The Influence of Cognitive Online Peer Feedback (COPF) on

Writing Revisions

Abdullah, R.[a]. Yahaya, M.H.[b*], Ishak, N.A.[c], Mohd Noor, N.[d]

[ac] Senior Lecturer, School of Educational Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia 11800 USM Pulau Pinang,
Malaysia
[b] Senior Lecturer, School of Social Sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia 11800 USM Pulau Pinang, Malaysia
[d]Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor,
Malaysia

Abstract

Online peer feedback was found to be beneficial for writing enhancement. However, there were also studies that proved otherwise. Hence, this research was undertaken to study the actual influence of online peer feedback to further expand the insights on this area particularly amongst ESL young adult learners. Ten voluntary respondents aged 24-25 years old participated in the study: 9 females and 1 male. The respondents were asked to post their manuscripts or text as well as feedback on individual blog accounts. Each manuscript received two rounds of feedback. Revisions on the manuscripts were also done twice. Data were collected from the online peer feedback transcript, interview transcript and manuscript. The thematic analysis suggested that online peer feedback primarily augmented the authors' revisions in the cognitive aspect; content, style, and organization. Meanwhile, the online peer feedback on language and its revisions were found to be immature. Albeit the shortfall, the authors secured a micro-structure level for their revisions. This concluded the ability of online peer feedback in enriching the quality of the content, organization, and style of the manuscript.

Keywords: online peer feedback, revision, micro-structure level, blog.

1. Introduction

For many years, the learner-centered approach has been emphasized to foster independent learning. As opposed to the teacher-centered approach that discourages dynamic learning, the learner-centered approach opens the door for learners to develop their potentials through cooperative and collaborative learning that helps them discover life-sustaining skills and concepts. Realizing its pragmatic, scholars have designed numerous strategies for instructional purposes using this learner-centered concept which is influenced by Vygotsky's (1978) theory of social constructivism.

Peer feedback is one of the strategies that thrived under this approach. It has not only been favored by first language (L1) educators but second language (L2) as well. Currently, with the advances in online learning, peer feedback is now becoming popular in the education realm. Traditional face-to-

face peer feedback has transited into online grounds (Abdullah, Hussin & Shakir, 2018; Ekahitanond, 2018; Yang, 2018).

In the online mode, be it synchronous or asynchronous, peer feedback has an advantage on space flexibility. Learners are not bound to classroom walls. In fact, in asynchronous mode, with time flexibility, peers could engage in thorough feedback, whilst authors could reflect on the feedback retrospectively and produce thoughtful revisions (Law & Baer, 2020). Discourses that take place in synchronous environment is also reported to be dynamic, whereas asynchronous learning environment can subdue one's writing anxiety (Bailey & Cassidy, 2020; Ertmer, et al., 2007; Yahya, Hussin & Shakir, 2018). Latifi et al. (2019) found that online scripted peer feedback improves students' feedback quality, revision, and content knowledge. Authors were also found to be more alert in their language use and grammar accuracy as they were being monitored by the peers who served as their editors and revisors (Kitchakarn, 2013). Further, the use of blog feedback has positive impact on students' writing quality (Abri, et al., 2021) and motivation (Mohd Said et al., 2013). The anonymity of the peer's identity led to the rise of the authors' writing scores (Bos & Tan, 2019, Leijen, 2017). Meanwhile, constructive peer feedback on content and organization was evident in Ma's (2019) study via Wiki medium. The manifestation of peer feedback has also motivated the authors to write in multiple drafts (Xiao & Xin, 2018).

On the other hand, we have also witnessed the challenges of using peers as feedback providers. In the virtual synchronous platform, since feedback using synchronous mode demands all players to be online simultaneously, turn-taking was problematic. Akin to oral feedback, comments tend to be more superficial. Asynchronous feedback was found to be time-consuming, thus creating anxiety for the receivers. Unless a period is set, this problem could be encumbering. Although the feedback results in improvements in the manuscript, the amendments made do not necessarily augment the manuscript performance if the authors do not reflect on the 'alterations or feedback offered by the peers (Leijen, 2017). İn a study on google classroom, the provision of feedback was inappropriate due to the ineptness and immaturity of the providers (Chuaphalakit, Inpin & Coffin, 2019). A systematic literature review on feedback of 20 studies from 1990-2010, suggested that problems arose due to the technical aspects of the online feedback employment causing negative attitude among the respondents. Working online consumed a lot of time and the feedback inclined to be at the surface level (Chen, 2016). In another systematic literature review on feedback of 12 studies between 2000-2016, Jıang & Ribeiro (2017) revealed that the adult ESL/EFL learners tended to engage more local feedback rather than global feedback leading to local revisions.

