Beyond the Red Pen: Navigating Features and Challenges in Peer Feedback

Brisbane C. Chua, Cristie Ann L. Jaca

Cebu Technological University, Main Campus

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1311000040

Received: 31 October 2026; Accepted: 05 November 2026; Published: 21 November 2026

ABSTRACT

This study explored the features, types, and challenges of peer feedback among Grade 11 students of Asian College of Technology-International Educational Foundation (ACT-IEF), Cebu City, Philippines, particularly in argumentative writing. Specifically, this study examined the features and types of feedback students provided, the aspects of writing they commonly addressed, the variation in the type and quality of feedback they provided, and the challenges they encountered when giving feedback to their peers. The study used an exploratory qualitative mixed-methods design and employed a researcher-made 40-item, 4-point Likert-scale questionnaire and a semi-structured interview guide as research instruments. The researcher analyzed quantitative data from the questionnaire using frequencies, means, and standard deviations. In contrast, they analyzed qualitative data from the peer feedback activity and interviews through transcription, coding, and thematic analysis. The findings revealed that students commonly provided feedback on content, organization, language use, and mechanics, with corrective, descriptive, evaluative, and motivational feedback evident in their responses. Students demonstrated awareness of key features of argumentative writing and could identify areas for improvement. However, throughout the activity, they struggled to identify errors, assess the accuracy of their feedback, organize their comments, and express criticism appropriately. The findings suggest that clear guidelines, criteria, and appropriate teacher guidance can help students provide more specific, constructive, and meaningful peer feedback. Overall, peer feedback can serve as a valuable classroom practice for promoting students' engagement in the writing process and supporting the development of argumentative writing skills among Grade 11 students.

Keywords: English teaching, argumentative writing, challenges, feedback features, Grade 11 students, peer feedback

INTRODUCTION

Peer feedback has become a crucial classroom practice in today's generation, where education, particularly in the K–12 curriculum, is increasingly emphasizing learner-centered instruction, critical thinking, and collaboration. It has become essential not only in classroom settings but also in writing instruction because it gives students opportunities to actively improve and evaluate their classmates' written work, especially in argumentative essays. According to Fleckney et al. (2025), peer assessment is effective when students use feedback to improve their work and when teachers provide guidance, clear assessment criteria, and opportunities for students to revise their writing. Through this process, learners can identify strengths and weaknesses in a text, exchange ideas, and enhance their understanding of effective writing. Instead of depending only on and waiting for the teacher's feedback, students become involved in examining written arguments and suggesting possible improvements. Recent research continues to discuss the educational value of peer feedback in students' writing development.

Vougan and Li (2023), in a meta-analysis of 26 empirical studies, have found that peer feedback had a significant positive overall effect on second-language writing. Their findings showed that peer feedback was particularly beneficial for content development and revision, highlighting its potential to help learners strengthen the substance of their writing. Similarly, in a systematic review of 60 studies on peer feedback in academic writing, Wei and Liu (2024) identified behavioral, cognitive, social, affective, and metacognitive

benefits. Peer feedback can support writing development while also encouraging students to become more diligent participants in the learning process. However, the effectiveness of peer feedback depends on the nature of the comments that students provide and the aspects of writing they identify as needing improvement. In argumentative essay writing, students are expected to demonstrate clear claims, provide relevant supporting evidence, construct logical arguments, and organize ideas coherently. Reviewing classmates' argumentative essays shows they need to focus on several writing features, including content, organization, language use, and mechanics. Content concerns the clarity and relevance of ideas, arguments, and supporting evidence. Organization involves arranging ideas, ensuring coherence, and maintaining logical progression. Language use includes vocabulary, grammar, and sentence construction, while mechanics concerns spelling, formatting, and proper punctuation. A meta-analysis of writing feedback by Scherer et al. (2024) found that feedback focused on deeper aspects of writing, such as organization and ideas, can substantially improve writing outcomes. Examining the features students comment on can provide useful information about how they approach reviewing argumentative essays. Beyond the features that the students address, the types of feedback they provide are also essential to understanding peer-review practices. Students may identify errors and offer corrections, describe strengths and weaknesses, evaluate the quality of a classmate's work, or provide encouragement. These responses serve different purposes during the writing and revision process. Corrective feedback may help students identify errors, descriptive feedback may explain specific aspects of a text, evaluative feedback may communicate judgment about writing quality, and motivational feedback may encourage continued effort. Nevertheless, comments do not necessarily provide feedback that is sufficiently specific, clear, or useful to support revision. According to Weng et al. (2024), peer feedback activities improved EFL students' recognition of feedback and their ability to judge feedback quality, even though the activities did not significantly enhance how students used feedback information. Recent research has further underscored that peer feedback requires learners to engage cognitively and communicate their observations effectively.

In a longitudinal study of three EFL learners, Li and Jiang (2024) examined changes in students' affective, behavioral, and cognitive engagement when giving peer feedback over an academic year. The study suggests that peer feedback is not simply about marking errors; it also requires students to explain written work, formulate responses, and make judgments. Similarly, Peng and Storch (2025), in a classroom-based study of secondary-school EFL learners, found that collaborative processing of peer feedback encouraged cognitive engagement through confirmation, discussion, and clarification. Despite these potential benefits, students still may encounter difficulties when reviewing their peers' work. They may struggle to identify weaknesses in an argument, determine whether supporting evidence is sufficient, explain why a particular sentence needs improvement, or express criticism. Differences in writing ability and familiarity with feedback criteria also affect the quality of students' comments. Wei and Liu (2024) identified challenges arising from feedback providers, feedback receivers, and the settings in which peer feedback takes place. The benefits of peer feedback may be limited when students lack the skills to provide constructive comments or when interpersonal concerns interfere with the feedback exchange. In a more recent systematic review, Wang et al. (2026) identified recurring challenges in peer feedback training, including vague comments, low learner confidence, weak peer trust, insufficient use of feedback during revision, and limited understanding of evaluation criteria. The review also underlined the importance of teacher modeling, guided peer-review activities, checklists, and opportunities for reflection and discussion.

In the Philippine educational context, researchers have also examined peer feedback as a strategy to enhance students' writing. Tiongco and Abergas (2025) investigated structured peer review and collaborative editing strategies among 60 Grade 8 students in a rural high school in Zamboanga del Sur. Their Quasi-experimental study reported significant improvements in the writing proficiency of students who participated in structured peer-feedback activities. The findings present local evidence of the potential value of peer review in supporting writing development. However, the study primarily examined changes in writing proficiency rather than the specific features of peer feedback, the types of feedback students commonly used, and the difficulties they encountered while reviewing their classmates' essays. Although international research has already identified the potential benefits of peer feedback and common challenges, how students offer feedback may still vary by classroom experience, familiarity with peer-review activities, and writing tasks. This research is valuable because it moves beyond viewing peer feedback as a technique for correcting students' written errors

and instead examines the feedback students provide, their experiences giving feedback, and the challenges they encounter during the process. This focus can give teachers a clearer understanding of the kinds of comments students naturally make on argumentative essays and the areas where they may need additional guidance. The findings may also help English teachers design more structured, meaningful peer-feedback activities and develop strategies to address difficulties related to feedback quality, confidence, and constructive communication.

