ijul who seemed to have confidence in giving and responding to peer feedback. The reason could be attributed to his English language proficiency level, which was higher than Soraya and Krisda’s. Due to his English language capability, Ijul always became the source person to his peers. For example, Soraya admitted that when she faced problems beyond her knowledge, she would count on Ijul: “I don’t feel confident because I lack in grammar. So I usually asked Ijul to handle it.” (Focused group interview). Similarly, Krisda stated:

When I was asked to scribe, sometimes I asked confirmation about the feedback. I don’t really feel confident because I lack of grammar, so many mistakes in my writing. So, when I tried to proofread other’s writing, I always asked Ijul for clarification. I was afraid that I would give wrong feedback.

(Focused group interview)

On the other hand, while admitting that he has confidence in providing feedback related to grammar, Ijul also expressed his concerns about lacking the ability to write with strong unity and coherence. He stated, “I am quite confident with the grammar but not for the unity, even for my own writing. Too many ideas” (Focused group interview). These findings suggest that the students’ confidence relates closely to their perceived language competence. Although Ijul was among the few students with high English language proficiency, his perceived incapability related to unity and coherence aspects of writing could impede him from performing well in collaborative written feedback

activities. Having a group member with high English language proficiency seemed to be beneficial for lower proficiency peers such as Soraya and Krisda in this case study. Both regarded Ijul as a capable peer they could rely on. In fact, as Krisda put it, Ijul had helped increased her confidence in grammar aspect because “Ijul told me the correct form. He usually taught us so we became more confident the more we did collaborative written feedback activities” (Focused group interview). For Ijul, however, while as stated in the beginning that working with peers helped him with finding more ideas to explore, he inquired that his peers became more confident to criticize him. He stated, “ I am afraid they don’t feel confident to correct me. If you don’t like something just tell or say it to me. This is important for the group work. We should be open”. This implied that Ijul seemed to expect more from his peers.

The last major factor affecting students’ experiences in collaborative written feedback is the types of task they were assigned to do. In the assigned tasks reported, the students were required to post their group’s writing on the wall and then to circulate in the room while proofreading and giving feedback to several other groups’ writing. While such collaborative written feedback activities might be beneficial in that learners could give and receive meaningful feedback from their peers on their writing, time could hinder learners from performing as expected. Ijul, Soraya, and Krisda also expressed this concern that they often time could not provide much feedback due to running out of time (Focused group interview; Classroom observation). Although this did not happen to Ijul’s group, it can be reported here that after the tasks were assigned to students more than once, some of the students seemed unenthusiastic to perform the tasks.

To conclude, the major factors that contributed to students’ experiences in collaborative written feedback reported in this study were individual characteristics, perceived level of English proficiency, and task types.

CONCLUSION

Making students aware that writing is a process that requires them to pay attention to writing rules and convention is important to improve the quality of their writing. Classroom instructions that require students to proofread, edit, review, and revise their writing are crucial. In order to promote these skills, students could be encouraged to accomplish them together with their peers as advocated by peer feedback supporters.

This research aimed to understand the ways in which EFL undergraduate students experienced collaborative written feedback instruction. The research findings suggested that students perceived their collaborative written feedback experiences as positive and valuable in that they were afforded to improve their writing skills and knowledge by learning with and from others. The findings also revealed that providing and responding to feedback collaboratively enabled them to develop interpersonal skills such as being open-minded, responsible, and respectful. Another conclusion that can be drawn from the research is that students employed different strategies in going about the collaborative written feedback tasks. Finally, it can be concluded that factors including group members’ characteristics, level of confidence, and task types influenced the

students' practices and the ways they understood their collaborative written feedback experiences.

Relying on the unique experiences of one EFL Essay writing class, the findings of the research could not be generalized to other larger context. Nevertheless, they can serve as sound evidence of the benefits or drawbacks of collaborative written feedback instruction when implemented in EFL writing classes.

