# COMMUNITY-INQUIRY: CURRENT PERSPECTIVES ON FRESHMEN'S VERBAL AND WRITTEN FEEDBACK FROM SOPHOMORES STUDENTS OF EFL WRITING

**[1]\*Lina Hanifiyah, [1]Francisca Maria Ivone, [1]Sri Rachmajanti**
[1]English Department, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author Email: linazakariya2005@gmail.com

| Article Info | Abstract |
|---|---|
| | *A community of inquiry can help students increase engagement that supports English language acquisition. The community- inquiry provides students not only with cognitive but also social intelligence. Therefore, this study aimed to explore the perceptions of sophomores' verbal and written feedbacks on freshmen's writing. This small-scale study examined 25 students attending an Intensive English Course in the English Literature Department at Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. It involved sophomores providing verbal and written feedbacks on freshmen's writing, reflecting the implementation of a community of inquiry. The study employed a case study method, using three types of questionnaires to gather students' opinions on sophomores' written feedbacks, their perceptions of the verbal feedbacks, and their descriptive writing competence following the feedback process. The study revealed that both the sophomores' verbal and written feedbacks were beneficial for improving the freshmen's writing skills. Furthermore, the process of receiving feedbacks also appeared to enhance the students' confidence in their writing. Verbal and written feedback from the sophomores not only clarifies the aspects for the improvement of the composition but also improves the freshmen's self-confidence to write better. The feedbacks are effective since the students are of the same age, the freshmen can relate better, and the feedback they receive matches their style. However, this type of mentorship also has drawbacks because the sophomores' knowledge is limited, so the input they can provide is also limited. Therefore, it is suggested that English lecturers take advantage of sophomores' verbal and written feedbacks to assist freshmen in developing their writing skills.* |

## INTRODUCTION

Writing, for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, is generally regarded as a complex skill compared to other language skills (Kusumaningrum et al., 2019) and as a challenging component in their English language acquisition (Samira, 2012). It is considered the most difficult skill because it encompasses several elements that must be mastered, namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics (Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Brown, 2004, 2007). Moreover, writing involves a lengthy process that includes pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing, proofreading, publishing, and conferencing (White & Arndt, 1991). Freshmen would find it difficult to improve their writing without the support of other students. It means they need a writing community. Therefore, this study concerns community-inquiry in EFL writing context.

Community inquiry is a prominent research topic related to efforts to encourage more autonomous English learning classes. In intermediate classes, a community of inquiry can help students increase engagement that supports English language acquisition. Moreover, in the context of English language learning for intermediate students, the application of community-

inquiry provides students not only with cognitive but also social intelligence (Rachman et al., 2021).

Community-inquiry belongs to one of the techniques for teaching writing, which is proposed in this study. According to Garrison et al. (2000), community-inquiry is defined as a strategy that combines collaborative learning and inquiry-based approaches in educational contexts. In this case, applying collaborative learning in the teaching of writing using an inquiry-based approach occurs in peer feedback activities. Peer feedback fosters a sense of belonging within student groups, motivates engagement, fosters beneficial conversations, and facilitates the collaborative building of knowledge. Also known as peer review, peer feedback, peer response, and peer evaluation (Liu & Hansen, 2002), peer feedback is one of the most effective methods to improve students' writing (Hirose, 2009; Kamimura, 2006). Moreover, peer feedback offers numerous approaches to enhancing students' writing skills. It is the process where peers take responsibility for commenting on their friends' writing drafts. This process can enhance their social relations, intellectual growth, and the development of their creative and critical thinking skills (Aprilianti & Widyantoro, 2024; Klimova, 2013).

The principle of community-inquiry encompasses three aspects: cognitive, social, and teaching presences (Garrison et al., 2000). In dealing with the cognitive aspect, peer feedback encourages learners to think critically about the feedback from their peers. The social aspect provides benefits, allowing learners who receive feedback from peers to express and negotiate ideas, comments, corrections, and suggestions in a stress-free zone (Kamimura, 2006). The teaching presence is represented by the role of the teacher as a facilitator in the peer feedback activity.