Peer feedback plays a pivotal role in modern writing instruction by shifting students from passive recipients of teacher corrections to active participants in revision. Focusing on senior high school learners at the Asian College of Technology–International Educational Foundation (ACT-IEF) in Cebu City, Philippines, this study investigates the features, types, and challenges of peer feedback in Grade 11 argumentative writing. Utilizing an exploratory qualitative mixed-methods design that combines a 40-item Likert-scale questionnaire with semi-structured interviews and written feedback analysis, the research examines how students evaluate key aspects of writing such as content, organization, language use, and mechanics, and the variations in feedback quality they deliver. While the findings highlight students' ability to offer descriptive, evaluative, corrective, and motivational insights, they also underscore key operational hurdles, including difficulties in accurately identifying errors, structuring comments, and delivering appropriate constructiveness. Ultimately, the paper demonstrates that structured teacher guidance and clear evaluative criteria are essential to transforming peer review into a meaningful, skill-building practice that enhances argumentative writing proficiency.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Peer feedback has increasingly shifted writing instruction away from traditional, teacher-centered correction toward dynamic, collaborative learning environments. Key features of structured peer feedback such as explicit rubrics, interactive dialogue, and prompt-based scaffolding, enhance critical thinking, foster learner autonomy, and improve overall writing quality by encouraging self-evaluation and deeper metacognitive awareness (Gan & Hattie, 2014; Jongsma et al., 2024). However, implementation is often complicated by distinct interpersonal and affective challenges. Students often struggle with peer credibility, anxiety about social critique, and a tendency to focus on surface-level revisions such as grammar and mechanics rather than substantial structural or argumentative revisions (Kasch et al., 2021). Consequently, optimizing peer feedback requires educators to establish psychological safety, build trust, and provide structured training to ensure students move beyond passive acceptance and engage productively as critical reviewers (Jongsma et al., 2024; Kasch et al., 2021).

The study is anchored primarily in Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1978), which explains that learning and cognitive development occur through meaningful social interaction and collaboration. From this perspective, learners develop higher-order thinking through communication, shared experiences, and participation in socially mediated activities. A central concept of the theory is the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which refers to the gap between what learners can accomplish independently and what they can do with guidance from more knowledgeable others or capable peers. Thus, learning does not occur solely through individual effort, but it can be enhanced through interaction with others who provide appropriate assistance. Peer interaction therefore serves as a form of socially mediated learning in which the students learn not only from the feedback they receive but also from the process of evaluating and commenting on another student’s work. Research supports this view. Cui et al. (2021) found that trained peer feedback positively affected students’ writing competence and writing self-efficacy and significantly enhanced autonomous motivation. The relevance of peer interaction is further explained through the concept of peer scaffolding, which is closely related to the ZPD. Peer scaffolding occurs when learners provide temporary assistance that enables classmates to accomplish tasks that may initially be difficult to perform independently. In peer feedback activities, students may scaffold one another by identifying strengths, pointing out unclear ideas, explaining errors, and suggesting revisions. Research on feedback literacy similarly indicates that participation in peer feedback can enhance students’ ability to recognize feedback and judge its quality. However, the ability to use feedback and manage emotional responses may not develop to the same extent (Anwar et al., 2024). Social Constructivist Learning Theory (Vygotsky, 1978) also supports this view, seeing knowledge as actively constructed through interaction, discussion, and collaboration rather

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue XI November 2026

than passively transmitted by the teacher. From this perspective, learners build understanding by engaging with different viewpoints and negotiating meaning with others. Peer feedback provides these opportunities because students must examine a classmate's writing, interpret its meaning, compare it with established writing expectations, explain their judgment, and consider alternative ways to improve the text. Zhang et al. (2023) found that students' engagement in giving peer feedback developed over repeated feedback activities, with students producing longer comments, identifying problems more deeply, and offering more developed solutions. Repeated social interaction can strengthen students' active participation and ability to provide meaningful feedback. In a peer feedback setting, students assume active roles as both feedback providers and recipients. Rather than relying entirely on the teacher to identify problems in their writing, students evaluate and discuss written work.

Zhang et al. (2022) reported that constructive peer feedback can encourage students to revise their work and improve their academic performance by exposing them to perspectives different from their own. Thus, collaboration allows students to encounter alternative interpretations and strategies that can contribute to their understanding of writing. Peer feedback can also be understood through dialogic knowledge construction, in which learning develops through meaningful dialogue and interaction. From this perspective, feedback is not limited to marking errors. Students engage in academic conversations in which they can explain their observations, ask questions, justify suggestions, negotiate meanings, and clarify ideas. Such dialogue can make students more aware of the reasoning behind their writing decisions and encourage reflection on both their own work and their classmates' work. Peungcharoenkun and Waluyo (2024) emphasized the importance of emotional engagement and collaborative dialogue in shaping students' experiences with peer feedback. Similarly, recent research on peer feedback literacy emphasizes that effective participation involves not only giving feedback but also evaluating its quality and engaging with it as part of the learning process. These theoretical perspectives also help explain the nature and types of peer feedback examined in the present study. Peer feedback in writing is multidimensional because students may comment on a written text's content, organization, language use, and mechanics. Their comments may also serve different functions, including corrective, descriptive, evaluative, and motivational purposes. Cui et al. (2021) demonstrated that trained peer feedback can support writing development, self-efficacy, and motivation, while Zhang et al. (2023) showed that students can develop their feedback practices through repeated participation. Consequently, examining the features and types of feedback produced by Grade 11 students can clarify how peer feedback operates in classroom writing activities. However, students' attitudes toward peer feedback may influence their willingness to participate, accept comments, offer honest suggestions, and use feedback for revision. Cui et al. (2021) found that trained peer feedback enhanced students' autonomous motivation, while Zhang et al. (2023) reported that positive feelings toward giving feedback developed alongside behavioral and cognitive engagement.

Peer feedback activities improved students' recognition of feedback and their ability to judge feedback quality, but had less pronounced effects on using feedback information and managing emotions. This indicates that participation in peer feedback does not automatically eliminate the cognitive and emotional difficulties associated with giving and receiving feedback. Because of these challenges, instructional scaffolding and facilitation are important considerations in implementing peer feedback. Students may require explicit instruction, examples, criteria, rubrics, checklists, modeling, and opportunities for reflection before they can provide effective feedback independently. Cui et al. (2021) demonstrated the value of trained peer feedback, showing that preparation can improve writing competence, self-efficacy, and motivation. More recent evidence likewise suggests that peer feedback is more effective when students receive systematic guidance, including rubrics or checklists, teacher modeling, guided peer review tools, peer dialogue, and opportunities for revision and reflection (Wang et al., 2025). These findings provide a strong basis for considering facilitation strategies in the present study and for developing a Peer Feedback Facilitation Guide based on them. The interaction among these roles may shape the kind of feedback students provide, their attitudes toward the activity, and the difficulties they experience. Relevant Philippine educational policies further support the present study. Republic Act No. 10533, or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, emphasizes learner-centered education and the development of competencies relevant to communication, critical thinking, collaboration, and lifelong learning. DepEd (2015) emphasizes formative assessment and feedback to support and improve student learning. Likewise, DepEd (2019) reinforces learner-centered approaches and the

development of 21st-century skills. These policies provide an educational context for examining peer feedback as a classroom practice that encourages active participation, reflection, collaboration, and continuous improvement. Overall, the theoretical background establishes that peer feedback is a socially mediated, collaborative, dialogic, and reflective learning process. Its effectiveness depends not only on the feedback itself but also on students' knowledge, confidence, interactions, and ability to use feedback. These theoretical and empirical perspectives consequently provide the foundation for examining the features, types, and challenges of peer feedback among Grade 11 students in argumentative writing.