REFERENCES

- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods (5th Ed.)*. New York: Pearson.
- Burkert, A. & Wally, J. (2013). Peer reviewing in in a collaborative teaching and learning environment. In M. Reitbauer, N. Campbell, S. Mercer, & J. Schumm-Fauster (Eds.), *Feedback matters: Current feedback practices in the EFL classroom*, (pp. 69-86). New York: Peter Lang Edition.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chatranonth, Phnita. (2008). *The impact of teacher feedback on students' grammatical writing accuracy: A case study in Thailand*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Manchester: The University of Manchester.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Fernández Dobao, A. (2012). Collaborative writing tasks in the L2 classroom: Comparing group, pair, and individual work. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(1), 40-58.
- Fernández Dobao, A., & Blum, A. (2013). Collaborative writing in pairs and small groups: Learners' attitudes and perceptions. *System*, 41(2), 365-378.
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). *Teaching ESL Composition: Purpose, Process, & Practice* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hu, G. W., & Lam, S. T. E. (2010). Issues of cultural appropriateness and pedagogical efficacy: Exploring peer review in a second language writing class. *Instructional Science*, 38, 371-394.
- Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 0(2), 83-101.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Teaching and researching writing (2nd. Ed.)*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hirose, Keiko. (2008). Peer feedback in L2 writing instruction. In K. Bradford Watts, T. & M. Swanson (Eds.), *JALT 2007 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.
- Lai, E. R. (2011). *Collaboration: A literature review*. Retrieved from <http://www.pearsonassessments.com/hai/images/tmrs/Collaboration-Review.pdf>
- Liu, J., & Hansen, J. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Liu, M., & Chai, Y. (2009). Attitudes toward peer review and reaction to peer feedback in Chinese EFL writing classroom. *TESL Reporter*, 42(1), 33-51.

- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. (2006) *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In R. William & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Lundstrom, K. & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 18(1), 30-43.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). London: Sage.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation. Revised and expanded from qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint.
- McAllister, C. H. (2005). Collaborative writing groups in the college classroom. In T. Kostouli (Ed.), *Writing in context(s): Textual practices and learning processes in sociocultural settings* (pp. 207-228). New York: Springer.
- Mutwarasibo, F. (2013). Promoting university students' collaborative learning through instructor-guided writing groups. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 2(3), 1-11.
- Pathinathan, S., & Yong, M. F. (2012). Intragroup conflicts during collaborative writing in an ESL/EFL preparatory programme. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(7). Retrieved from <http://www.ijalel.org/pdf/173.pdf>
- Rezeki, Y. S. (2016). *Indonesian English-as-a-foreign language learners' experiences in collaborative writing*. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Rochester, Rochester). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1802/30856>
- Rezeki, Y. S. (2016). *Language learning affordances in collaborative writing: A qualitative case study of Indonesian EFL undergraduate students*. Paper presented to the 63rd TEFLIN 2016 Conference, Surabaya.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge, U.K./New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process and students' reflection. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 153-173.
- Storch, N. (2013). *Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms: New perspective on language and education*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tang, R. (Ed.). (2012). *Academic writing in a second or foreign language: Issues and challenges facing ESL/EFL academic writers in higher education contexts*. London: Continuum International Pub.
- Vygotsky, L., S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Yin, R. (2014). *The case study research: Design and methods* (5th Ed.). Thousand Oaks: CA. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Yu, S., & Hu, G. (2016) Can higher-proficiency L2 learners benefit from working with lower-proficiency partners in peer feedback?, *Teaching in Higher Education*, DOI: 10.1080/13562517.2016.1221806
- Yu, S. & Hu, G. (2017). Understanding university students' peer feedback practices in

- EFL writing: Insights from a case study. *Assessing Writing*, 33, 25-35.
- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2014). Understanding EFL students' participation in group peer feedback of L2 writing: A case study from an activity theory perspective. *Language Teaching*, DOI: 10.1177/1362168814541714