Students’ Perception of Electronic Feedback: Lecturer, Peer, and Self-Electronic Feedback on Writing Academic With Different Students’ Writing Achievement
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This study investigates the critical role of writing as a fundamental skill requiring continuous refinement, particularly in professional settings where it underpins daily business, academic, and corporate interactions. Focused on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students, 30 participants from Universitas Islam Negeri Intan Lampung engaged in a clustered class setting. Utilizing a Likert-Scale questionnaire and SPSS version 26 for analysis, the research assessed students' perceptions of electronic feedback provided by instructors and peers. Findings indicate that while a majority of students received feedback on grammar, organization, and vocabulary, there’s a notable gap in self-feedback, with many feeling uncertain about error identification. While 75% acknowledge the instructor’s role in offering electronic feedback, 69% stress the importance of peer feedback. Interestingly, 75% deem self-feedback less impactful, citing uncertainty in error identification. These insights underscore the significance of targeted training to enhance English writing proficiency across diverse socio-cultural backgrounds.
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INTRODUCTION

Developing English language proficiency in writing among students is a crucial skill that should be cultivated in the classroom, serving as a key determinant of success. Notably, writing skills are inherently linked to reading, listening, and speaking, given that effective communication is the primary goal of writing (Mubarok, 2012; Celce-Murcia & Olstain, 2000; Leki, 1992). While syntax is often part of writing drills, the focal point in enhancing writing proficiency lies in the meaningful content expressed.

Writing holds significant importance in both professional and personal spheres, enabling individuals to clearly convey their views, opinions, feelings, and thoughts to avoid miscommunication. Expressing oneself can be challenging without a grasp of the technical flow of ideas, from introduction to discussion and conclusion. Additionally, maintaining coherence, cohesion, and unity in content is crucial for readers to understand better (Wali & Madani, 2020). The author plays a central role in transferring ideas to readers, forming the basis for constructive feedback. Written thoughts serve as documented communication read by the receiver, relaying one’s knowledge.

Teachers play a vital role in shaping students’ communication skills within the school environment. However, teachers need to be trained and experienced, recognizing that competency in teaching differs from the ability to write. A teacher’s impact on a student’s writing proficiency is influenced by the teacher/mentor’s identity and daily writing activities. Teachers can create effective educational materials, learning media, and strategies to address students’ needs and interests, facilitating a culture of self-improvement through activities like drills, written exercises, and critical thinking (Wali & Madani, 2020).

Part of writing skills development involves determining the students’ proficiency levels to identify their needs and bridge gaps. Monotonous teaching methods and uniform lessons hinder students’ transcendence of writing proficiency, limiting academic freedom. Teaching is about transferring knowledge and cultivating students’ know-how in writing. Developing writing skills should focus on expressing oneself rather than rigid syntactic norms, as effective communication stems from expressed knowledge (Bestari et al., 2019; Rasiban, 2018; Amanda, 2013). As seen in Silvia’s (2020) study, recognizing diverse student proficiency levels promotes inclusive teaching, encouraging individual development through personalized feedback (Chen, 2021).

Feedback is a fundamental element in the writing process, fostering a dynamic exchange of ideas between the writer and reader (Keh, 1990). Writing becomes an interaction between two or more people, influencing each other through active idea exchange. This interaction aligns with Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), where feedback influences the writer and evaluator, explaining how students’ writing abilities are developed (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2023).

In Saito’s (1994) study, feedback plays a crucial role in students’ self-reflection for improvement, while teachers provide encouragement and comments to drive students’ motivation. Hyland & Hyland (2001) explored the impact of peer-reviewed techniques on students’ development in speaking and writing using English, noting success in improving writing series. In the era of digital education, emphasis on electronic feedback (e-feedback) is essential, especially with the shift from face-to-face to distance learning. Tuzi’s (2004) study on e-feedback resonates with its positive impact on revising students’ written outputs despite a preference for oral feedback. This underscores the importance of dedicating time to e-feedback to elevate students’ writing skills.