In view of the inconsistent findings, this study was undertaken to investigate the actual influence of online peer feedback on the authors' manuscripts in a qualitative perspective amongst ESL young adult learners. This research attempts to explain the development of the revisions made by the authors after receiving online feedback from their peers through process writing which required the authors to produce 3 manuscript drafts or 3 manuscripts. Hence, the research objective of this study is to understand how the peer feedback assist in the authors' writing progress.

.

2. Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework of this study dealt with social constructivist theory (Vygotsky,1978). He illumined that good learning occurs when one's potential is sharpened through social interactions with individuals who are more competent. These individuals are the ones who can provide support for the learner until he is ready to work individually. Vygotsky believed that a learner could progress from his actual development level to a much higher level which is the potential level (ZPD) with the assistance given by the more knowledgeable individuals. By working with more capable others, who would model various ways to solve problems or prompt leading questions, the child would gain the 'skills, knowledge and attitudes' of their mentors to enable them to take up more challenging problems in the future (Kanevsky & Geake, 2004).Vygotsky (1978) also posited that learning is a socialization process where learners collaborate and support each other through interactions and negotiations to reach a solution to a problem or decision on a subject matter. For one to move into the ZPD, a social setting is needed to promote learning.

Considering the concept of communication or interaction in the theory, since writing is an act of communication that takes place between the author and the reader, writing was the learning subject undertaken for this study. The peers became the authentic audience that the author would have to satisfy for the communication to come through. In this study, the negotiation process between the peers and the author was administered through the asynchronous online peer feedback. Studies by Lowell, & Ashby (2018), Lee (2017) and Kitchakarn (2013) had proven that online writing was able to broaden the learners' ZPD.

Collaborative learning approach is yet another concept that supports the use of peer feedback to assist learners in their writing skills (Abdullah, Hussin & Shakir, 2018; Yim, Zheng & Warschauer, 2017). According to Bruffee (1984) collaborative learning is a type of learning strategy popularized in favor of the learner-centered approach. In line with social constructivist theory, collaborative learning also argues that knowledge is socially constructed. In this approach, learners maximize their knowledge from the social exchanges that occur among them (van Popta et al., 2017). Learning is said to be reciprocal when one stays in a collaborative group as they help one another to success.

Speck (2002) affirmed the significance of collaboration that exists in writing. He argued that no writing is a product of a single authorship. An author, be it in an academic or creative writing, would consider views from others during the writing process. Hence, in a classroom context, Speck proposed the learners to actively collaborate as peer critiques to their friends' manuscripts.

Revision

Revision is claimed to be useful for learning writing (Wichmann, Funk & Rummel, 2018) as it provides a base for the authors to strengthen their written text by the reformation or reconceptualization of ideas, elucidation of ambiguities, and correction of linguistic errors. Putting more emphasis on the mechanics of writing, Sole (2006) argued that revision is making modification at structural and paragraph levels to improve the written discourse. Sole (2015) emphasized that students can improve incrementally when given a good writing model. A good revision is when an author can make a global change in the writing (Becker, 2006). Global refers to not only making minor amendments like spelling or grammar

errors, but to focus more attention to the deeper level: will the author be able to reconceptualize the ideas in the text in order to convey the intended message to the reader effectively.

Revision is a very demanding task to accomplish especially for second language learners (L2). The degree of complexity varies from one person to another as L2 learners come from different backgrounds upholding certain beliefs and values. Hence, studies have been carried out to clearly see what makes a good revision to facilitate the learning of writing and it was found that novice authors lose their battle to professional authors on several grounds. Firstly, professional authors pay serious attention to revision that involves rigorous and vigorous process from beginning to end (Peskin & Ellenbogen, 2019; Sommers, 1980). In their revisions, professional authors try to match their intentions and executions: between their goals and what they have written. Novice authors on the contrary, are bound to set marginal goals, merely viewing writing as a set of finished sentences. Peskin & Ellenbogen (2019) found that novices hardly revise their work. Secondly, unlike inexperienced authors, expert authors place the audience as fundamental in revision (Sommers, 1980). Durán (2017), Cho & Choi (2018) and Sulistyo et al. (2019) confirmed the importance of audience in influencing the learners' performance. Inexperienced authors however, very often, confine their audience to their teachers, who are consistent at employing rhetorical rules (Sommers, 1980). This rigidity limits the author's creativity. Unskilled authors take their readers for granted, assuming that their readers know what their contentions are which ultimately results in ambiguity. Finally, expert authors treat writing as a recursive process in which the authors 'go back and forth in order to move forward' (Hayes & Flower,1980; Sommers, 1980). Even though novice authors do go back and forth, but due to their incompetence, their revision is still imperfect. In conclusion, professional authors perceive revision as an opportunity to discover new ideas and rejoice in them. Novice authors on the contrary, consider revisions as what Becker (2006) coined 'punitive.'