Peer feedback is particularly beneficial for learners who do not fully understand teachers' explanations or comments. Those with lower proficiency in writing benefit significantly from receiving verbal and written feedbacks from their peers. The classification of peer feedback is based on the mode of the feedback, whether it is verbal or written. A verbal feedback occurs when the teacher or peers provide comments through verbal interaction, where the use of language in the feedback process can influence various aspects of writing, including language forms, content, and organization (Yu & Lee, 2016). A written feedback involves writing comments on learners' papers.

Both verbal and written feedbacks provide advantages for learners. They can improve learners' writing performance, including content, language, organization, and other aspects of writing (Ion et al., 2016; Yu & Lee, 2016). Moreover, based on the types of information, feedbacks can also be classified into confirmative, corrective, and interpretive (Pangestu & Surjono, 2023). While written feedbacks can take the form of indirect feedbacks, which are particularly appropriate for high grammar knowledge in composition (Shin, 2008) and for correcting errors in spelling and particles (Park et al., 2015). However, different research conducted by Hashemnezhad and Mohammadnejad (2011) states that direct written feedbacks offer more advantages for proficient learners than indirect written feedbacks. Additionally, a study by Poorebrahim (2017) showed that direct written feedbacks are better for revising purposes, while indirect written feedbacks are better for learning.

Previous studies have provided evidence that peer feedback effectively enhances learners' writing (Ali et al., 2015; Behin & Hamini, 2011; Bijami et al., 2013; Cahyono & Rosyida, 2016; Kamberi, 2013; Kusumaningrum et al., 2019; Samira, 2012; Wihastyanang at al., 2020; Zano, 2022) as well as helps them write more confidently with a low level of anxiety (Samira, 2012). Additionally, some studies on learners' perceptions of peer feedback show that learners find peer-written feedbacks beneficial to their learning since the process improves their work and provides better writing (Harutyunyan & Poveda, 2018; Ion et al., 2016; Mulder et al., 2014; Levi & Doolittle, 2014).

The study of peer feedback has been conducted by numerous experts over decades. However, studies on feedback given in the form of verbal and written feedbacks by sophomores to freshmen's writing still require further exploration. It is crucial to investigate the impact of differing levels of academic experience and potential variations in writing perspectives among freshmen on the feedback process (Grabe & Kaplan, 2014). Furthermore, examining peer feedback in the form of verbal and written feedbacks by involving sophomores and freshmen can foster collaboration and develop communication and teamwork skills among them, promoting a culture of constructive criticism and mutual support that creates a community of inquiry (van den Berg et al., 2006).

Research findings by Suharno et al. (2023) indicate that not all applications of community of inquiry are suitable for implementation in the context of English as a foreign language in other countries. In this case, it is mentioned that community inquiry has a low impact on English language learning at the intermediate level. Community of inquiry is more supportive when applied to English language learning at the high-school level or in universities (Suharno et al., 2023). This is a strong reason underlying the present study, which applies community inquiry in the context of writing education for university learners.

In this study, the community-inquiry involves sophomores and freshmen of the IEC at one of the State Islamic universities in Indonesia. The IEC is an English course commonly taken in the early semester as a foundation for subsequent courses. This course is highly important as it provides a strong basis for intermediate-level English writing competency. By acquiring good writing skills in English, learners will be better prepared to tackle more complex tasks and materials in advanced courses. Based on the preliminary study, during the IEC, the freshmen still find some difficulties in developing descriptive paragraph writing. It is assumed that, through the assistance of peer feedback in the form of verbal and written feedbacks, these freshmen can benefit more.

The freshmen here are first-semester learners of the English Literature Department required to join the Intensive English Course (IEC) class. The IEC class covers materials on English skills and competence. However, the most difficult skill is writing. Consequently, they need the activity of peer feedback to support their learning to write. In this study, the peer feedback activity involves sophomore students. The sophomore students in this study are selected based on their competence in writing. They proofread the freshmen's writing, give verbal and written feedbacks, and share their experience in dealing with problems in writing. It helps the freshmen increase their performance and confidence in writing. Therefore, the focus of this study is to describe the learners' perception of sophomores' verbal and written feedback to improve the quality of freshmen's writing.