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized an exploratory qualitative mixed-method design to investigate the features, types, variations, and challenges of peer feedback among Grade 11 students at Asian College of Technology - International Educational Foundation (ACT-IEF) during the School Year 2026-2027.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What features of peer feedback do students commonly provide in reviewing argumentative essays in terms of:

1.1 Content (ideas, clarity of arguments, supporting evidence)

1.2 Organization (structure, coherence, logical flow)

1.3 Language Use (grammar, vocabulary, sentence construction)

1.4 Mechanics (spelling, punctuation, formatting)

2. Which type of peer feedback is most frequently used by students?

3. How do students vary in the type and quality of feedback they provide?

4. What patterns or trends emerge in student's peer feedback on argumentative essays?

5. What challenges do students encounter when giving peer feedback?

6. Based on the findings, what peer feedback facilitation guide can be proposed?

An exploratory mixed-method design combines qualitative and quantitative approaches to provide a more comprehensive understanding of a research problem by exploring participants' experiences and supporting them with quantitative data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). This research design is appropriate for the present study because it sought to examine the features of peer feedback in argumentative writing, identify the types of feedback most frequently used by the students, explore variations in the type and quality of feedback provided, identify emerging patterns and trends, and determine the challenges students encountered when giving peer feedback. The quantitative phase described students' peer feedback practices through a structured 4-point Likert scale questionnaire, while the qualitative phase explored their experiences and challenges through semi-structured interviews. Integrating both data types provided a more comprehensive understanding of peer feedback among Grade 11 students and served as the basis for developing a proposed Peer Feedback Facilitation Guide (Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

The study was conducted at Asian College of Technology - International Educational Foundation (ACT-IEF) in Cebu City, Philippines, 6000, during School Year 2026-2027. The institution is a private educational institution, with its Senior High School department housed in Cyber Tower Building 2, located at the corner of P. Del Rosario and Leon Kilat Streets, Cebu City, near the Cebu City Sports Center and Elizabeth Mall (E-Mall). Cyber Tower Building 2. The study has 43 Grade 11 student-respondents at Asian College of Technology - International Educational Foundation (ACT-IEF), Cebu City, Philippines, during the Academic

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue XI November 2026

Year 2026-2027. The Grade 11 Devsphere section was selected as the research setting because the students were directly involved in the English writing and peer-feedback activities relevant to the study.

The study utilized two instruments to gather the data needed to answer the research questions: a researcher-made 4-point Likert scale questionnaire and a researcher-made semi-structured interview guide. The questionnaire collected quantitative data, while the interview guide gathered qualitative data. Both instruments were aligned with the statements of the problem (SOPs). They were designed to examine the features, types, and challenges associated with peer feedback among Grade 11 students in argumentative writing. The first instrument was a 40-item, researcher-made, 4-point Likert-scale questionnaire. It was developed to identify the features and types of peer feedback Grade 11 students demonstrated during the peer feedback activity. The questionnaire consisted of two parts, each with 20 items. Part 1 contained 20 items on the features of peer feedback. These items examined the extent to which particular features, including clarity, specificity, relevance, usefulness, and quality, were manifested in the feedback provided by the students. The selection of these features drew on literature on effective feedback and formative assessment. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) emphasized the importance of effective feedback in supporting students' learning and self-regulation, while Hattie and Timperley (2007) explained how feedback can help learners understand their performance, identify gaps in their knowledge, and determine appropriate steps for improvement. Drawing on these principles, the researcher operationalized clarity, specificity, relevance, usefulness, and quality as indicators for examining the characteristics of peer feedback in the present study. These five categories served as researcher-defined indicators informed by the literature, rather than as a classification directly established by a single theoretical framework. Part II contained 20 items on the types of peer feedback. It examined how often students demonstrated corrective, descriptive, evaluative, and motivational feedback during the peer feedback activity. Researchers rated responses using a 4-point frequency scale: 4-Always, 3-Often, 2-Sometimes, and 1-Never. Responses to both parts of the questionnaire provided quantitative data to describe the features and types of peer feedback observed during the activity.

Before the actual data gathering, the questionnaire underwent validation by Sir Wilson Castañeda, a statistician, to establish its content validity. It was also pilot-tested with 15 students who were excluded from the main study. The pilot test was conducted to assess the questionnaire's reliability and suitability before its administration to the actual respondents. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the internal consistency of the questionnaire items across the different dimensions. The reliability analysis indicated acceptable to good internal consistency across the questionnaire's dimensions. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the sub scales of peer feedback features ranged from .0.702 to 0.719, while those for the types of peer feedback ranged from 0.719 to 0.798. The overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.850 for the features of peer feedback scale and 0.874 for the types of peer feedback scale, indicating good internal consistency for both major scales. Furthermore, the corrected item-total correlation (CITC) results indicated that most items demonstrated satisfactory discrimination. Although a few items yielded relatively lower item rest correlations, deleting these items would not substantially improve the overall reliability coefficients. Therefore, all items were retained because they contributed to the theoretical completeness and content coverage of the respective dimensions. The questionnaire was subsequently used in the main study.

The second instrument was a researcher-made, semi-structured interview guide. It was developed directly from the statements of the problem to obtain in-depth qualitative data about participants' experiences and challenges related to the peer feedback activity. The interview guide consisted of eight open-ended questions, with Cebuano translations for selected questions to support participants' understanding and encourage them to share their experiences more comfortably. The semi-structured format allowed the researcher to ask follow-up questions when necessary while giving participants sufficient opportunities to explain their experiences, perceptions, and difficulties in their own words. The qualitative data obtained through semi-structured interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis. The analysis involved familiarizing the researchers with the interview responses, coding relevant statements, grouping related codes into potential themes, reviewing and refining the themes, and interpreting the findings in relation to the research questions. The interview guide did not undergo formal expert validation before the actual data gathering. Although its questions were derived directly from the statements of the problem, the absence of formal validation was a methodological limitation because expert review could have further established the clarity, relevance, and adequacy of the questions in

eliciting response aligned with each SOP. This limitation was acknowledged in describing the development of the instrument

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents, analyzes, and interprets the data gathered from the Grade 11 students at Asian College of Technology - International Educational Foundation (ACT-IEF), Cebu, Philippines, during the Academic Year 2026-2027. The data were collected to examine the features and types of peer feedback students provided when reviewing argumentative essays, as well as the challenges they encountered during the peer feedback process. The quantitative data gathered through the researcher-made questionnaire were analyzed using appropriate descriptive tools, including frequency, mean, and standard deviation, to determine the features and types of peer feedback students commonly provided. Meanwhile, the qualitative data obtained through semi-structured interviews were analyzed thematically to identify recurring patterns, variations, and challenges in students' peer feedback experiences.