A perfect revision is still far from reach without knowing the 'how' to. Hence, guidance on what are the types of revision that are proper and adequate to be appraised as excellent is of priority. A growing number of researchers have embarked on this methodology issue. Sole (2006) developed the '4S' method: structure, substance, sequence and style, a framework or revision taxonomy. These elements are essential to be considered when one needs to produce a sound text. Breindenbach (2006) suggested that teachers could teach revision by concentrating on four major components: content, rhetorical decisions, style and mechanics. Language revisions should be done after these four aspects have been accounted for. Faigley and Witte (1981) viewed revisions in two categories: surface and text- based changes (meaning). Surface changes consist of two types: formal changes and meaning preserving changes. Formal changes involve changes in 'spelling, tense, modality, abbreviation, punctuation and format'. Meaning-preserving changes are 'additions, deletions, substitutions, permutations, distributions and consolidations'. In short, although alterations are made, the revisions for this category would not change the meaning of the text. Text-based changes contain microstructure changes and macrostructure changes. They both involve the same elements as the meaning pre-serving changes. However, the meaning of both texts is altered. Microstructure change does not affect the essence of the text. Macrostructure change involves major changes that affect the overall meaning of the text. Hewett and Thonus (2019) found that students in their study made meaning-focused revisions to their drafts when metaphorical feedback was provided.

Within this revision process is where peer feedback is necessary. Instead of just relying on themselves, the authors can also depend on their peers to contribute to their writing by providing constructive comments. Although professional authors benefit a lot from peer feedback, it is the L2 learners who need more feedback. They require a greater support in their revisions as having to learn to write and learn English concurrently are tumultuous for L2 learners.

3. Objectives of the Study

- To understand how the online peer feedback could augment the authors' writing progress

4. Population and Sample

The sampling for this study was purposive and criterion sampling. Among the criteria was voluntary participation. Thus, 10 respondents (nine females and one male), age ranging from 23-24 years old from three public tertiary institutions volunteered to participate in the study. All of them were the authors cum the feedback providers (peers). They were concurrently engaged in a process writing, producing draft one, two and final draft. Blog was used as the medium for them to post their manuscripts as well as to communicate their feedback.

Data Collection

The data for this study was collected using asynchronous online peer feedback transcript, interviews and essay drafts (manuscripts). In total, there were two feedback transcripts, two interview transcripts and three essay drafts (Draft one, Draft two and Final draft) for each author.

5. Data Analysis Technique Used in the Present Study

The data were analyzed using thematic analysis. According to Maguire & Delahunt (2017) 'the goal of a thematic analysis is to identify themes, i.e. patterns in the data that are important or interesting, and use these themes to address the research or say something about an issue' (p. 3353). The data was analyzed in six steps: 'becoming familiar with the data, generate initial codes, search for themes, feedback themes, define themes and write up'[24, p.4]. Aside from that, Faigley & Witte's (1981) taxonomy was used to determine the level of revision made by the authors.

According to Miles & Huberman (1994), a 70% agreement between the researcher and the raters would confirm the reliability of the study. Hence, four language experts confirmed the consistency in the agreements on the coding categories. The average percentage for all four raters was 97.4%. Hence, the reliability of this study was accepted as it proved to be higher than the conditioned percentage by Miles & Huberman (1994).

6. Data Analysis and Interpretation

The data revealed that the online peer feedback did assist the authors in producing better manuscripts through constructive feedback. In this study, this type of feedback was labelled as cognitive online peer feedback, henceforth; COPF. They focused on content, style, organization, and language of the text. COPF was actually the most significant type of peer feedback. It was the point of reference for

the authors to resolve issues of ambiguity, mismatches, unfounded assertions, redundancy, cohesion, or language use that were unheeded. As shown in Table 1, it can be concluded that all respondents received more COPF in Draft two:151 than Draft one: 104. In the first round of feedback, the respondents were still new to each other. They needed time to warm up. After establishing a sound rapport amongst them, the respondents were more upfront in highlighting and scaffolding the authors' weaknesses, they have then become peers. Consequently, in Draft two, the peers were more intensive on assisting the authors' cognitive development. This was evident in the quality of COPF of Draft one and Draft two. The first round of COPF was based on the author's general performance of Draft one. On the contrary, the COPF for Draft two were more specific, providing more critical and analytical premises, mostly founded on the amendments or progress made by the authors. To illustrate, here are some examples of COPF written in the authors' blog comment sections:

COPF

    a. Content:

Draft one:

- I agree to Isda that u should limit those expressions (Tini)
- If you want to make it more interesting, you may add some reasons why Malaysians are rude nowadays. (Dian)

Draft two:

- It seems you have change the title from true Malaysians into Malaysian with negative attitude. I think the second title is more appropriate for your draft. Reading the title itself will tell the reader of what you are going to talk about. It is good to do so, as sometimes when the reader lack of time and just wanted to browse through the article the suitable and informative title will help them to select what to read (Salina)