Contemporary pedagogy demands a focus on e-feedback, given the shift to distance learning and specialized learning approaches. Tuzi’s (2004) study on the impact of e-feedback on second-language learners reinforces its effectiveness in enhancing written outputs. Teachers should allocate time to e-feedback, recognizing it as a convenient tool that provides clarity of expectations. This approach reports a higher educational value, contributing to increased grades and teacher regard (McCabe et al., 2011).

The researcher specifically focuses on the study of electronic feedback for several reasons. Firstly, understanding the current status of students in improving their language proficiency is necessary to justify the study. A prevalent problem in the English Language Education Department of UIN Raden Intan Lampung is students’ writing proficiency, marked by grammatical errors and essay-writing difficulties. With academic writing introduced in the fourth semester, this study sheds light on students’ writing...
concerns. Secondly, the English Language Education Department caters to students from four major ethnic groups (Java, Lampung, Palembang, and Padang), each with distinct language backgrounds and parental education influences. Exploring language errors arising from these influences aids teachers in providing culturally sensitive feedback, fostering a deeper sociocultural understanding. Lastly, the study delves into the efficiency of electronic feedback to enhance the writing proficiency of second language learners, contributing to the ongoing discourse on its effectiveness.

This research goes beyond merely identifying error models for each ethnic group. It employs these models as a basis for electronic feedback, adding nuance to the ongoing debate on the usefulness or burden of electronic feedback in language development. The study aims to provide electronic feedback to English for Foreign Learners (EFL) students, measuring its effects and understanding students’ perceptions as L2 learners. With some institutions already implementing electronic feedback, the study seeks to validate or reject its effectiveness, providing UIN Raden Intan Lampung’s English Language Education Department with a concrete basis for potential adoption. Lastly, the preliminary study highlights common difficulties learners face in paragraph writing during the third semester. These include grammatical syntax errors, specifically in Subject-Verb Agreement (SVA), sentence fragments, run-on, misspellings, and the use of punctuation marks. Difficulties also extend to content flow, such as organizing ideas, coherence, and unity. These challenges emphasize the need for innovative and alternative approaches to aid students in improving their writing skills.

Research Objectives
The primary aim of this study was to investigate students’ perception regarding electronic feedback from lecturers, peers, and self-assessment in academic writing, taking into account variations in students’ writing achievements.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design
This study utilized a descriptive quantitative research design, focusing on characterizing the population or phenomenon under investigation. The design prioritizes the “what” over the “why,” utilizing surveys to define respondent characteristics, measure data, and compare and validate findings. The questionnaire was used to gather insights into students’ perceptions of feedback from teachers, peers, and self-assessment.

Respondents of the Study
The study involved selecting 30 students from the 175 enrolled in English language education studies during the fourth semester at Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung. Arikunto’s (2017) guideline for determining sample size was followed, selecting 30 respondents from the entire population due to the smaller sample size. All distributed questionnaires received a 100% response rate.

The questionnaire consisted of four sections: (A) student profile (6 questions), (B) student perceptions of teacher feedback (5 items), (C) students’ perceptions of peers’ feedback (5 items), and (D) the student’s perceptions of self-feedback (5 items). In total, students responded to 15 items, addressing teacher feedback on content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanism, as well as peers’ feedback and self-feedback on the same aspects. The questionnaire utilized a 5-point Likert scale: strongly agree (5), agree (4), uncertain (3), disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1). The data collected through the Likert scale were analyzed using SPSS version 26. The questionnaire underwent development and validation by three field experts, and its reliability was confirmed with a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of 0.98.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION
The questionnaire was divided into two parts: demographic information (gender, writing achievement background, and age) and perceptions of feedback from lecturers, peers, and self-assessment. The data were collected using a 5-point Likert Scale format and analyzed using SPSS version 26.
Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 illustrates the characteristics of the 30 respondents. Of the participants, 20% were male, and 80% were female. The majority fell within the age group of 23-24 years (80%), with smaller percentages in the age groups of 17-20 years (17%) and 21-22 years (3%). The dominance of female students did not introduce subjectivity, as the study objectively assessed their writing performance. Notably, the students were mostly mature, aged 21-24, indicating readiness for constructive e-feedback strategies.