Table 1. Features of Peer Feedback from Grade 11 Students

Rank	Feature/Category	M	SD	Interpretation
1	Content	3.13	0.64	Agree
2	Organization	3.07	0.63	Agree
3	Mechanics	3.04	0.77	Agree
4	Language Use	2.88	0.75	Agree
	Overall	3.03	0.71	Agree

Legend: M= mean; SD= standard deviation. The categories are ranked in descending order of their mean scores.

Table 1 summarizes and ranks peer feedback features in reviewing argumentative essays by mean score. The results show an overall mean of 3.03 (SD = 0.71), interpreted as Agree. This indicates that, overall, students agreed that they provided peer feedback addressing the different aspects of argumentative writing included in the questionnaire. All four categories were interpreted as Agree, although their mean scores differed slightly. These results suggest that students reported providing feedback across content, organization, mechanics, and language use rather than concentrating exclusively on one aspect of writing. Content ranked first, with a mean of 3.13 and a standard deviation of 0.64, interpreted as Agree. This finding indicates that content-related feedback received the highest level of agreement among the four categories. Students appeared to give relatively greater attention to the ideas expressed in an argumentative essay, the clarity of its central argument, and the supporting evidence used to justify the writer's position. This feedback matters because argumentative writing requires writers to present a clear claim and develop it with relevant reasons and evidence. The results indicate that students placed comparatively greater emphasis on the substance of their classmates' arguments than on the other assessed features. However, the mean score reflects students' questionnaire responses and does not, by itself, establish the actual effectiveness of the feedback they provided. Organization ranked second, with a mean of 3.07 and a standard deviation of 0.63, also interpreted as Agree. This result indicates that students reported providing feedback on how argumentative essays were structured and how ideas were connected. Organization-related feedback may involve identifying weaknesses in the introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion, as well as noticing problems with coherence, logical progression, and the arrangement of supporting arguments. The relatively high mean indicates that students recognized the importance of the way ideas were presented, not merely the ideas themselves. In argumentative writing, clear organization helps readers follow the writer's position and understand how individual reasons and pieces of evidence support the overall claim. Although organization ranked below content, the difference between their mean scores was only 0.06, suggesting the two categories received broadly similar levels of agreement.

Mechanics ranked third, with a mean of 3.04 and a standard deviation of 0.77, interpreted as Agree. This finding indicates students also reported attending to the technical conventions of writing, including spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and formatting. Attention to mechanics ranked third, with a mean only 0.03 lower

than organization and 0.09 lower than content. Therefore, the ranking should not be interpreted as indicating a substantial difference between these categories. The standard deviation of 0.77 was the highest among the four categories, suggesting comparatively greater variability in students' responses about mechanics. In other words, students' reported attention to mechanics appeared less consistent than their responses concerning content and organization. Language Use ranked fourth, with a mean of 2.88 and a standard deviation of 0.75, interpreted as Agree. Despite having the lowest mean among the four categories, the result still indicates agreement rather than disagreement. Language-use feedback concerns grammar, vocabulary, sentence construction, and the appropriateness and clarity of language. The result suggests that students reported giving somewhat less attention to these aspects than to content, organization, and mechanics. One possible interpretation is that students may have found it easier to identify problems with an argument or visible writing conventions than to recognize and explain grammar- or vocabulary-related issues. The standard deviation of 0.75 for language use also indicates some variation in responses. This means that students did not report the same level of attention to language-related concerns. Nevertheless, because the mean remained within the Agree category, the finding should not be interpreted as showing that students generally neglected grammar, vocabulary, or sentence construction. Overall, the findings revealed a descending order of Content (M=3.13), Organization (M=3.07), Mechanics (M=3.04), and Language Use (M=2.88). The overall mean of 3.03 indicates agreement across the four categories. The small differences among the first three categories suggest that students reported attending to these aspects at relatively similar levels, whereas language use received a comparatively lower mean. Taken together, the findings indicate that students reported providing feedback on the meaning and organization of argumentative essays, as well as their language conventions.

Table 2. Types of Peer Feedback Most Frequently Used by Grade 11 Students

Rank	Type of Peer Feedback	Mean	SD	Level
1	Motivational Feedback	3.09	0.85	Often
2	Corrective Feedback	2.76	0.85	Often
3	Descriptive Feedback	2.74	0.82	Often
4	Evaluative Feedback	2.70	0.80	Often
	Overall	**2.82**	**0.84**	**Often**

Legend: SD= standard deviation. The types of peer feedback are ranked in descending order of their mean scores.

Table 2 summarizes and ranks the types of peer feedback Grade 11 students provided when reviewing argumentative essays. The results show an overall mean of 2.82 (SD = 0.84), interpreted as Often. This indicates that students reported frequently providing the different types of peer feedback included in the questionnaire. All four types motivational, corrective, descriptive, and evaluative feedback received the interpretation Often, suggesting that students engaged in different forms of feedback when reviewing their classmates' argumentative essays. However, the mean scores indicate differences in how frequently each type was reported, with motivational feedback ranking first and evaluative feedback ranking fourth. Motivational feedback ranked first, with a mean of 3.09 and a standard deviation of 0.85, interpreted as Often. This finding indicates that students most frequently reported providing feedback intended to encourage, support, or motivate their classmates to improve their writing. Such feedback may include acknowledging a classmate's effort, appreciating a well-presented idea, or encouraging the writer to keep improving the essay. Motivational feedback can help create a supportive environment where students feel more confident sharing their work and responding to suggestions. Its first-place ranking suggests that students placed comparatively greater emphasis on encouraging their classmates than on the other types of feedback assessed. Nevertheless, the result reflects the frequency reported in the questionnaire and does not establish whether encouragement directly improved essay quality. Corrective feedback ranked second, with a mean of 2.76 and a standard deviation of 0.85, also interpreted as Often. This result suggests that students frequently reported identifying errors or problems in their classmates' writing and indicating where revisions were needed. Corrective feedback may involve pointing out grammatical mistakes, spelling errors, incorrect punctuation, or other inaccuracies in an argumentative essay. The 0.33 difference between their mean scores suggests that students reported motivational feedback more frequently than corrective feedback. Descriptive feedback ranked third, with a

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XIII Issue XI November 2026

mean of 2.74 and a standard deviation of 0.82, interpreted as Often. This finding indicates that students frequently reported giving comments that describe a problem, explain an aspect of the essay, or identify an area for improvement. Unlike feedback that merely identifies an error or judges the quality of a piece of writing, descriptive feedback explains what the writer has done and what may need further development. The mean score for descriptive feedback was only 0.02 lower than that for corrective feedback, indicating that the two types were reported at very similar frequencies. However, their ranking alone does not establish whether the difference is statistically significant. Evaluative feedback ranked fourth, with a mean of 2.70 and a standard deviation of 0.80, interpreted as Often. Although it ranked lowest, the result still indicates that students often judged the quality or effectiveness of their classmates' argumentative essays. Evaluative feedback may involve expressing whether an argument is convincing, whether supporting evidence is relevant, or whether the essay communicates its main point effectively. Such feedback can help writers recognize the perceived strengths and weaknesses of their work. The relatively lower mean suggests that students reported providing evaluative judgments less frequently than motivational, corrective, and descriptive feedback. However, because students still often interpreted it, the finding does not mean they rarely evaluated their classmates' writing.