- I'm sorry but I couldn't keep jumping from one paragraph to another as the entry is too long When you tend to write more, the reader will lose their attention. (Wafa)

b. Style

Draft one:

- If ur target readers are people who do not have any single knowledge bout the info, maybe u can put in something fun or fun fact or anything bout polymers (Rose)

Draft two:

- Your essay is a factual manuscript. But I think u can make it more interesting by adding some rhetoric questions or add some tag line or excerpt or newspaper article or dialogue or anything (Yati)

c. Organization

Draft one:

- For the first and second paragraph, I could not see the transition between it. Maybe it is just my feeling. But the starting of the second paragraph seemed that it is a new essay writing. That is why I could not see the coherent between the 1st n 2nd paragraph (Tini)

Draft two:

- Besides, i think you should divide the second paragraph into two parts.The first one is about how people easily get fat and second is about the prejudice among fat woman. You have raised two issues in one paragraph. So, it is better to divide and you can talked about it more and give examples (Asiah)

d. Language

Draft one:

- However, maybe the limitation of your vocabulary prevents the story from capturing readers' attention till the end (Anne)
- There are quite a number of grammatical errors and you can improve on it especially subject-verb agreement. (Nan)

Draft two:

- ... or maybe you can make use of simple sentences sometimes...instead of using all complex sentences. It might make users feel relax and interesting (Yati)
- Pay attention to the grammatical errors that you have done. Some of them are repeated. Some of the grammatical mistakes you have done are: "Polymers are very unique material should be "Polymers are very unique materials," "Sometimes they also not know..." Sometimes they also do not know (Isda).

Table 1 demonstrates the number of COPF received by all authors.

Draft	Tini	Isda	Nan	Dian	Rose	Yati	Wafa	Ann	Asiah	Salina	Total
D1	11	8	16	5	14	8	9	9	9	14	104
D2	35	11	19	7	9	11	20	10	14	15	151

Interpretation of table-1.

The above table projects that there were in total, more COPF received in Draft 1: 104 than Draft two: 151 by the authors. In Draft one, the highest number of COPF was provided for Nan; 16. Dian received the least COPF; 5 for this first round of feedback. Meanwhile, in Draft two, Tini received the most number of COPF;35 from her peers and Dian still received the least; 7.

The provisions of COPF resulted in the authors' micro-structure level of revisions according to Faigley & Witte's Taxonomy (1981). This means that the updates were not simply editions that resulted in merely surface changes, but rather changes in meaning, style, organisation, and language problems. In

other words, the modifications made were more substantial than merely spelling, punctuation, and deletions, requiring the authors to carefully plan before revising. The succeeding paragraphs illustrate the examples of COPF and revisions employed in the content, style, organization and language of the manuscripts.

Content

Salina who wrote about 'The Meaning of Friendship,' was commented on her brief Draft one consisting of only 250 words. Nan and a few other peers wanted her to elaborate. Reciprocally, Salina felt that she should exemplify the types of good and bad friends. Hence, in Draft two, she added on a good friend who loaned her some money when she was truly in need, whilst those who did not have the financial means, supported her morally. Nonetheless, Nan and Yati were still unsatisfied with her second draft's revision as it was still found to be shallow (intv.1, lines 522, 537-539, intv. 2, lines 175-179). Therefore, in her final draft, Salina complemented her essay with another type of friend. She disclosed a story about a friend who backstabbed her. Salina also added a new paragraph to portray the sweet memories that she had with her friends to convey yet another example of a valuable friendship:

Draft two

There was not long ago when my mother has been diagnosed with advanced kidney failure. My life seems to turn upside down. My family were running out of money as the dialysis treatment required a large amount of money. I felt devastated looking how my mother suffers from the disease. Some of my friends lend me some money and those who could not lend money give me moral support to go through the problems. It means a lot to me.

Final draft

During my secondary school I have a friend who backstabbed me. I felt really disappointed. She pretended to be good but she keep spreading bad things about me behind my back. My friends informed me about this and later I asked her whether it is true. She cried and asked for my apologize. I could not believe that the person whom I thought really honest and kind willing to do bad things behind my back. I am sure that you guys might have many experiences dealing with many types of friends.

Well, I just came back from UPM. I am so happy to meet my best friend and share her happy moment together. She just graduated from UPM with the degree in biotechnology. I managed to meet many of my ex-classmates there. One of them is now studying in medical field and i asked her to check my eyes because I have eyes problems (free consultation of course..hehe). It was awesome. I mean, previously we were just an ordinary students and now we are reaching for greater things in our life. There are so many stories to tell. We could not stop talking. It was really fun. I really enjoyed myself. They are so meaningful to me.

