

ANALYSIS OF EFL STUDENTS' EXPERIENCES OF GIVING AND RECEIVING DIGITAL PEER FEEDBACK IN SPEAKING PRACTICE

Cantika Salsabilla¹, Sri Handayani², Ayu Istiana Sari³

cantikasalbil@gmail.com

^{1,2,3} Universitas Slamet Riyadi Surakarta

ABSTRACT

Digital platforms are increasingly used in English language learning to facilitate peer feedback, particularly in speaking practice. However, students' experiences of giving and receiving peer feedback through digital platforms remain underexplored, particularly in EFL speaking contexts. This study aims to explore EFL students' experiences of giving and receiving digital peer feedback during speaking practice, with particular attention to their reflections on feedback and how they reported using it in subsequent speaking activities. The study employed a descriptive qualitative design involving 34 eleventh-grade students at MAN 1 Surakarta during the 2025–2026 academic year. Data were collected through a questionnaire distributed via Google Forms, a semi-structured interview with the English teacher, and documentation in the form of photographs and videos of the learning activities. The data were analyzed using qualitative data analysis procedures involving data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. The findings indicate that students generally reported positive experiences with digital peer feedback. Many students reported engaging in giving and receiving feedback, reflecting on their speaking strengths and weaknesses, and applying peer suggestions in subsequent speaking practice. However, the responses also showed variation in students' engagement, particularly in paying attention to feedback and feeling motivated to practice speaking. The findings should be interpreted as students' self-reported perceptions rather than direct evidence of improvement in speaking performance. The study is also limited by the absence of individual student interviews and objective measures of speaking development.

Keywords : student experiences, peer feedback, digital platforms, speaking skills.

INTRODUCTION

Students' learning experiences are an important aspect of English language learning because they involve how learners participate in, interpret, and respond to learning activities. In speaking instruction, students are expected not only to produce spoken language but also to reflect on their performance and respond to feedback. Speaking can be challenging for EFL learners because it requires them to communicate ideas while managing accuracy, fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, and confidence (Harmer, 2015). Therefore, understanding how students experience speaking activities and respond to feedback is important for examining how they engage with the learning process.

The importance of learning experiences can be understood through Kolb's (1984) Experiential Learning Theory. Kolb conceptualizes learning as a process in which knowledge develops through experience, reflection, conceptualization, and experimentation. The four stages consist of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. From this perspective, students are not merely recipients of instructional information; they interpret their experiences, reflect on what happened, develop new understandings, and apply those understandings in subsequent situations. Examining students' experiences can therefore provide insight into how they make sense of learning activities and respond to what they encounter during the learning process.

One learning activity that provides opportunities for such experiences is peer feedback. Peer feedback involves students commenting on, evaluating, or responding to their classmates' work. In speaking practice, students may comment on aspects such as pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, grammar, or content. Peer feedback also positions students as both feedback providers and recipients, requiring them to consider the quality of their peers' performances as well as their own. This social dimension is consistent with Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory, which emphasizes that learning develops through interaction with others. However, peer feedback should not be viewed simply as an activity in which students exchange comments. Students also need to understand feedback, judge its usefulness, manage their responses to it, and decide whether and how to use it.

This perspective is closely related to the concept of student feedback literacy. Carless and Boud (2018) describe feedback literacy as the understandings, capacities, and dispositions needed to make sense of feedback and use it for learning. They identify four interrelated aspects: appreciating feedback, making judgments, managing affect, and taking action. Thus, receiving feedback does not automatically mean that students will use it. Students need to interpret what their peers mean, consider whether the feedback is relevant and useful, manage their responses to criticism, and decide how to act on the information. This perspective is particularly relevant to peer feedback because students may differ in their ability and willingness to engage with feedback.