The standard deviations for the four types ranged from 0.80 to 0.85, indicating some variability in students' responses. Motivational and corrective feedback had the highest standard deviation (0.85), suggesting that students' reported frequencies of these types varied similarly. Evaluative feedback had the lowest standard deviation (0.80), indicating slightly less variability in responses for this category. These standard deviations describe the spread of responses and should not be interpreted as measures of feedback quality. Overall, the findings revealed that motivational feedback was the most frequently reported type of peer feedback, followed by corrective, descriptive, and evaluative feedback. The overall mean of 2.82, interpreted as Often, indicates that students reported using different forms of feedback when reviewing argumentative essays. The results suggest that encouragement was particularly prominent in their peer feedback practices, while comments involving correction, description, and evaluation were also reported frequently. This pattern provides a descriptive overview of the types of peer feedback students use and helps distinguish the relative frequency of these practices.

Table 3. Emerging Themes on Variations in the Types and Quality of Peer Feedback Provided by Students

Emerging Themes	Categories	Actual Interview Extracts
Theme 1: Variation in Feedback Approaches	Descriptive Feedback	**P12**: "I give descriptive feedback when I notice a grammar problem in my classmates' essays, ma'am!"
	Evaluative Feedback	**P13**: "I am more on evaluative feedback, ma'am, like telling my classmate if his work is good or needs improvement! "
	Motivational Feedback	**P14**: " I give motivational feedback in order for my classmates to do well, because I want to encourage them to continue improving their essays."
	Corrective Feedback	**P15**: "I give corrective feedback because I want to help my classmate notice his mistakes."
Theme 2: Differences in the Writing Features Addressed	Content	**P05:** "Ahm… ang content sa ilang mga essay, ma'am." ("Ahm… the content of their essays, ma'am.") **P08**: "Ahm… ari ko mag-base sa iyang content, ma'am." ("Ahm… I base my feedback on the content, ma'am.")
	Organization and Mechanics	**P09**: "Ahm..On how they organize their ideas, ma'am, and also mechanics." **P11**: "Ahm.. I mostly give feedback about organization, ma'am, like arranging their ideas properly."
	Essay Structure and Argument Development	**P06**: "Ahm.. kuan ma'am… kay ang kuan..kuan man gud, ang napili nakong partner ma'am ba kay wala niya nakuha ang intoduction, body and conclusion nga form

		sa essay, So, akoa siyang giingnan nga ang imuhang essay kay mubo raman kaayo siya, ang statement , ang iyahang instead argumentative essay man to siya ma'am, dili siya kuan, dili siya with argue, okay ra man sad iyahang mga punctuation."
Theme 3: Variation in the Specificity and Elaboration of Feedback	Lengthy feedback and improvement-oriented comments	**P01**: Ahm..Hmmm... depends on the areas, especially in writing the essay. A lot of errors. I write feedback like a very large paragraph. We can learn what my classmate wrote and how to improve it, ma'am."
	Feedback identifying specific writing concerns	**P06**; "…wala niya nakuha ang introduction, body and conclusion nga form sa essay. So, akoa siyang giingnan nga ang imuhang essay kay mubo raman kaayo siya…"
	Agreement with ideas and limited elaboration	**P04**: "Kuan…kanang… uhmmm usually wala koy ikuan nga feedback. Like I agree ra man sa ilahang specific ideas." ("Um…usually, I do not really have much feedback to give. I just agree with their specific ideas.")

The interview responses revealed three recurring patterns in the aspects of argumentative essays that students reported commenting on: essay organization, content and argument relevance, and language use and mechanics. We identified these patterns by comparing participants' responses to the interview question about the parts of the essay they usually reviewed and why they commented on them. The findings are discussed through cross-case synthesis, highlighting similarities and differences across participants rather than treating each response separately.

Table 4. Emerging Patterns and Trends in Peer Feedback on Argumentative Essays

Emerging Patterns	**Description**	**Actual Interview Extracts**
Pattern 1: Recurring Attention to Essay Organization	Several participants reported focusing on the arrangement of ideas and the essay's structure, particularly the introduction, body, and conclusion. Some also looked for problems in the development or arrangement of ideas.	**PO2**: "Kuan like murag, sa organization kay murag, murag tanan naman gud na. Kana…makasuwat siya sa introduction, body and conclusion". ("Um, perhaps organization. It includes whether the writer can provide an introduction, body, and conclusion.") **P07**: "Depende sa pag-organize, ma'am, kung wala kaayo niya na-address or na-organize iyang body." ("It depends on the organization, Ma'am, especially if the body has not been adequately addressed or organized.") **P10**: "Siguro, sa pag-organize, Ma'am, kung naay uban mudiritso ug conclusion." ("Maybe organization, Ma'am, especially when some writers go straight to the conclusion.") **P13**: I look for the organization, because sometimes their ideas are not arranged."
Pattern 2: Attention to Content and Argument Relevance	Participants also reported examining the essay's ideas, their clarity, and their relevance to the topic or argument. Their responses suggest that some students considered the argument's substance when reviewing their classmates' work.	**P01:** "I usually rate all of them, but most of the time I used the context of whether it has connected to the topic and if it has a good point or good argument." **P04**: "Sa content. Ahm…Mas specific ang content, instead muadto ka sa mechanics, murag wala may ingon sakto, like more opinion ra bitaw." ("The content. More specifically, the content, rather than mechanics, which seems to involve more opinion.") **P11**: "I usually comment on the content because I want to check my classmate's ideas if they are clear." **P14**: "I comment on multiple areas, ma'am, like the

		organization, content, and mechanics, because I think all of them are important in making a good essay."
Pattern 3: Attention to Language Use and Mechanics	Some participants focused on language-related concerns, including grammar, spelling, punctuation, word choice, and other mechanical features. Their explanations indicated that these features mattered because errors could affect an essay's clarity and overall presentation.	**P03:** "Kung muhatag ko ug feedback sa iyang essay, ahmmmm…. usually ang grammar ug ang spelling and context." ("When I give feedback on the essay, I usually focus on grammar, spelling, and context.") **P06**: "Ahm..kanang…iyahang kuan ma'am iyahang ahm…Mechanics." **P12**: "I comment on grammar and word choice, ma'am, because incorrect grammar can make their ideas difficult to understand." **P15**: "I comment on spelling and proper punctuation because these mistakes can affect the overall quality of an essay."

Presentation and Analysis of Patterns

To further examine participants' responses about the writing features they considered when providing peer feedback, the interview data were reviewed, compared, and grouped by recurring areas of attention. Responses reflecting similar concerns about different aspects of argumentative writing were clustered to identify common patterns. Through this process, three patterns emerged:

Pattern 1: Recurring Attention to Essay Organization

The participants described their attention to the structure and arrangement of ideas in argumentative essays, particularly the organization of the introduction, body, and conclusion.