Reflecting upon the need to explore more about learners' verbal and written feedbacks, the purpose of this study is to describe the freshmen's competence after receiving sophomores' verbal and written feedbacks, and the freshmen's perception of sophomores' verbal and written feedbacks. Portraying these two objectives provides a significant aim of enhancing understanding of peer feedback dynamics and its contribution to learners' writing development. This investigation aims to offer valuable insights into the effectiveness of peer feedback mechanisms and their potential impact on learners' writing proficiency and academic growth

## RESEARCH METHOD
### Research Design
This study employed a case study research design to explore learners' perspectives on sophomores' verbal and written feedbacks. It was conducted in the English Literature Department at UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. The case study design was chosen as it allows for an in-depth examination of a particular phenomenon within its real-life context, which is particularly beneficial when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not

clearly evident (Yin, 2003). In this study, examining how sophomores' verbal and written feedbacks affect first-year learners' writing skills involves a deep dive into interpersonal interactions and educational outcomes, which are intricately linked to the specific educational setting at UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Another reason for employing case study is because the present study focused on a specific course within the English Literature Department allows for a detailed examination of unique pedagogical approaches and learner interactions within that setting. Case studies are particularly adept at bringing out detailed insights in single setting analyses (Baxter & Jack, 2008).

## Research Setting and Participants

The study involved 25 first-semester learners enrolled in an Intensive English Course (IEC). The group comprised 10 male learners and 15 female learners. These learners were required to attend class five times a week, from Monday to Friday, with each day comprising 2 credit points or 100 minutes. The course covered three English skills—reading, speaking, and writing—along with components such as grammar and pronunciation. Two lecturers taught the class, each focusing on different areas. One lecturer handled reading, speaking, and pronunciation for three sessions (Monday to Wednesday), while another focused on grammar and writing during the remaining two sessions (Thursday and Friday). This study specifically addressed the teaching of writing on Fridays, focusing on the development of descriptive paragraphs from topic sentences, supporting sentences, and concluding statements over seven sessions (see Table 1 for the teaching schedule and sophomores' activities).

Table 1
Freshmen Teaching Schedule and Sophomore's Activities

| Week | Freshmen's Learning materials | Sophomores' Activities (outside the class) |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | The basic concept of writing a descriptive paragraph and ways to write a descriptive paragraph (discussing and analyzing the model of descriptive paragraph). | Providing some models of a descriptive paragraph to discuss with the freshmen. |
| 2. | The characteristics of a good topic sentence and a controlling idea (discussion and practice). | Giving written feedback especially in their topic sentence and controlling ideas and discussing it with the freshmen. |
| 3. | Kinds of supporting sentences; and major (the main details that tell us about the topic sentence) and minor (telling us more about the major) supporting sentences (discussion and practice). | Giving written feedback especially in the major and minor supporting sentence and discussing it with the freshmen. |
| 4. | The concluding statement and methods of conclusion (discussion and practice). | Giving feedback especially in the concluding statement and discussing it with the freshmen. |
| 5. | Individual writing on a descriptive paragraph (describing people or someone's talent). | Giving written feedback on freshmen's descriptive paragraph and discussing it with the freshmen. |
| 6. | Individual writing on a descriptive paragraph (describing thing or place). | Giving written feedback on freshmen's descriptive paragraph and discussing it with the freshmen. |
| 7. | Teacher feedback on learners' descriptive paragraph and completing questionnaire on learners' voice on sophomores' feedback. | - |

The recruitment of the sophomores was conducted using a Google Forms application, where they completed their personal identity information and submitted their academic achievement records from the first year. This was done to ensure that the sophomores met the criteria of having completed two writing courses—paragraph writing and essay writing—with

a minimum grade of B+ in each. Before the sophomores began the process of providing verbal and written feedbacks, they participated in guided activities outside the class for six weeks and received training on how to handle the freshmen's writing (see Table 1). Furthermore, they were also provided with guided feedback to generate a positive impact (Behin & Hamidi, 2011; Nguyen & Pham, 2023).