Ann wrote about 'The Past, Present, and Future'. In her Draft one, Wafa and Dian felt that Ann did not elaborate on the sickness that she suffered during her childhood, leaving her readers in curiosity. In response, Ann produced a new substantive paragraph explicating her misery. She claimed, 'I elaborate well for them to understand' (intv.1, line 297). She wrote about the unbearable pain and the side effects of the prolonged medication. Ann also revealed that the doctors could not diagnose her immediately. The cause of the pain: her unborn twin, was also described. Besides the physical

endurance, Ann added on the effects on her mental health. Due to her weight problem, she suffered a long-term low self-esteem:

Draft one

Then, I started to experience abdominal pain when I was in Standard 4. After that, I moved to Kedah and schooling in Sekolah Kebangsaan Telok Kechai. I met lots of friends and till now we will have a gathering once a year. Back to my health condition, it was very painful that I cannot forget about it till now. I suffered for nearly ten years before the mystery solved. I have been through my secondary years with the pain and not to forget lots of happiness.

Draft two

Then, I started to experience an abdominal pain when I was in Standard 4. The pain comes and goes at certain times, but it haunted me for nearly ten years. It was very painful that I could not forget about it till now. Furthermore, because of the medicines that I took, I became fat bit by bit. As many doctors could not found the cause, I was only given steroid to ease my pain. Years of went in and out of hospitals, finally the mystery solved two months before I entered Institut Perguruan Persekutuan Pulau Pinang. I was diagnosed with a cyst on my left ovary. The pain that I bear all those years was because the cyst getting bigger, and it spun inside me. It consists of teeth, small bones, hair and others. It was my twin. Till now, I tried to digest the fact, but I just could not believe it. Furthermore, I was not only suffering from the physical pain but psychologically as well as I was fat and had low self-esteem.

Style

Wafa's feedback on Yati's introduction prompted Yati to improve on the style of her manuscript. In Draft one, Yati's style was quite common, relating the experience on the day of the accident. The feedback that kindled her to rewrite her manuscript was *'I think it is better for you to start your writing with something interesting…..nasi goreng kampong,(fried rice) it becomes more delicious when you add scrambled eggs with it'* (Wafa). Obviously Yati grasped this idea and thought about an approach to zest her manuscript. Consequently, in Draft two, she used a flashback technique, beginning the story with the scene of the accident, and then recalling what had happened before that. Yati had also engaged dramatic elements like suspense and jokes in her manuscript. Monologues were used to enliven her manuscript.

Draft One:

It was a sunny morning. Instead of taking bus to town, Ida and I decided to go shopping at YAWATA Supermarket by motorbike. It was a tough ride of course for about 20 minutes before we reached the supermarket.

Later we decided to fill in the petrol as it had almost reached the empty level. Who knows we might get trapped in the traffic or stuck in the middle of the road later? Carefully, I ride my motorbike to the edge of the road and enter the petrol station area. I saw a few men washing cars at the gas pump. So I straight away wait for my turn behind a motorcycle. Ida got down from the bike to pay the money.

Draft Two:

"Am I still alive?" I smelled the ground soil and clorophyl of the grass. When I woke up, I realized that I am lying on the ground near a drain. I can feel the sand in my eyes and tasted it in my mouth! I hope that was not shit or tiny insects.

As I look up to the sky, the sun is shining brigthly, I winked my eyes, I was lying on the ground, beside me was the gate and on the other side was the drain. In the the drain, a motorcycle has fallen down to the earth and the wheel was stirring. "Lucky me," Im not at the hospita I heard steps coming towards me. An old man and a few mechanics helped me to lift up the motorcycle. ....

(*There were a few more paragraphs in between)

So I recalled back what had happened. It was a sunny morning . Instead of taking bus to town, Ida and I decided to go shopping at YAWATA Supermarket by motorbike. ....

Tini whose manuscript; 'My best friend' was commented as disjointed for her draft one by Wafa and Yati. Consequently, Tini decided to revise her entire essay. In doing so, she changed her introduction. Before introducing her best friend, Tini added another paragraph. It functioned as a preamble to her story about her best friend. In this paragraph, she used a poem and discussed it in another paragraph. This was a new style that she exploited. The revision made was more relevant than the one in Draft two.

Draft two

'I have a friend who have said something to me.... "friends are not important to me than my boyfriend and my family." Do u agree with that statement?? She always ignored our messages (SMS) to save her credit for calling her boyfriend. I felt very angry and annoyed with her at that time. At the meantime, her world only for his boyfriend, never listen to us if we want to take her time - even for discussing our assignments! Her exam grades also effected by this problem'

Final draft

Friends will come, and friends will go
The seasons change and it will show
I will age and so will you
But our friendship stays, strong and true

Based on an idiom above, I always think that a friendship is difficult to build but easy to break it up. While a best friend is someone who always be with you, someone who never let you down: and someone who always holding your hand and never let you fall.