Below are the exact transcripts of the participants' responses.

P02 "Kuan like murag, sa organization kay murag, murag tanan naman gud na. Kana..makasuwat siya sa introduction, body and conclusion." ("Um, perhaps organization. It includes whether the writer can provide an introduction, body, and conclusion").

P07 "Depende sa pag-organize, ma'am, kung wala kaayo niya na-address or na-organize iyang body." ("It depends on the organization, Ma'am, especially if the writer has not adequately addressed or organized the body").

P10 "Siguro, sa pag-organize, ma'am, kung naay uban mudiritso ug conclusion". ("Maybe organization, Ma'am, especially when some writers go straight to the conclusion").

P13: "I look for the organization, because sometimes their ideas are not arranged."

These responses show a shared concern with whether the essay follows a recognizable structure and arranges its ideas appropriately. P02 emphasized the introduction, body, and conclusion, while P07 focused on developing and organizing the body. P10 identified a specific organizational problem: a writer proceeds directly to the conclusion. Meanwhile, P13 emphasized arranging ideas properly. Taken together, these accounts indicate that participants considered organization not only as the presence of separate essay parts but also as the logical arrangement and development of ideas.

This pattern can be interpreted in relation to Nelson and Schunn's (2009) discussion of feedback characteristics, particularly problem identification and explanation. P10 identified a possible structural problem, while P07 referred to the organization and development of the essay body. However, the interview responses do not establish whether the participants explained how to correct these problems or proposed specific revisions. The findings therefore indicate that organization was a recurring focus of reported feedback, rather than evidence of the feedback's effectiveness.

Pattern 2: Attention to Content and Argument Relevance

The participants also described their attention to the substance, clarity, and relevance of ideas presented in argumentative essays. Their responses emphasized the importance of ensuring that the written arguments were connected to the assigned topic and communicated clearly.

Below are the exact transcripts of the participants' responses.

P01 "I usually rate all of them, but most of the time I use the context of whether it has connected to the topic and if it has a good point or good argument."

P11 "I usually comment on the content because I want to check my classmate's ideas if it is clear."

P04 "Sa content. Ahm. Mas specific ang content, instead muadto ka sa mechanics, murag wala may ingon sakto, like more opinion ra bitaw". ("The content. Um, more specifically, the content, rather than mechanics, which seems to involve more opinion").

P14 "I comment on multiple areas, ma'am, like the organization, content, and mechanics, because I think all of them are important in making a good essay."

These accounts emphasize what the essay communicates. P01 considered the discussion's relevance and the argument's strength, while P11 focused on whether the writer's ideas were clear. P04 also focused on content rather than exclusively on mechanical correctness. Meanwhile, P14 demonstrated a broader approach by considering content alongside organization and mechanics. Taken together, the responses indicate that participants looked beyond the essay's formal structure and considered whether its ideas were relevant, clear, and appropriate to the argumentative task. Nelson and Schunn's (2009) framework provides a useful basis for distinguishing between merely identifying a concern about an argument and explaining why the argument needs improvement or suggesting a way to strengthen it. For instance, P01 referred to an argument's quality and relevance, while P11 emphasized clarity. Nevertheless, these statements describe the areas participants reported reviewing; they do not necessarily show whether their actual comments included detailed explanations or actionable suggestions.

Pattern 3: Attention to Language Use and Mechanics

The participants also identified language use and mechanics as important aspects of argumentative essays that they considered when providing peer feedback. Their responses included concerns about grammar, spelling, punctuation, and word choice.

Below are the exact transcripts of the participants' responses.

P03 "Kung muhatag ko ug feedback sa iyang essay, ahmmm.. usually ang grammar ug ang spelling and context". ("When I give feedback on the essay, I usually focus on grammar, spelling, and content").

P06 "Ahm... Kanang...iyahang kuan ma'am iyahang ahm... Mechanics".

P12 "I comment on grammar and word choice, ma'am, because incorrect grammar can make their ideas difficult to understand."

P15: "I comment on spelling and proper punctuation because these mistakes can affect the overall quality of an essay."

These responses reveal that participants considered language accuracy and mechanical correctness when reviewing their classmates' argumentative essays. P03 mentioned grammar and spelling alongside content, showing that feedback could extend across multiple writing features. P06 specifically identified mechanics as an area of attention, while P12 emphasized grammar and word choice and explained their possible effect on comprehension. P15, meanwhile, highlighted spelling and punctuation as factors that could affect an essay's

overall presentation. These accounts suggest that participants recognized the importance of both accurate language use and appropriate writing conventions in communicating ideas effectively. Nelson and Schunn (2009) are relevant here because their framework distinguishes identifying a problem from explaining it or suggesting a solution. P12 went beyond naming grammar as a concern by explaining its possible effect on understanding. P15 also provided a reason for addressing spelling and punctuation. However, neither statement confirms that the participant provided a specific correction or explained how to revise an error in the actual feedback. Thus, the responses support a pattern of attention to language use and mechanics, but do not establish that all such feedback was equally detailed or effective.

Table 5. Emerging Themes on the Challenges Students Encounter in Giving Peer Feedback

Emerging Themes	Description	Actual Interview Extracts
Theme 1: Fear of Offending Classmates and Creating Conflict	Participants expressed concern that honest criticism, corrections, or suggestions might hurt their classmates' feelings, cause anger, or lead to disagreement.	**P03**: "Ahm… the hardest part is..ahm..Katong lisud siya iestorya kay basen ma offend siya." ("The hardest part is that it is difficult to say because the classmate might be offended.") **P05**: "Mahadlok ko masuko siya nako." ("I am afraid that my classmate might get angry at me.") **P06:** "Ahm.. ang kuan ma'am, ang paghatag ug kanang feedback ug kanang straight to the point, kay basin unya ug malain siya, ma-offend ma'am." ("Giving feedback directly is difficult because my classmate might feel bad or offended.") **P12**: "It was difficult to give honest feedback, ma'am, because they might think that I was being negative about their essays." **P13**: "To be honest, ma'am, the most difficult part is to tell my classmate about her mistake. I was afraid she might feel offended."
Theme 2: Uncertainty About the Correctness of Feedback	Participants described uncertainty about their own knowledge, judgment, or ability to identify errors accurately.	**P01:** "Most of the time because we cannot really identify good pointing, you do not have knowledge that part, and you cannot judge someone based on their opinion." **P08**: "And the difficult part, ma'am, is kung sakto ba pud kaha akong feedback sa iyahang essay." ("The difficult part, Ma'am, is wondering whether my feedback on the essay is correct.") **P14**: "For me, it is hard to point out if they have correct grammar." **P15**: "Most of the time, it was difficult to identify grammar mistakes because I was also not sure about the correct grammar."
Theme 3: Difficulty Understanding and Identifying Writing Problems	Participants reported difficulty understanding unclear ideas, recognizing problems in an essay, or communicating concerns when classmates might disagree.	**P11:** "I found it difficult to understand some parts of the essay, especially when their ideas are not clear." **P07**: "Kung kuan ma'am, wala niya matarung pag arrange iyahang idea and mahadlok ko ma offend siya." ("When the ideas are not properly arranged, Ma'am, I am also afraid that my classmate might be offended.") **P04**: "Debate. Murag makipag debate siya ug kuan, sayop siya." ("There might be a debate or argument if I point out that something is wrong. I am also afraid that my classmate might be offended.") **P09**: "The most difficult part is maghatag ug suggestions kay basin ikalain niya." ("The most difficult part is giving suggestions because my classmate might take them the wrong way or feel hurt.")