This study explores students’ perceptions of electronic feedback from various sources, considering their writing achievements. The quantitative and qualitative data collected aim to provide a comprehensive understanding of students’ and lecturers’ preferences and justifications for electronic feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the respondents’ Writing Achievement Backgrounds are predominantly Fair, comprising 40% (12 participants), followed by Low at 33% (10 participants). Additionally, 27% of participants (8) exhibit a High writing Achievement background. This indicates that many students involved in the e-feedback study fall within the Fair to Low proficiency levels, suggesting a need for substantial support to enhance their writing skills.

Perception on Electronic Feedback

Tables 2 and 3 present the students’ perceptions of electronic feedback, with results categorized into Strongly Agree (4.21-5.00), Agree (3.41-4.20), Uncertain (2.61-3.40), Disagree (1.81-2.60), and Strongly Disagree (1.00-1.80).

The study focused on three main indicators based on the quantitative data collected through closed-ended questions: (1) students’ perception of lecturer feedback, (2) students’ perception of peer feedback, and (3) students’ perception of self-feedback. Additionally, three open-ended questionnaires were administered, seeking insights into (1) students’ perception of lecturer electronic feedback, (2) students’ perception of peer electronic feedback, and (3) students’ perception of self-electronic feedback. Responses were interpreted using ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ for positive perceptions and ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘disagree’ for negative responses.

The study delved into three major topics: (1) findings on students’ perception of lecturer electronic feedback; (2) findings on students’ perception of peer electronic feedback, and (3) findings on students’ perception of self-feedback.

Students’ Perception of Lecturer Electronic Feedback

The initial study objective aimed to uncover students’ views on lecturer electronic feedback. Results from the questionnaires, with responses from 25 participants, are detailed in Table 2.
The first indicator highlights that participants receive lecturer electronic feedback concerning language aspects, specifically correct syntax, grammar, and mechanisms such as spelling, punctuation, and capitalization (Jhon et al., 2023). The second indicator emphasizes that lecturer electronic feedback primarily focuses on content, including unity, coherence, development, and clarity. The third indicator outlines the lecturer electronic feedback related to organization, addressing the content flow in writing, encompassing the introduction, body, and conclusion. Most participants (24% of High students, 30% of Fair students, and 27% of Low students) expressed satisfaction with lecturer feedback on grammar, content, organization, and vocabulary, indicating an appreciation for this form of assessment and evaluation in their learning process.

**TABLE 2**

**STUDENTS’ PERCEPTION OF THE LECTURER ELECTRONIC FEEDBACK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>The teacher gave feedback on grammar, including the right usage of grammar</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>The lecturer gave feedback on content, including the right usage of unity,</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>10 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coherence, development, and clarity of ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>The lecturer gave feedback on the organization including the right usage</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the introduction, the body; or the conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>The lecturer gave feedback on vocabulary including the right usage of</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meaning, vocabulary choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>The lecturer gave feedback on mechanism including spelling, punctuation,</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>10 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and capitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36 (24%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>46 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the computation of results using the Likert Scale determined that students across High, Fair, and Low proficiency levels perceived that they received feedback from lecturers on language form. Table 3 provides a detailed breakdown of the syntax, mechanism, content, and format indicators.
The findings presented in Table 3 indicate that the three indicators are associated with the perception of lecturer feedback across three writing achievement backgrounds of learners. The results show that High, Fair, and Low proficiency students predominantly perceived receiving feedback from lecturers on organization, encompassing the introduction, body, and conclusion, followed by grammar, vocabulary, content, and mechanism. Most students (75%) recognize the significance of lecturer-provided electronic feedback, emphasizing accountability for errors committed by the students.

One of the respondents stated:

“I think it is the lecturer’s responsibility to give feedback on the learners’ errors in writing. By doing so, there will be a writing improvement.” (A, High students’ interview).