The use of digital platforms adds another dimension to peer feedback. Platforms such as Google Classroom, Google Forms, YouTube, and WhatsApp can provide opportunities for students to exchange feedback beyond immediate face-to-face interaction. Digital environments may allow students to review speaking performances, provide written or recorded comments, and respond to feedback at different times. However, the availability of digital tools does not necessarily mean that all students will participate in the same way or perceive peer feedback similarly. Students may differ in their willingness to provide comments, their confidence in evaluating classmates' speaking

performances, their perceptions of peer feedback, and their willingness to use the feedback they receive.

Previous studies have examined digital peer feedback and speaking in EFL contexts. El Mortaji (2022) investigated students' perceptions of online peer feedback in a blended EFL public-speaking course. Ding and Zhu (2025) examined mobile-based peer feedback in EFL speaking and focused on learners' motivation and behavioral engagement in feedback provision. Fatahhela Dewi et al. (2020) examined formative peer feedback in relation to students' speaking ability, while Renita and Irawan (2024) investigated peer feedback through Instagram in an EFL high-school context. These studies provide useful evidence concerning peer feedback, digital platforms, and speaking-related learning. However, much of the existing literature has emphasized effectiveness, achievement, or learning outcomes. Less attention has been given to how students experience the processes of giving and receiving digital peer feedback, including how they interpret feedback, reflect on it, and decide whether to apply it.

This issue is particularly relevant in secondary-school EFL contexts. Students may not have the same level of linguistic knowledge or confidence to evaluate their peers' speaking performances. Some students may be more active in providing feedback, whereas others may show neutral or less engaged responses. Their experiences may also vary depending on how they perceive the usefulness and quality of peer feedback and how they respond to the social and emotional aspects of evaluating and being evaluated by classmates. Digital platforms may provide affordances such as flexibility and accessibility, but these affordances do not automatically guarantee meaningful engagement with feedback.

Based on this research gap, the present study focuses on EFL students' experiences of giving and receiving digital peer feedback during speaking practice. Rather than measuring the effectiveness or causal impact of digital peer feedback, the study examines students' self-reported experiences and perceptions of the feedback process. Specifically, this study focuses on three aspects: students' experiences of giving and receiving peer feedback through digital platforms during speaking practice, students' perceptions and reflections on the feedback they receive from peers, and students' reported application of peer feedback in subsequent speaking practice.

By focusing on these aspects, this study seeks to provide a more experience-oriented understanding of digital peer feedback in EFL speaking practice. The study also considers students' engagement with feedback, including how they interpret feedback, reflect on its usefulness, and decide whether to apply it in their speaking practice. The findings may provide pedagogical insights into how teachers can guide students in interpreting, evaluating, and using peer feedback while recognizing that students may experience the feedback process differently.

METHOD

1. Research Design

This study employed a descriptive qualitative research design to explore EFL students' experiences of giving and receiving digital peer feedback during English speaking practice. A descriptive qualitative approach was selected because the study focused on describing students' reported experiences and perceptions in their natural learning context rather than testing a hypothesis or measuring the causal effectiveness of an instructional intervention. Qualitative research focuses on understanding how participants interpret experiences and phenomena within particular contexts (Creswell, 2009).

In this study, the student questionnaire served as the primary source of information about students' self-reported experiences. The teacher interview and documentation were used as supporting contextual data to complement the questionnaire findings. Therefore, the study does not claim that digital peer feedback caused changes in students' speaking ability. Instead, it focuses on what students reported experiencing, how they reflected on feedback, and how they reported using feedback in speaking practice.

2. Participants / Subjects

The participants were 34 eleventh-grade students from Class XI F4 at MAN 1 Surakarta during the 2025/2026 academic year. The participants were selected through purposive sampling because they had participated in English speaking activities involving digital peer feedback. Their experiences were considered relevant to the purpose of the study. In addition to the student participants, one English teacher was interviewed to provide contextual information about the implementation of digital peer feedback and the learning activities.

3. Instruments

Data were collected from three sources: a student questionnaire, a semi-structured interview with one English teacher, and documentation in the form of photographs and videos.