The interview findings revealed three challenges associated with giving peer feedback: fear of offending classmates and creating conflict, uncertainty about the correctness of feedback, and difficulty understanding and responding to writing problems. These themes emerged from comparing participants' experiences and show that providing peer feedback involved not only identifying writing concerns but also considering the accuracy and interpersonal consequences of the comments.

Analysis of Qualitative Findings on Students' Challenges

The qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews were carefully reviewed and compared to identify recurring difficulties students experienced when giving and receiving peer feedback on argumentative essays. The participants' responses were examined for similarities and differences in their experiences, particularly regarding the difficulties they encountered when identifying errors, expressing comments, and providing suggestions to their classmates. The researchers then grouped related responses by common ideas and underlying concerns. Through this process, three themes emerged:

Theme 1: Fear of Offending Classmates and Creating Conflict

Participants described concerns about giving honest feedback because it might hurt classmates' feelings, cause misunderstandings, or create disagreements.

Below are the exact transcripts of the participants' responses.

P03 explained that the difficult part was saying something that might offend a classmate.

P05: "Mahadlok ko masuko siya nako," meaning ("I am afraid that my classmate might get angry at me").

P06: "Ahm… ang kuan, ma'am, ang paghatag ug kanang feedback ug kanang straight to the point, kay basin unya ug malain siya, ma-offend, ma'am." ("Giving feedback directly is difficult because my classmate might feel bad or offended").

P12: "It was difficult to give honest feedback, ma'am, because they might think that I was being negative to their essays."

P13 also expressed concern about pointing out mistakes because the recipient might feel offended. Meanwhile, P04 and P10 indicated that disagreements could arise when they identified errors or when classmates insisted their work contained no mistakes.

These responses show that participants struggled to balance honest criticism with the need to maintain positive relationships with classmates. P05 worried that a classmate might become angry, while P06 hesitated to offer direct comments for fear of offending them. P12, on the other hand, was concerned that honest criticism might be interpreted negatively. The responses of P04, P10, and P13 further suggest that identifying mistakes could sometimes lead to disagreement or uncomfortable interactions. Taken together, these accounts indicate that interpersonal concerns influenced how participants approached giving feedback. Nelson and Schunn (2009) provide a useful basis for interpreting the feedback-related aspects of this challenge. Their discussion of feedback characteristics includes praise and other comment features that may influence how recipients understand and use feedback. However, the participants' concerns about offending classmates represent an interpersonal challenge that should not be attributed entirely to this framework. The interview responses show that students were concerned not only with what to say about an essay but also with how their classmates might receive their comments.

Theme 2: Uncertainty About the Correctness of Feedback

Participants also described difficulty determining whether their observations and comments about their classmates' essays were correct. Their responses reflected uncertainty when identifying grammatical errors, evaluating written work, and deciding whether their feedback was appropriate.

Below are the exact transcripts of the participants' responses.

P08: "And difficult part, ma'am, is kung sakto ba pud kaha akong feedback sa iyahang essay." ("The difficult part, Ma'am, is wondering whether my feedback on the essay is correct").

P15: "Most of the time, it was difficult to identify grammar mistakes because I was also not sure about the correct grammar."

P14: "For me, it is hard to point out if they are using correct grammar."

P01 likewise described difficulty identifying appropriate points and acknowledged limitations in knowledge.

These responses suggest that some participants were not fully confident in their ability to evaluate particular aspects of writing. P08 questioned the correctness of the feedback provided, while P15 and P14 specifically identified difficulty recognizing grammatical errors. P01 also indicated uncertainty about which points to address. These accounts suggest that limited confidence in evaluating written work may have affected participants' willingness or ability to comment on and suggest improvements to their classmates' work. The findings point to the importance of providing students with clear feedback criteria, examples of common writing errors, and opportunities to practice evaluating essays. Nelson and Schunn (2009) are relevant because their framework distinguishes characteristics such as identifying a problem, explaining it, and suggesting a solution. A student who is unsure whether an error exists may have difficulty proceeding to the explanation or suggestion stages. Nevertheless, the interviews establish participants' reported uncertainty; they do not independently prove that their grammatical knowledge was insufficient or that their feedback was inaccurate.

Theme 3: Difficulty Understanding and Identifying Writing Problems

Participants described difficulty understanding unclear ideas and identifying specific writing problems in their classmates' argumentative essays. Their responses indicated that poorly expressed or disorganized ideas sometimes made it challenging to determine which aspects of the essay needed improvement.

Below are the exact transcripts of the participants' responses.

P11 "I found it difficult to understand some parts of the essay, especially when their ideas are not clear."
P07 "Kung kuan, ma'am, wala niya matarung pag-arrange iyahang idea, ug mahadlok ko ma-offend siya." ("When the ideas are not properly arranged, Ma'am, the ideas are not organized properly, and I am afraid that my classmate might be offended").

P04 also described difficulty identifying and discussing problems in a classmate's work, particularly when opinions differed.

These responses suggest that participants struggled to interpret unclear or poorly organized ideas and to determine which writing features needed improvement. P11 specifically emphasized the challenge of understanding unclear statements, while P07 identified problems involving the arrangement of ideas. P04's response further suggests that differences in interpreting written work could complicate the feedback process. Taken together, these accounts indicate that understanding an argumentative essay's content and organization was central to providing meaningful peer feedback. Nelson and Schunn's (2009) framework provides a useful basis for interpreting these findings because it considers feedback characteristics such as problem identification, explanations, and proposed solutions. When students struggle to understand an essay, they may also struggle to identify the specific problem and formulate an appropriate suggestion. Nevertheless, the interview responses establish the participants' reported difficulties in understanding and identifying writing concerns; they do not independently demonstrate the quality of the feedback they actually produced.

CONCLUSION

The findings of the study suggest that peer feedback among Grade 11 students involved different approaches to reviewing argumentative essays, ranging from identifying writing problems to providing motivational

comments. However, the variations in students' reported feedback practices and the difficulties they encountered indicate that identifying an error or expressing an opinion does not necessarily mean that feedback provides sufficient guidance for revision. Thus, effective peer feedback requires not only recognizing writing problems but also communicating specific explanations and useful suggestions for improvement. These findings are consistent with the central ideas of Nelson and Schunn's (2009) framework, which emphasizes the characteristics of feedback and how different feedback components may relate to writing improvement. The framework provided a useful basis for interpreting the differences in students' reported feedback approaches and for identifying areas that require further support. Nevertheless, because the study relied on questionnaire responses and interviews rather than systematically analyzing actual written feedback and subsequent essay revisions, it did not establish whether students' feedback improved writing quality. Therefore, the findings support the framework's relevance as an interpretive lens but do not constitute a direct test or complete confirmation of its assumptions.