Another student affirmed that:

“Lecturer’s feedback helps me to write Academic writing.” (A, Low students’ interview).

**Students’ Perception of Peer Electronic Feedback**

The second objective of the research aimed to explore students’ perceptions of peer electronic feedback. Participants were queried about their views on the application of peer-electronic feedback in writing class, with twenty-five responding participants, as shown in Table 5.

Table 3’s initial indicator depicts the outcome of peer electronic feedback concerning language elements, encompassing syntax and mechanism, which pertain to the accurate usage of grammar, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. The second indicator relates to peer electronic feedback dealing with writing content, particularly focusing on unity, coherence, development, and clarity of ideas. The third indicator addresses peer electronic feedback in content flow, involving organization in components such as the introduction, body, and conclusion. Notably, most participants (20% of High students, 27% of Fair students, and 26% of Low students) reported receiving peer feedback on syntax, mechanism, organization, content flow, and format. The Likert Scale elucidates students’ acceptance of the mentioned indicators in peer electronic feedback, highlighting the participants’ recognition of its value in their academic and professional growth, particularly in writing proficiency.
TABLE 4
STUDENTS’ PERCEPTION OF THE PEER ELECTRONIC FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>High Agree</th>
<th>High Not agree</th>
<th>Fair Agree</th>
<th>Fair Not agree</th>
<th>Low Agree</th>
<th>Low Not agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>The peer-feedback gave feedback on grammar, including the right usage of</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>The peer -feedback gave feedback on content, including the right usage of</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the unity, coherence, development, and clarity of ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>The peer-feedback gave feedback on the organization including the right</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>usage of the introduction, the body; or the conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>The peer feedback gave feedback on vocabulary including the right usage of</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meaning, vocabulary choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>The peer -feedback gave feedback on mechanism including spelling,</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>10 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>punctuation, and capitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30 (20%)</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
<td>40 (27%)</td>
<td>20 (13%)</td>
<td>39 (26%)</td>
<td>11 (7%)</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the computation of results using the Likert Scale indicated that High, Fair, and Low students perceived that they received peer feedback on language elements, specifically focusing on the correct use of syntax and mechanism, encompassing grammar, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization, as outlined in Table 5.

The findings in Table 4 shed light on three aspects related to the perception of peer feedback across three ethnic groups of learners. As per the results, High, Fair, and Low students predominantly felt that they received peer feedback on language forms, including correct grammar, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. A significant majority of students (69%) grasp the significance of peer electronic feedback as it underscores the educators’ responsibility to enable learners to rectify their errors in writing.
TABLE 5
LIKERT SCALE RESULTS ON THE PEER ELECTRONIC FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>The peer-feedback gave feedback on grammar, including the right usage of grammar</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>The peer-feedback gave feedback on content, including the right usage of the unity, coherence, development, and clarity of ideas</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>The peer-feedback gave feedback on organization including the right usage of the introduction, the body; or the conclusion</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>The peer-feedback gave feedback on vocabulary including the right usage of meaning, vocabulary choice</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>The peer-feedback gives me with feedback on mechanism including spelling, punctuation, and capitalization</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One respondent stated:

“I think peer feedback will greatly contribute to my language improvement in writing.” (A, Fair students’ interview).

Another student affirmed:

“Peer feedback also helps me in writing academic writing.” (A, High students’ interview).

Additionally, in the written interviews, participants emphasized the importance of peers correcting specific grammatical errors like verb agreement, punctuation, and misspelling rather than focusing on the content.

**Students’ Perception of the Self-Electronic Feedback**

The study’s third objective was to uncover students’ perspectives on self-electronic feedback. Participants were queried about their views on self-electronic feedback, and the findings are outlined in Table 6.