The questionnaire was distributed to 34 students through Google Forms after they had participated in digital peer feedback activities during English speaking practice. It consisted of closed-ended statements measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The questionnaire explored students' self-reported experiences of giving and receiving feedback, paying attention to feedback, reflecting on their speaking performance, recognizing strengths and weaknesses, understanding useful feedback, and applying peer feedback in subsequent speaking practice.

A semi-structured interview was conducted with one English teacher who was involved in the speaking activities. The interview obtained contextual information about the implementation of digital peer feedback, student participation, and teacher guidance. The teacher interview was used as supporting contextual information and was not treated as a substitute for students' reported experiences. Documentation was collected in the form of photographs and videos of the learning activities. The documentation was used to provide contextual evidence of the implementation of speaking practice and digital peer feedback activities. It was used to complement the questionnaire and teacher interview rather than to determine students' perceptions or experiences.

4. Data Collection Procedure

Data collection was conducted from 4 to 7 February 2026 at MAN 1 Surakarta. Before data collection, the researcher obtained permission from the school principal and the English teacher. The researcher also explained the purpose and procedures of the study to the participants.

First, the researcher distributed the questionnaire through Google Forms after students had participated in digital peer feedback activities during speaking practice. Students completed the questionnaire individually based on their own experiences. Second, a semi-structured interview was conducted with one English teacher to obtain contextual information about the implementation of digital peer feedback, student participation, and teacher guidance. Third, photographs and videos documenting the learning activities were collected as supporting documentation.

5. Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using the qualitative data analysis procedures of Miles and Huberman (1994), consisting of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. The questionnaire responses were first organized according to the aspects examined in the study. Frequencies were used descriptively to identify general patterns in students' self-reported experiences. The responses were then interpreted in relation to the research questions.

The teacher interview data were transcribed and reduced by selecting information relevant to the implementation of digital peer feedback, student participation, and teacher guidance. The photographs and videos were reviewed as supporting documentation of the implementation of speaking and peer feedback activities. The questionnaire remained the primary source for claims concerning students' reported experiences, while the teacher interview and documentation were used to provide supporting contextual information. Finally, conclusions were drawn based primarily on the questionnaire findings, with the teacher interview and

documentation used to support the interpretation of the findings. Because the questionnaire data were based on self-reports and the study did not include objective pre- and post-assessments of speaking performance, the findings are interpreted as students' reported perceptions and experiences rather than evidence of causal improvement in speaking proficiency.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

A. The Experiences of Students in Using digital platforms for peer feedback in English speaking practice

This section presents the findings related to students' experiences in using digital platforms for peer feedback during English speaking practice. The analysis was organized into three experience aspects: giving feedback, receiving feedback, and participating in peer feedback activities through digital platforms. The summarized findings for each aspect are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The Experiences of Students in Using digital platforms for peer feedback in English speaking practice

Experiences Aspect	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Giving Feedback	0%	5.9%	29.7%	61.8%	2.9%
Receiving Feedback	1.5%	1.5%	20.6%	58.9%	17.7%
Active Participation	1.0%	8.8%	40.2%	42.2%	7.8%

B. The Benefits of Students' Experiences in Giving and Receiving Peer Feedback Through Digital Platforms in Speaking practice

This section presents the findings related to students' reflective experiences of peer feedback through digital platforms in English speaking practice. The analysis is organized into four aspects: reflecting on the benefits of peer feedback, recognizing strengths and weaknesses in English speaking, understanding the benefits of peer feedback, and understanding the characteristics of effective peer feedback. A summary of the findings for each aspect is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The Benefits of Students' Experiences in Giving and Receiving Peer Feedback Through Digital Platforms in Speaking practice

Experiences Aspect	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--------------------	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Reflecting on Benefits	0%	1.5%	13.2%	66.2%	19.1%
Recognizing Strengths and Weaknesses	0%	3.9%	17.6%	56.9%	21.6%
Understanding the Benefits	0%	5.9%	19.1%	63.2%	11.8%
Understanding the Characteristics of Effective Peer Feedback	1.0%	2.0%	25.5%	57.8%	13.7%