Organization

An obvious revision that Asiah did was on her paragraphing. Her manuscript was entitled 'Being Fat Is Not A Sin'. Since many of the peers like Anne and Wafa advised her to balance her paragraphs Asiah did so in both her second and final draft. Nonetheless, the drastic improvement was evident in the final draft. By shortening her long introduction, reorganizing, and elaborating more in certain paragraphs, Asiah's manuscript certainly was refined. There was a definite balance, coherence, and cohesiveness in her final draft.

Draft two

Imagine this situation: "I don't eat or drink at parties because someone will say, don't eat that, it'll make you fat". Or "I can't go to the playgrounds: I'm scared the chains of the swings will break". Fat is one of the most frightening words in a woman's life. Who wants to be fat? Certainly not you and not me. But in reality today when the world moves fast where the word global and glokal come in and people keep saying "broaden your mind to be a first class mind", they still point out their fingers to fat people especially fat women. Do you get what I'm trying to say? I mean despite of the so- called brilliant mind or education they get, these people still make remarks, or sneer towards the fat women. Apart of that, women are getting restless and scared they will put on more weights and wish they would die in their sleep if they cannot lose the pounds.

Final Draft

Imagine this situation: "I don't eat or drink at parties because someone will say, don't eat that, it'll make you fat". Or "I can't go to the playgrounds: I'm scared the chains of the swings will break". Fat is one of the most frightening words in a woman's life. Who wants to be fat? The answer would be a big NO, am I right?

The problem is in reality today when the world moves fast and where the words global and glokal come in and people keep saying "broaden your mind to be a first class mind", they still point out their fingers to fat people especially fat women. Do you get what I'm trying to say? I mean despite of the so- called brilliant mind or education they get, these people still make remarks, or sneer towards the fat women. Apart of that, women are getting restless and scared they will put on more weights and wish they would die in their sleep if they cannot lose the pounds.

Asiah felt that Wafa should reorganize her manuscript because it was too long. Thus, Wafa made another round of changes to her content in her final draft. The three paragraphs in draft two were revamped. The points on sweet memories were discarded entirely. Instead, Wafa elaborated on the benefits of karateka. Previously, she wrote that karate could protect her, widen her social networks, and keep her fit. In the final draft, she kept the first and the third main ideas but dropped the second. In replacement, she added discipline as another main idea. Wafa also tried to balance the elaborations on all the main ideas.

Draft two

From the time when I joined karate-do, my life become much more colourful compared to the previous one. Although some of you might think that joining a martial art will only make you feel tired and waste your time, but it is the other way. Karate-do gives you many benefits that you could not even think of about it. First, you are able to learn how to protect and defence yourself from the danger. In spite of expanding your social networks, you are able to tie bond between different races such as Chinese and India. I've got a karateka friend who is a mix between an African-Arab and Malay. I thought he would only talk in English, however when he talked in Malay with Penang accent, I could not stop laughing because it looked kinda funny when a foreigner talk Malay with Penang accent. In addition, karate-do is good for your health. The physical activities could help you burn out all your fats.

*There were two more paragraphs after this.

Final draft

As a karate-ka, we can gain a lot benefits from this martial arts. One of it is you are able to learn how to protect and defence yourself from the danger. It is very important for human especially women to take safety step especially when they go out and karate-do could provide those safety tips for them. In addition, karate-do is good for your health. To all girls who want to burn their fats fast, join karate-do. This is because a lot of physical activities must be done so that you are fit to do all the punch and kick during the training. A karateka need a high stamina so that they are able to do karate-do fast, firm and accurate especially when they compete in a tournament, or being attacked by someone else. Besides, karate-do could discipline you as a person. Punctuality and respects is very important in this area. If you want to train yourself to be on time and doing the same thing without complaining, karate-do is the answer. You might get bored doing the same thing every day, but as the time pass by, you can see that your physical will improve slowly.

Language

All the respondents were given feedback on their language: grammar, spelling and vocabulary errors. Nevertheless, most of the COPF were general, which means that the errors were not specified. Amongst the general COPF were *'pay attention to grammar errors, you have a few grammar mistakes there and several grammar errors.'* Simultaneously, there were few specific grammar errors COPF like '*avoid starting a sentence with the coordinating conjunction "and", and mixture of both past and present tense.*'

For the ones who received general COPF, the researchers noticed that it was quite demanding for them to detect and correct those errors by themselves. As what many complained, the COPF were too general. Therefore, many failed to amend their errors. Despite that, some of the respondents had struggled and succeeded in their corrections. Regrettably, the success was not wholesome. The respondents did not manage to rectify the complete manuscript. There were still grammatical errors in their final drafts. There were also errors that were not highlighted by the feedback providers. This implied that these ESL feedback providers were still inept in their language ability.