Self-electronic feedback, about language forms such as syntax and mechanism that specifically relate to the accurate use of grammar, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization, indicated that students from all ethnic backgrounds disagreed with the notion of engaging in self-electronic feedback on grammar and mechanism, content, and organization. Despite the majority of participants (17% of High students, 27% of Fair students, and 20% of Low students) feeling that they did not receive self-feedback on syntax, mechanism, content, and organization—especially regarding the correct use of grammar, unity, coherence, development, clarity, introduction, body, and conclusion, as well as vocabulary including the proper use of meaning, vocabulary choice, and mechanisms such as spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. Participants perceive little value in self-electronic feedback, suggesting a misalignment between their skills and the required constructive criticism. Although participants may enhance their writing based on technical knowledge, refining their writing based on the language’s intricacies may remain elusive.

The Likert Scale computation indicated that learners did not receive self-feedback on language form, content, and organization, as delineated in Table 6.
### Table 6
**Students’ Perception on the Self - Electronic Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>The self-feedback gives me with feedback on grammar, including the right usage of grammar</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>The peer feedback gives me with feedback on content, including the right usage of the unity of the ideas, coherence of the ideas, development of ideas, and clarity of ideas</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>The peer feedback gives me with feedback on organization including the right usage of the introduction, the body; or the conclusion</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>The peer feedback gives me with feedback on vocabulary including the right usage of meaning, vocabulary choice</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>10 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>The peer feedback gives me with feedback on mechanism including spelling, punctuation, and capitalization</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>7 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15 (10%)</td>
<td>25 (17%)</td>
<td>19 (13%)</td>
<td>41 (27%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcomes presented in Table 7 highlighted five items (items 1, 2, and 3) associated with the three writing achievement backgrounds of learners’ perceptions of peer feedback. In line with these results, High, Fair, and Low students predominantly believed that they did not receive self-feedback on grammar, encompassing the correct usage of grammar, and on content, which involves unity, coherence, development, and clarity. Additionally, they perceived a lack of feedback on organization, covering the appropriate use of introduction, body, and conclusion, as well as on vocabulary, encompassing meaning, vocabulary choice, and mechanism, including spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.
TABLE 7
LIKERT SCALE RESULTS ON THE SELF-ELECTRONIC FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>The self-feedback gave feedback on grammar, including the right usage of grammar</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>The peer feedback gave feedback on content, including the right usage of the unity of the ideas, coherence of ideas, development of ideas, and clarity of ideas</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>The peer feedback gave feedback on organization including the right usage of the introduction, the body; or the conclusion</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>The peer feedback gave feedback on vocabulary including the right usage of meaning, vocabulary choice</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>The peer feedback gave feedback on mechanics including spelling, punctuation, and capitalization</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A belief is held by most students (75%) that self-feedback is not considered too important for improving their language development. This is argued because benefits are not obtained from self-feedback due to uncertainties in identifying and correcting errors.

One respondent stated:

“I think self-feedback is not important for me because I have no benefits from it when I write an argumentative essay.” (A, High students’ interview).

Another student affirmed:

“I am not sure about the errors I revised.” (A, Fair students’ interview).

Furthermore, the written interviews asserted that self-feedback did not contribute to language improvement, attributing it to uncertainties about identifying errors for revision. One respondent mentioned,

“I do not get benefits from self-feedback because I do not believe in the errors I revised in my composition. I need somebody else to revise my composition.” (A, Low students’ interview).

Benefits resulting from the lecturer’s feedback were reported by EFL learners, including an increase in grammar accuracy, as well as improvements in organization and content in paragraph writing. Notably, the writing lecturer highlighted an emphasis on grammatical errors in the feedback.

“I get some benefits in increasing grammar because the writing lecturer emphasized on grammatical errors in giving feedback for my composition.” (A, High students’ interview at August, 15, 2022 in Room F.2.2.A).

Benefits derived from the feedback, particularly in writing organization and content, were expressed by the student. The individual highlighted the positive impact of Writing Correction Feedback (WCF), stating that it made organizing ideas in writing much easier.
“I get benefits from the feedback mainly in writing organization and content. Formerly, it is hard for me to organize my ideas in writing. However, after being treated using WCF, I can easily organize the ideas.” (A, Low students’ interview on August, 15, 2022 in Room F.2.2.A).