C. The Relation of Students Experiences in Using Digital Feedback and Their Speaking Skill

This section presents the findings related to the relationship between students' experiences of using digital peer feedback and their English speaking skills. The analysis was based on questionnaire data collected from 34 students and organized into three aspects: applying peer feedback to improve speaking performance, increasing motivation to practice speaking, and trying new speaking strategies based on peer feedback. The summarized findings for each aspect are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The Relation of Students Experiences in Using Digital Feedback and Their Speaking Skill

Experiences Aspect	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Applying Peer Feedback	0%	1.5%	11.8%	76.5%	10.3%
Increasing motivation to practice speaking	0%	7.8%	37.3%	44.1%	10.8%
Trying New Speaking Strategies	0%	3.9%	25.5%	58.5%	11.8%

Discussion

Students' Experiences in Using Digital Platforms for Peer Feedback in English Speaking Practice

The findings indicate that students generally reported positive experiences of giving and receiving peer feedback through digital platforms, although their experiences varied across the three aspects examined. The strongest positive response was found in receiving

feedback, with 58.9% of students agreeing and 17.7% strongly agreeing. Giving feedback also showed a generally positive tendency, with 61.8% agreeing and 2.9% strongly agreeing. However, active participation showed a more varied pattern, with only 42.2% agreeing and 7.8% strongly agreeing, while 40.2% of students remained neutral. This pattern suggests that students were generally more comfortable receiving feedback than actively participating in the overall feedback process.

The relatively high neutral response for active participation is important because it indicates that access to digital platforms did not automatically result in consistent engagement. Students may differ in their confidence in evaluating peers' speaking performances, their perceptions of peer expertise, and their comfort with giving comments to classmates. Social relationships may also influence participation, as some students may hesitate to point out their peers' mistakes because they are concerned about creating discomfort or appearing overly critical. Thus, neutral responses should not simply be interpreted as a lack of interest in digital learning but may reflect differences in students' confidence, trust, and social comfort.

The findings can be related to student feedback literacy. Carless and Boud (2018) explain that feedback literacy involves students' ability to appreciate feedback, make judgments, manage affective responses, and take action based on feedback. In this study, students' reported experiences suggest that receiving feedback was relatively more common than active participation. This may indicate that being a recipient of feedback is not necessarily equivalent to actively engaging with the feedback process. Students need to judge whether peer comments are relevant and useful before deciding how to respond to or apply them.

The teacher interview provides additional context for this pattern. The English teacher reported that students appeared more open to giving feedback through digital platforms than in direct face-to-face interaction. Digital interaction may provide students with more time to formulate their comments and reduce the immediate pressure of direct communication. However, this teacher observation does not mean that all students became active participants, as the questionnaire still showed a substantial neutral response regarding active participation.

These findings also reflect Kolb's (1984) Experiential Learning Theory, in which learning involves experiencing an activity and reflecting on that experience. Giving and receiving peer feedback provide students with opportunities to experience and reflect on speaking performance. However, the different response patterns suggest that students do not necessarily engage with these experiences in the same way. Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory also highlights the importance of interaction with others in learning, but meaningful peer interaction may require appropriate guidance and support.

Overall, the findings suggest that students generally reported positive experiences of digital peer feedback, particularly in receiving feedback. However, the relatively high neutral responses for active participation show that engagement was not uniform across students. This highlights the importance of teacher guidance, clear feedback criteria, and the development of feedback literacy so that students can participate more confidently and critically in digital peer feedback activities

Students' Reflective Experiences of Peer Feedback through Digital Platforms

The second aspect concerns students' reflective experiences of giving and receiving peer feedback through digital platforms. The findings were examined across four indicators: reflecting on peer feedback, recognizing speaking strengths and weaknesses, understanding the perceived benefits of peer feedback, and understanding the characteristics of effective peer feedback.