7.Discussion and Conclusion

The authors' revisions improved tremendously with the assistance from the peers on the online platform. Although the revisions made were not equivalent to expert changes, all of the authors had achieved at least text-based changes at micro-structure level according to Faigley's Revision Taxonomy (1981). This level was certainly far-off better than surface changes. The asynchronous platform in blogs afforded the authors time to revise wisely. This finding is similar to Lae & Baer's (2020) and Mohd Said et al. (2013) studies. This study has also highlighted the augmentation in the authors' content, corroborating a study by Latifi et al.(2019). However, the peers were not able to offer practical grammatical COPF as there were still grammar errors left unapprised. Similarly, the authors could not solve the grammatical errors. This finding contrasts with Kitchakarn's (2013) discovery in which authors were more observant in their grammar edition.

This study revealed a few poignant points. First, on the importance of authentic audience, corroborating the findings from Durán (2017), Cho & Choi (2018) and Sulistyo et al. studies. It demonstrated how feedback from others are important as they provided authentic constructive comments. If the authors had written alone, s/he would have only been writing in a vacuum, in

isolation. Her/his thoughts would have remained to herself/himself. Nevertheless, the meaning-making of a text happens only when there is an audience (Sommers, 1980). The data from this study thus confirmed that the authentic audience through online peer feedback was a pivotal factor to the enhancement of the authors' writing performances. According to Vygotsky's (1978) theory, this learning process has elevated the author's ZPD.

The second point to note is, no doubt that the authors were able to reach micro-structure revision level, they were not able to correct the language errors holistically. There were still grammatical errors in the authors' final drafts. This indicated that the authors, being L2 learners still needed a lot of assistance in their language structure. Although the highlighted errors were precise, the authors were not able to produce error free manuscripts. As for the online peer feedback providers, there were still grammatical errors that remained undetected. This implied that the online peer feedback providers in this study were not yet competent in their grammar, they were still immature, thus were not able to offer effective COPF on language.

This study has also proven that students can learn in a learner-centered learning environment through an online platform without the presence of the educators. Evidently the players in this learning context were purely learners themselves. There was no instructor involved neither was there a training. They commenced the learning process with just an instruction: to assist their friends to improve writing and a sample of feedback checklist. The success of such a learning context had proven that online learner-centered approach could be implemented at tertiary level to develop learners' writing skills as they are more independent, self-directed and focused at achieving their goals.

In conclusion, the researchers would recommend the use of online peer feedback as a collaborative method to augment writing skills. Observing the possibilities, this platform could be employed as a self-directed learning approach as an outside of class exercise where the learners can continually progress in their writing by themselves. In this respect, the learners could sharpen not only their writing ability but their critical and analytical thinking as well. As writing is a decision-making activity, the learners could also advance in their decision-making abilities, producing better manuscripts. Working with peers paves a way for learning cultivation as they come from the same age group, having similar needs, favourites, and trends. The diverge background of experiences could also enrich the learning process. As for the language, the researchers would recommend the teachers to intervene by encouraging the learners to do more online language exercises progressively. It needs to be a sustainable effort. In due time, they would be better in their language structure as well.

References

[1]. Abdullah, M. Y., Hussin, S., Shakir, M. (2018). The effect of peers' and teacher's e-feedback on writing anxiety level through CMC applications. IJET, 13 (11), 196-207.

[2]. Abri, A.A., Baimani, S.A., Bahlani, S.A. (2021). The role of web-based peer feedback in advancing EFL essay writing. CALL-EJ. 22 (1), 374-390.

[3]. Bailey, D., Cassidy, R. (2020). Online peer feedback tasks: training for improved L2 writing proficiency, anxiety reduction, and language learning strategies. CALL-EJ, 20(2), 70-88.

[4]. Becker, A. (2006). A feedback of writing model research based on cognitive processes. In A. Horning, A. Becker (Eds.), Revision history, theory and practice. West Lafayyette: Parlor Press.

[5]. Bos, A.H., Tan, E. (2019). Effects of anonymity on online peer feedback in second-language writing. Computers & Education. 142.

[6]. Breindenbach, C. (2006). Practical guidelines for writers and teachers. In A. Horning, A. Becker (Eds.), Revision history, theory and practice. West Lafayyette: Parlor Press.

[7]. Bruffee, K. (1984).Collaborative learning and the conversation of mankind. In Villanuaeva, V. (Ed.), Cross talk in comp theory. Urbana : National Council of Teachers of English.

[8]. Chen, T. (2016). Technology-supported peer feedback in ESL/EFL writing classes: a research synthesis. Computer Assisted Language Learning. 29(2), 365-397.

[9]. Cho, Y., Choi, I. (2018). Writing from sources: Does audience matter? Assessing writing. 37, 25-38.

[10]. Chuaphalakit,K., Inpin,B., Coffin, P. (2019). A study of the quality of feedback via the Google classroom-mediated-anonymous online peer feedback activity in a Thai EFL Writing Classroom. International Journal of Progressive Education. 15 (5), 103-118.

[11]. Durán, L. (2017). Audience and young bilingual writers: building on strengths. Journal of Literacy Research. 49(1): 92–114.