The guided points of the written feedback included the following:(a) does he/she have a clearly worded topic sentence that states the paragraph's main idea?, (b). does the topic sentence indicate what person, place, or object will be described in the paragraph?, (c). does he/she have enough ideas to support the topic sentence, or does he/she need to review notes or try another strategy to find additional supporting materials?, (d). does he/she have enough descriptive details, or does he/she need to introduce more details or examples?, (e). do all his/her examples and details support the paragraph's main idea, or should some be removed?, (f). do transitions lead readers from one detail to the next, or does he/she need to add transitions to make the paragraph more coherent?, (g). are his/her details presented in a clear spatial order?, (h). does the paragraph end with a concluding statement that summarizes or restates the main idea?, (i). are his/her sentences complete and grammatically correct?, (j). do all his/her subjects and verbs agree?, (k). has he/she used the correct verb tenses?, (l). are commas used where they are required?, (m). has he/she used apostrophes correctly?, (n). has he/she used other punctuation marks correctly?, (o). has he/she used capital letters where they are required?, (p). are the words spelled correctly?.

There were 12 sophomores assisting 25 freshmen, which means that one sophomore assisted three freshmen, while other sophomores assisted two freshmen each. The group of sophomores consisted of three males and eight females. The feedback process took place outside the class once a week for 60 minutes. Since both sophomores and freshmen had different course schedules, they arranged their own schedules by agreement. After seven weeks of the sophomores' verbal and written feedbacks, the next stage of the research involved collecting data on the learners' perceptions using questionnaires.

**Data Analysis**

To analyze the data, the researchers applied descriptive statistics and calculated frequencies to determine the percentage occurrence of each item. Consequently, the findings indicate the number of times a specific answer was chosen relative to the total number of responses. For example, when we state that 20% of respondents answered that they strongly agree with enjoying reading their sophomores' written feedbacks, it means that 'strongly agree' was the response selected for item 1 by 5 out of 25 learners, which represents 20% of the learners. Furthermore, this approach allows us to examine trends over time and identify significant patterns in respondents' attitudes and preferences, lending credibility to the conclusions drawn from the data.

**RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**
**Research Findings**
*Students' Voices on Sophomores' Written Feedbacks*

As shown in Table 2, the responses of the freshmen regarding the sophomores' written feedbacks are overwhelmingly positive, with most indicating "agree" or "strongly agree." All respondents appreciated reading the sophomores' feedback (item 1), with none expressing disagreement with this questionnaire item. Additionally, all respondents found the sophomores' written feedbacks beneficial (item 2), with 36% strongly agreeing with this point. Concerning the freshmen's improvement in their composition (items 3, 4, and 5), 96% of respondents stated that the sophomores' feedback helped them enhance their language skills, including grammar and vocabulary. Moreover, 92% indicated that the feedback improved the organization of their compositions. In contrast to items 1 and 2, 12% of the respondents did not agree that the

feedback enriched the content of their compositions (item 3). Nevertheless, the overall effectiveness of the sophomores' written feedbacks is evident as 100% of the respondents acknowledged their benefits (item 6).

Table 2
Freshmen's Students' Voice on Sophomores' Written Feedback

| No | Questionnaire items | N (%) | | N (%) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
| 1 | I liked reading my sophomores' written feedback | 5 (20%) | 20 (80%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 2 | I found my sophomores' written feedback useful | 9 (36%) | 16 (64%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 3 | My sophomores' written feedback helped me enrich the content of my composition | 7 (28%) | 13 (50%) | 3 (12%) | 0 (0%) |
| 4 | My sophomores' written feedback helped me improve the organization of my composition. | 6 (24%) | 17 (68%) | 2 (8%) | 0 (0%) |
| 5 | My sophomores' written feedback helped me improve the language (including grammar and vocabulary) of my composition. | 8 (32%) | 16 (64%) | 1 (4%) | 0 (0%) |
| 6 | I benefited from my sophomores' written feedback. | 7 (28%) | 18 (72%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |

*Students' Voices on Sophomores' Verbal Feedbacks*

Table 3 addresses the second research question, showing results that are similar to those of the first question. The responses to the questionnaire items are still predominantly "agree" and "strongly disagree," indicating that the freshmen benefited from both the sophomores' written and verbal feedbacks. All respondents (100%) agreed that the sophomores' verbal feedbacks were useful and helped improve the language of their compositions. Although there were a few students who disagreed with items 1, 3, and 4, each at a rate of 4%, the overall results still demonstrate that the freshmen found value in the sophomores' verbal feedbacks, as evidenced by the 100% positive response to item 6.

Table 3
Freshman Students' Voice on Sophomores' Verbal Feedback

| No | Questionnaire items | N (%) | | N (%) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
| 1 | I liked discussing with my sophomore in the verbal response session | 8 (32%) | 16 (64%) | 1 (4%) | 0 (0%) |
| 2 | I found my sophomore's feedback in the verbal response session useful | 11 (44%) | 14 (56%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 3 | My sophomore's feedback in the verbal response session helped me enrich the content of my composition | 4 (16%) | 20 (80%) | 1 (4%) | 0 (0%) |
| 4 | My sophomore's feedback in the verbal response session helped me improve the organization of my composition | 5 (20%) | 19 (76%) | 1 (4%) | 0 (0%) |
| 5 | My sophomore's feedback in the verbal response session helped me improve the language (including grammar and vocabulary) of my composition. | 10 (40%) | 15 (60%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| 6 | I benefited from my sophomore's feedback in the verbal response session | 7 (28%) | 18 (72%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |

*Students' Voices on Their Competence after obtaining feedback*

Table 4 addresses the third research question concerning how the freshmen perceive their competence following the sophomores' feedback process. This section includes five questionnaire items requiring a 'yes' or 'no' response, accompanied by a reason for each answer. The table reveals that almost two-thirds of the students believe that the process of giving the feedback has enhanced their writing skills in IEC class sessions (item 1), with 68% feeling confident about their writing abilities (item 2).

However, when asked if they can perform well in their writing sessions, one-third (32%) of the students expressed ongoing struggles with grammar, as indicated by comments from students 1, 7, and 23: "Sometimes I still don't understand the grammar," "Using language and grammar are still lacking," and "I don't have enough grammar skill to write perfectly." Difficulties in constructing sentences into coherent paragraphs were also cited as reasons for negative responses, as mentioned by student 12 ("I cannot make the paragraph coherent") and student 13 ("I feel confused when writing some sentences in a paragraph").

Despite these challenges, 100% of the students reported that the feedback process has improved their understanding of writing descriptive paragraphs (item 3), and 96% (24 out of 25 students) said they can now easily understand how to write descriptive paragraphs. The final questionnaire item revealed that nearly all students felt equipped to excel in the writing sessions of their IEC class.

Table 4
Freshman Students' Competence after Obtaining Verbal and Written Feedback

| No | Questionnaire items | "Yes" | | "No" | |
|----|---------------------|-------|---|------|---|
| | | N | % | N | % |
| 1. | Can you do well in your writing session in Intensive English Course class? | 17 | 68 % | 8 | 32 % |
| 2. | Are you confident about your ability to write a descriptive paragraph? | 17 | 68 % | 8 | 32 % |
| 3. | Do the activities during the sophomore's feedback process improve your understanding of the descriptive paragraph? | 25 | 100 % | 0 | 0% |
| 4. | Can you easily understand how to write a descriptive paragraph after the sophomores' feedback process? | 24 | 96 % | 1 | 4 % |
| 5. | Do you have "What it takes to do well" in your writing session in Intensive English Course? | 24 | 96 % | 1 | 4 % |