In response to the findings, the researcher developed a researcher-made peer feedback facilitation guide entitled "PEER: A Student Guide to Effective and Respectful Peer Feedback". The guide was designed specifically for Grade 11 students to provide practical and organized guidance in reviewing their classmates' argumentative essays. Its development was based on the identified features and types of peer feedback, as well as the challenges experienced by the students during the peer-review process. It incorporates the four features of writing examined in the study: Content, Organization, Language Use, and Mechanics. These categories guide students in identifying specific aspects of an essay that may require attention. Furthermore, the guide incorporates motivational, corrective, descriptive, and evaluative feedback to help students understand the different ways of communicating comments and suggestions to their classmates. The student guide also addresses the difficulties identified in the qualitative findings, particularly students' fear of offending their classmates, uncertainty about the accuracy of their comments, and difficulty identifying errors or explaining unclear ideas. It provides guidance on how to recognize writing concerns, explain observations, recommend appropriate revisions, and communicate feedback in a constructive and respectful manner. Through teacher modeling, guided practice, peer-review activities, essay revision, and reflection, the material is intended to help students become more thoughtful and responsible providers of peer feedback.

The development of "PEER: A Student Guide to Effective and Respectful Peer Feedback", represents a practical application of the study's findings by translating the identified feedback practices and challenges into an instructional resource that students can use during peer-review activities. Rather than merely encouraging students to identify errors or give general comments, the guide emphasizes the importance of providing clear, relevant, specific, and constructive feedback that can help writers recognize areas for improvement. It may also serve as a supplementary teaching material for English teachers in facilitating structured peer-review activities among Grade 11 students. However, its effectiveness has yet to be established and may be examined through classroom implementation, analysis of students' actual written feedback, and assessment of changes in argumentative writing and revision practices.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anwar, F., et al. (2024). Effects of peer feedback in English writing classes on EFL students' writing feedback literacy. Assessing Writing, 61, Article 100874. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100874
2. Cheng, X., & Zhang, L. J. (2024). Engaging secondary school students with peer feedback in L2 writing classrooms: A mixed-methods study. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 81, Article 101337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101337
3. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
4. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
5. Cui, Y., Schunn, C. D., Gai, X., Jiang, Y., & Wang, Z. (2021). Effects of trained peer vs. teacher feedback on EFL students' writing performance, self-efficacy, and internalization of motivation. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, Article 788474. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.788474

6. Department of Education. (2015, April 1). Policy guidelines on classroom assessment for the K to 12 basic education program (DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/04/01/do-8-s-2015-policy-guidelines-on-classroom-assessment-for-the-k-to-12-basic-education-program/
7. Department of Education. (2019, August 22). Policy guidelines on the K to 12 Basic Education Program (DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2019). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/DO_s2019_021.pdf
8. Fleckney, P., Thompson, J., & Vaz-Serra, P. (2025). Designing effective peer assessment processes in higher education: A systematic review. Higher Education Research & Development, 44(2), 386–401. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2024.2407083
9. Gan, Z., & Hattie, J. (2014). Prompting learners' use of feedback in writing. Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 37(3), 195–207.
10. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487
11. Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). Testing ESL composition: A practical approach. Newbury House Publishers.
12. Jongsma, M. V., Scholten, D. J., Houtkamp, J., Meeter, M., & van Muijlwijk-Koezen, J. E. (2024). Enhancing trust, safety and quality: Exploring the role of dialogue in peer feedback on professional competencies. Cogent Education, 11(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2024.2349355
13. Kasch, J., van Rosmalen, P., Löhr, A., Klemke, R., Antonaci, A., & Kalz, M. (2021). Students' perceptions of the peer-feedback experience in MOOCs. Distance Education, 42(1), 145–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2020.1869522
14. Li, J., & Jiang, L. (2024). Understanding changes in learner engagement with peer feedback giving in EFL writing: A longitudinal study. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 83, Article 101391. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101391
15. Lira Lorca, A., Peltzer, K., Busse, V., & Krause, U.-M. (2026). Effects of peer feedback and self-assessment on writing: Learning and Instruction, 102, Article 102253.
16. Nelson, M. M., & Schunn, C. D. (2009). The nature of feedback: How different types of peer feedback affect writing performance. Instructional Science, 37(4), 375–401. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9053-x
17. Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in Higher Education, 31(2), 199–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090
18. Peungcharoenkun, T., & Waluyo, B. (2024). Students' affective engagements in peer feedback across offline and online English learning environments in Thai higher education. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 9, Article 60. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00286-w
19. Peng, C. X., & Storch, N. (2025). From receiving to engaging: Collaborative oral languaging of teacher versus peer feedback by secondary school EFL learners. The Modern Language Journal, 109(4), 915–934. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.70003
20. Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. https://issuances-library.senate.gov.ph/legislative%2Bissuances/Republic%20Act%20No.%2010533
21. Robles, R. M. V., & Torres, J. M. (2020). Filipino ESL teachers' attitudes, practices, and challenges in using peer correction strategy in teaching writing. HEALS Sciences, 1, 26–31.
22. Scherer, S., Graham, S., & Busse, V. (2024). How effective is feedback for L1, L2, and FL learners' writing? A meta-analysis. Learning and Instruction, 93, Article 101961. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101961
23. Tiongco, J. S., & Abergas, F. M. (2025). Enhancing English writing proficiency through peer feedback strategies: A quasi-experimental study among Grade 8 students. Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 48(2), 206–211. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.480205
24. Vuogan, A., & Li, S. (2023). Examining the effectiveness of peer feedback in second language writing: A meta-analysis. TESOL Quarterly, 57(4), 1115–1138. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3178
25. Wang, J., Yunus, M. M., & Sulaiman, N. A. (2026). Peer feedback training in L2 English writing: A systematic literature review of empirical studies from 2016 to 2025. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 25(7), 514–534. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.25.7.23

26. Wang, S., Ramakrishnan, K. M., Li, X., Xiao, M., Yinan, X., & Na, L. (2025). Impact of multiple feedbacks on revision behavior of Chinese EFL undergraduates' argumentative essays. Environment-Behaviour Proceedings Journal, 10(32), 135–140. https://doi.org/10.21834/e-bpj.v10i32.6796
27. Wei, Y., & Liu, D. (2024). Incorporating peer feedback in academic writing: A systematic review of benefits and challenges. Frontiers in Psychology, 15, Article 1506725. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1506725
28. Weng, F., Zhao, C. G., & Chen, S. (2024). Effects of peer feedback in English writing classes on EFL students' writing feedback literacy. Assessing Writing, 61, Article 100874. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100874
29. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Harvard University Press.
30. Zhang, F., Schunn, C. D., Chen, S., Li, W., & Li, R. (2023). EFL student engagement with giving peer feedback in academic writing: A longitudinal study—Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 64, Article 101255.
31. Zhang, Z., & Hyland, K. (2022). Fostering student engagement with feedback: An integrated approach. Assessing Writing, 51, Article 100586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100586