[12]. Ekahitanond, V.(2018). The impact of feedback in Facebook on students' language proficiency. TEM Journal. 7(3), 686-692.

[13]. Ertmer, P. A., Richardson, J. C., Belland, B., Camin,D. (2007). Using peer feedback to enhance the quality of student online postings: an exploratory study. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication. 12: 412–433.

[14]. Faigley, L., Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision. College Composition and Communication. 32.

[15]. Hayes, J.R., Flower, L.S. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing process. In L. Gregg, E.R. Steinberg (Ed.), Cognitive processes in writing. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

[16]. Hewett, B., Thonus, T. (2019). Online metaphorical feedback and students' textual revisions: an embodied cognitive experience. Computers and Composition. 54.

[17]. Jiang, W. & Ribeiro, A .(2017). Effect of computer-mediated peer written feedback on ESL/EFL writing: A systematic literature feedback. electronic International Journal of Education, Arts, and Science. 3(6), 57-79.

[18]. Kanevsky, L., Geake, J. (2004). Inside the zone of proximal development: validating a multifactor model of learning potential with gifted students and their peers. Journal for the Education of the Gifted. 28.

[19]. Kıtchakarn, O. (2013). Peer feedback through blogs: An effective tool for improving students' writing abilities. Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education. 14 (3), 152-164.

[20]. Lowell, V.L., Ashby, I.V. (2018). Supporting the development of collaboration and feedback skills in instructional designers. J Comput High Educ. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-018-9170-8

[21]. Latifi, S., Noroozi,O., Hatami, J., Biemans, H.J.A. (2019). How does online peer feedback improve argumentative essay writing and learning? Innovations in Education and Teaching International. DOI: 10.1080/14703297.2019.1687005.

[22]. Law, S. , Baer, A. (2020). Using technology and structured peer feedback to enhance students' writing. Active Learning in Higher Education. 21(1), 23 –38.

[23]. Lee, L. (2017). Learners' perceptions of the effectiveness of blogging for l2 writing in fully online language courses. International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching, 7. DOI:10.4018/IJCALLT.2017010102

[24]. Leijen, D.A.J. (2017). A novel approach to examine the impact of web-based peer feedback on the revisions of l2 authors. Computers and Composition. 43, 35-54.

[25]. Ma, Q. (2019): Examining the role of inter-group peer online feedback on wiki writing in an EAP context. Computer Assisted Language Learning. DOI: 10.1080/09588221.2018.1556703

[26]. Maguire, M., Delahunt, B. (2017). Doing a thematic analysis: A practical, step-by-step guide for learning and teaching scholars. All Ireland Journal of Higher Education. 9, 3351.

[27]. Miles, M. B., Huberman, A.M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook. London: SAGE Publications, Inc.

[28]. Mohd Said, N. E., Yunus,M., Doring, L.K., Asmi, A., Farah Aqilah, Li, L.K. (2013). Blogging to enhance writing skills: a survey of students' perception and attitude. Asian Social Science. 9(16), 95-101.

[29]. Peskin, J. & Ellenbogen, B. (2019). Cognitive processes while writing poetry: an expert-novice study. Cognition and Instruction, 37:2, 232-251.

[30]. Sole, D. (2006). The '4S' method for helping students revise their writing. Proceedings of Annual College English Association Conference. San Antonio, Texas. April 6.

[31]. Sole, D. (2015). The essentials of academic writing. Cengage Learning Canada Inc.: Canada.

[32]. Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. In Villanuaeva, V. (Ed.), cross talk in comp theory. Urbana : National Council of Teachers of English.

[33]. Speck, B. (2002). Facilitating students' collaborative writing. Jossey-Bass: ERIC Publications.

[34]. Sulistyo, T., Mukminatien, N., Cahyono, B. Y., Saukah. Enhancing learners' writing performance through blog-assisted language learning. iJET , 14 (9).

[35]. Van Popta, E. , Kral, M., Camp, G., Martens, Simons, J. P.R. (2017). Exploring the value of peer feedback in online learning for the provider. Educational Research Review. 20, 24-34.

[36]. Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind-in society- The development of higher psychological processes. UK: Harvard Univ. Press.

[37]. Wichmann, A., Funk, A., Rummel, N. (2018). Leveraging the potential of peer feedback in an academic writing activity through sense-making support. Eur J Psychol Educ. 33, 165–184. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-017-0348-7

[38]. Xiao, G., Xin, C. (2018). Application of COCA in EFL writing instruction at the tertiary level in China. iJET , 13 (9), 160-173.

[39]. Yang,S.J. (2018). Language learners' perceptions of having two interactional contexts in E-Tandem. Language Learning & Technology. 22 (1), 42–51.

[40]. Yim, S., Zheng, B. & Warschauer, M. (2017). Feedback and revision in cloud-based writing: Variations across feedback source and task type. Writing & Pedagogy. 9 (3), 517-553.