After the implementation of verbal and written feedbacks, the increased descriptive writing competence is evident in Table 5, which describes the differences in scores before and after the feedbacks

Table 5
Freshman Students' Competence after Obtaining Verbal and Written Feedback

| No. | Initials | Score 1 | Score 2 | No. | Initials | Score 1 | Score 2 |
|-----|----------|---------|---------|-----|----------|---------|---------|
| 1 | Alm | 72 | 77 | 14 | Bab | 71 | 73 |
| 2 | Aio | 86 | 90 | 15 | Iy | 70 | 80 |
| 3 | Ban | 84 | 87 | 16 | Fhn | 71 | 75 |
| 4 | Ho | 73 | 82 | 17 | Gnw | 72 | 80 |
| 5 | Dw | 67 | 73 | 18 | T | 70 | 80 |
| 6 | Pams | 73 | 77 | 19 | As | 77 | 85 |
| 7 | Lm | 72 | 76 | 20 | Thz | 82 | 87 |
| 8 | Mni | 76 | 85 | 21 | Sw | 71 | 75 |
| 9 | Ah | 70 | 75 | 22 | Tap | 63 | 70 |
| 10 | Ffpa | 70 | 77 | 23 | Mra | 66 | 77 |
| 11 | Hah | 85 | 90 | 24 | Wa | 70 | 75 |
| 12 | Ppa | 75 | 82 | 25 | Fys | 76 | 80 |

| 13 | Rrm | 78 | 80 | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Mean Score 1: 73.40 | | Mean Score 2: 79.44 | |
| | Std. Deviation Score 1: 5.45 | | Std. Deviation Score 2: 5.49 | |
| | Std. Error Mean Score 1: 1.09 | | Std. Error Mean Score 2: 1.09 | |

## Discussion

*The Freshmen's Perception of Sophomores' Verbal and Written Feedbacks*

The results from a descriptive analysis of the students' responses to sophomores' feedbacks indicate a positive perception of this activity. The questionnaire results reveal that, in general, students positively viewed the sophomores' feedbacks as beneficial for their writing abilities. The responses to the questions are favorable, as all questionnaire items show a high percentage of positive feedback.

The findings of this study suggest that both sophomores' written and verbal feedbacks were useful. The freshmen greatly benefited from them. Both types of feedbacks helped improve the organization and language of their compositions. Moreover, the feedbacks also enriched the content of their compositions. These results align with previous findings indicating that written peer feedbacks are beneficial for learning because they improve the quality of writing (Harutyunyan & Poveda, 2018; Ion et al., 2016; Mulder et al., 2014; Levi & Doolittle, 2014). Additionally, the results concerning verbal feedbacks corroborate the study by Yu and Lee (2016), which stated that the use of language in peer discussions could enhance peer feedbacks by allowing comments on language forms, content, organization, and other aspects of writing.

The activities of sharing verbal and written feedbacks outside the classroom provide students with the opportunity to engage deeply with the material, rather than merely receiving the feedback from their peers. Furthermore, their involvement in community-inquiry learning expands their social interactions by fostering collaboration across different student levels. This study's findings reinforce similar perspectives on the benefits of peer feedback, as identified in studies by Kamimura (2006). Additionally, based on Tables 2 and 3, the implementation of verbal and written feedbacks can be categorized into confirmative, corrective, and interpretive information. This categorization aligns with the recommendations of Pangestu and Surjono (2023) for integrating peer feedback in language learning activities.

*The Freshmen's Competence after Obtaining Sophomores' Verbal and Written Feedback*

In addition to the students' feedback on their competence following the sophomores' feedback, responses to all questionnaire items indicate positive effects. The sophomores' feedbacks not only helped them perform well in their IEC class writing sessions but also boosted their confidence in writing descriptive paragraphs. This result is supported by Samira (2012), who found that peer feedback helps students write more confidently with lower levels of anxiety. Furthermore, these feedbacks enhanced their understanding of paragraph structure, simplifying how they approach writing. These results align with the findings of Liu and Hansen (2002), who noted that peer feedback offers diverse approaches to writing improvement.