L2 learners generally preferred correction on the texts, as it was deemed easier to comprehend the errors. Also, another respondent said that:

“Well, about the way the lecturer corrects, I prefer to be corrected on the texts than others, because it is easy to follow” (A, Fair students’ interview on August, 15, 2022 in Room F.2.2.A).

The learners’ interviews indicate an appreciation for the lecturer’s electronic feedback, highlighting the opportunity it provides to learn from mistakes and revise their work for improved submissions. The EFL learners acknowledge the advantages of electronic feedback as an innovative strategy fostering confidence in writing proficiency.

DISCUSSION

The study’s findings on learners’ attitudes toward electronic feedback covered their perspectives on lecturers, peers, and self-feedback. Initially, 80% of participants emphasized that receiving electronic feedback from lecturers is part of the lecturers’ responsibility for learner development. Second, 69% recognized the impact of peer-electronic feedback, acknowledging its role in reviewing works, identifying common mistakes, and benefiting from peers’ insights. However, 75% expressed disinterest in self-feedback, attributing it to perceived ineffectiveness in improving linguistic skills and lack of confidence in language proficiency.

Responses indicated mutual appreciation between learners and lecturers for electronic feedback. The feedback process involved two rounds for each learner’s composition: initial feedback from the lecturer, followed by student revisions, a second draft corrected by peers, and, finally, learners producing the final draft.

The study revealed a positive stance from both lecturers and students toward embracing electronic feedback as a strategy. However, students favored specific techniques, particularly direct electronic feedback. Participants found electronic feedback beneficial and practical, aiding in developing writing proficiency and enhancing practical application, especially in future professional writing. They recognized the motivational value of electronic feedback for self-improvement in writing skills and technical knowledge.

While students generally held a positive perception of electronic feedback, some differences emerged in their preferences. Both lecturers and learners valued feedback’s utility in academic writing, with students preferring direct electronic feedback for constructive criticism. Overall, learners believed electronic feedback enhanced writing skills, particularly in grammar accuracy and paragraph organization.

Mustafa (2012) and Hamouda (2011) discovered that learners in academic writing generally prefer feedback, with less than half favoring direct feedback. This approach effectively enhanced writing accuracy by identifying and addressing specific problems. Ferris (2002) emphasized varied feedback methods to correct errors, enabling students to improve through lecturer comments, suggestions, and constructive criticism. While syntactic and lexical errors are common, students prefer specific areas of correction rather than a comprehensive review.

Amara (2015) and Ferris (2004) highlighted learners’ positive perception of lecturer feedback, appreciating comments, suggestions, insights, and corrections as beneficial for growth, particularly in L2 writing classrooms. Chandler (2003) emphasized the need for careful expression in feedback to avoid misconceptions and misleading remarks on student development.
Moreover, Rahimi (2009), Min (2006), Peterson, Childs & Kennedy (2004), and Tsui & Ng (2000) suggested revising learners’ output and returning it to the lecturer for validation. This revision is the application of learning based on electronic corrective feedback, allowing learners to demonstrate their willingness to learn and justify when they find feedback not applicable.

Rouhi & Azizian (2013) and Saito & Lyster (2012) underscored the importance of peer-feedback, enhancing writing accuracy and fluency. Yu & Lee (2014) and Yoshida (2008) found that peer feedback motivates learners, creating engaging learning opportunities with the lecturer.

Yeganehfar (2000) shared a perspective on self-electronic feedback, highlighting the lecturer’s feedback as a significant correction aiding learners in better writing performance. In cases where learners struggle to provide constructive feedback on their own writing, it might be attributed to their low English language proficiency (Bahrami, 2002).

Overall, both students and lecturers exhibited a positive perception of electronic feedback. Students preferred direct feedback from lecturers for error correction, while lecturers favored using various feedback methods based on learners’ levels. The consensus was that electronic feedback improves writing proficiency, particularly in grammar accuracy and organization.
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