The increased competence after receiving the sophomores' feedback underscores the importance of collaboration among students at different levels. This collaboration is a hallmark of a learning community or community-inquiry that can enhance student competence through a blend of collaborative and inquiry learning (Garrison et al., 2000). The improvement in competence, as shown in Table 5, also corresponds with findings from Kamimura (2006) and Hirose (2009). The freshmen participants particularly noted improved performance in grammar and writing accuracy, as well as content organization (refer to Table III, items 3 and 5), supporting the research of Shin (2008) and Park et al. (2015).

A significant finding of this research is the reduced burden on teachers, as it was demonstrated that sophomores could provide valuable assistance to freshmen. This reduction means teachers might not need to expend as much energy and time guiding the students' writing

processes. Although teacher feedback remains essential, the sophomores' feedbacks have proven more effective. Therefore, sophomore feedbacks could serve as an alternative strategy to support writing instructors. In summary, the process of verbal and written feedback can enhance the writing quality of freshmen students, particularly in the context of Indonesian EFL learners. This mirrors findings by Ion et al. (2016), Kusumaningrum et al. (2019), Mulder et al. (2014), and Saleh and Sadeghi (2015).

This research found that community inquiry plays a role in enhancing the writing competence of freshmen students after receiving verbal and written feedbacks from their sophomores. This confirms that better engagement through such activities will provide greater benefits, as found by Teng et al. (2024) in the context of reading skills.

## CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that both sophomores' written and verbal feedbacks were beneficial for the freshmen's writing performance, as evidenced by the consistency in responses across two questionnaires. All respondents indicated that the sophomores' feedbacks were useful and that they greatly benefited from them. Therefore, it is recommended that English lecturers take advantage of sophomores' feedback to assist in improving freshmen's writing. For future researchers, it is advisable to expand on this study by exploring sophomores' perceptions of the feedback process. For instance, researchers could distribute open-ended questionnaires to delve into the strengths and weaknesses of this type of feedback.

## REFERENCES

Ali, N., Anwer, M., Abbas. J. (2015). Impact of Peer Tutoring on Learning of Students. *Journal for Studies in Management and Planning, 1*(2).'

Aprilianti, B. D. A., & Widyantoro, A. (2024). Digital Peer Feedback and Students' Critical Thinking: What Correlation and to What Extent?. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 12*(2), 629-644. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v%vi%i.10264

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The qualitative report, 13*(4), 544-559.

Behin & Hamidi (2011) Peer Correction: the key to improve the Iranian English as a foreign language learners' Productive Writing Skill. *Procedia : Social and Behavioral Science. 30*, 1057-1060. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.206

Bijami, M., Kashef, S. H., Nejad, M. S., (2013). Peer Feedback in Learning English Writing: Advantages and Disadvantages. *Journal of Studies in Education, 3*(4). http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jse.v3i4.4314

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. White Plains, Pearson Education

Brown, H. D. (2007).*Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. White Plains, Pearson Education

Cahyono, B. Y. (2018). Culture and innovation in essay writing project: EFL students' perceptions. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 8*(11), 1433-1440. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0811.07

Cahyono, B., & Rosyida, A. (2016). Peer feedback, self-correction, and writing proficiency of Indonesian EFL students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 7*(1), 178-193. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2804010

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (2014). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. Routledge.

Harutyunyan and Poveda (2018).Students' Perception of Peer Review in an EFL Classroom. *English Language Teaching*, *11*(4).

Hirose, K. (2009). *Cooperative learning in English writing instruction through peer feedback*. Aichi Prefectural University.

Ion, G., Barrera-Corominas, A., & Tomàs-Folch, M. (2016). Written peer-feedback to enhance students' current and future learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 13*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-016-0017-y

Kamberi, L. (2013). The Significance of teacher feedback in EFL writing for tertiary level foreign language learners. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 1686-1690. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.241

Kusumaningrum, S. R., Cahyono, B. Y. & Prayogo, J. A. (2019). The Effect of Different Types of Peer Feedback Provision on EFL Students' Writing Performance. International Journal of Instruction, 12(1), 213-224. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12114a

Kamimura, T. (2006). Effects of peer feedback on EFL student writers at different levels of English proficiency: A Japanese Context. *TESL Canada Journal, 23*(2), 22-34.

Klimova. (2013). Developing Thinking Skills in the Course of Academic Writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93*, 508-511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.09.229

Lee, M. K. (2014). Peer feedback in second language writing: Investigating junior secondary students' perspectives on inter-feedback and intra-feedback. *Elsevier- System 55.* Article 1e10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.08.003

Levi, L. and Doolittle, P. (2014).Students' perceptions of peer feedback. *Argentinian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 2*(2)*,* 60-76.

Liu, J., & Hansen, J. (2002).*Peer response in second language writing classrooms.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Mulder, R A., Pearce, J. M., Baik, C. (2014). Peer Review in Higher Education: Student Perceptions Before and After Participation*. Active Learning in Higher Education, 15*(2),157-171. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787414527391

Nguyen, T. B., & Pham, A. T. (2023, March). EFL Teachers' Beliefs about Students' Practices of Peer Correction in Letter Writing. In Proceedings of the 2023 4th International Conference on Education Development and Studies (pp. 97-103). https://doi.org/10.1145/3591139.3591141

Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. 2006. *Writing Academic English*. New York, Pearson Education

Pangestu, R. F., & Surjono, H. D. (2023). Principles of Learning Message Design in E-Learning. *Jurnal Pedagogi dan Pembelajaran*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.23887/jp2.v6i1.52228

Park, E. S., Song, S. & Shin, Y. K. (2015). To what extent do learners benefit from indirect written corrective feedback? A study targeting learners of different proficiency and heritage language status. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(6)*,* 678–699. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815609617

Poorebrahim, F. (2017).Indirect written corrective feedback, revision, and learning. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 6(2),* 184-192. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v6i2.4843

Rachman, A. N., Maghfiroh, A., Mustikawati, D. A., & Indriastuti, N. R. (2021). Community of Inquiry for Students' Autonomy in English Language Learning: A Case of Philippines High School. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 6(*1), 61-72.

Samira. (2012). An investigation of the effects of peer evaluation in enhancing Algerian students' writing autonomy and positive affect. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 69,* 1775 – 1784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.12.127

Shin, S-K. (2008). 'Fire your proofreading!' Grammar correction in the writing classroom. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 62*(4), 358-365. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm089

Suharno, S., Suherdi, D., & Gunawan, W. (2023). Implementation of a community of inquiry in teaching English as a foreign language in secondary schools: A literature review. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn), 17*(4), 685-695. https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v17i4.20550

Teng, Y., Yin, Z., Wang, X., & Yang, H. (2024). Investigating relationships between community of inquiry perceptions and attitudes towards reading circles in Chinese blended EFL learning. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21(1), 6. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00440-x

van den Berg, I., Admiraal, W., & Pilot, A. (2006). Peer Assessment in University Teaching: Evaluating Seven Course Designs. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(1), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500262346

White, R.V.& Arndt, V. (1991). *Process Writing: Longman Handbook for English Teachers*. London: Longman.

Wıhastyanang, W. D., Kusumanıngrum, S. R., Latıef, M. A., Cahyono, B. Y. (2020). Impacts of Providing Online Teacher and Peer Feedback on Students' Writing Performance. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 21*(2), 178-189. https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.728157

Yin, R. K. (2003). Design and methods. *Case study research, 3*(9.2), 84.

Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016).Understanding the role of learners with low English language proficiency in peer feedback of second language writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(2), 483-494. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43893831

Zano, K. (2022). Promoting Peer Assessment 'Learner To Learner' Feedback In A Multilingual High School English First Additional Language Setting, JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 10(4), pp.561-569.DOI: https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v%vi%i.5268