Regarding reflection on the benefits of peer feedback, 66.2% of responses were in the Agree category and 19.1% in the Strongly Agree category, while 13.2% were Neutral and 1.5% were Disagree. These findings indicate that most students perceived peer feedback as an opportunity to reflect on their speaking experiences. This pattern is consistent with Kolb's (1984) concept of Reflective Observation, which emphasizes reflection on previous experiences as part of the learning process. However, the neutral responses indicate that students did not necessarily engage with feedback at the same level. In this regard, feedback literacy is relevant because students need to interpret and make sense of feedback rather than merely receive it (Carless & Boud, 2018).

Regarding recognition of speaking strengths and weaknesses, 56.9% of responses were Agree and 21.6% were Strongly Agree, whereas 17.6% were Neutral and 3.9% were Disagree. The findings suggest that many students perceived peer feedback as useful for identifying aspects of their speaking performance that they considered strengths or areas for improvement. Nevertheless, the neutral and disagree responses indicate variation in students' experiences. Such variation may be associated with differences in students' linguistic knowledge, confidence, and perceptions of their peers' ability to provide reliable feedback.

Regarding students' understanding of the perceived benefits of peer feedback, 63.2% of responses were Agree and 11.8% were Strongly Agree, while 19.1% were Neutral and 5.9% were Disagree. These results indicate that most students perceived peer feedback as beneficial to their speaking practice. However, the findings represent students' perceptions rather than objective evidence of improvement in speaking performance. The variation in responses may partly reflect differences in the relevance and quality of the feedback received. This is consistent with Hansen and Liu (2005), who emphasize that effective peer feedback should be clear, specific, and oriented toward improvement.

Regarding understanding the characteristics of effective peer feedback, 57.8% of responses were Agree and 13.7% were Strongly Agree. Meanwhile, 25.5% were Neutral, 2.0% were Disagree, and 1.0% were Strongly Disagree. This indicator had the highest proportion of neutral responses among the four indicators, suggesting that some students were still uncertain about how to evaluate the usefulness of peer feedback. This finding is particularly relevant to feedback literacy, which involves students' ability to make judgments about feedback, manage their responses, and determine appropriate actions based on the feedback received (Carless & Boud, 2018).

Overall, the findings indicate that students generally reported positive reflective experiences with digital peer feedback. However, the presence of neutral and negative responses demonstrates that these experiences were not uniform. Students' engagement with feedback may vary according to how they interpret its content, perceive its quality, and evaluate the credibility of their peers' judgments. Therefore, providing clear feedback criteria and teacher guidance may help students engage with peer feedback more critically and meaningfully.

The Relation of Students Experiences in Using Digital Feedback and Their Speaking Skill

Students' experiences in using digital peer feedback can be viewed through Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theory, particularly the stage of active experimentation, in which learners apply what they have learned from previous experiences to subsequent activities. In speaking practice, peer feedback provides an opportunity for students to consider comments from their peers and report whether they use those comments in later speaking activities. Anderson (2008) also emphasizes the importance of peer interaction in online learning, where learners can exchange responses and construct understanding through interaction. In this context, digital platforms provide a space in which students can engage with peer feedback as part of their speaking practice.

The findings on the application of peer feedback indicate that 76.5% of students agreed and 10.3% strongly agreed that they applied peer feedback in their speaking practice. Meanwhile, 11.8% selected the neutral category and 1.5% disagreed. These responses indicate that most students reported using feedback as a reference for subsequent speaking practice, although this experience was not shared equally by all students. The relatively small number of negative responses suggests that strong rejection of applying peer feedback was uncommon, while the neutral responses indicate that some students were less certain or did not consistently report applying the feedback. This finding is consistent with Renita and Irawan (2024), who reported that digital peer feedback encouraged students to pay attention to aspects of their speaking performance.

Regarding motivation to practice speaking, 44.1% of students agreed and 10.8% strongly agreed, while 37.3% selected the neutral category and 7.8% disagreed. These

responses suggest that many students perceived their experiences with peer feedback as related to their motivation to practice speaking, but the experience was more varied than the responses concerning the application of feedback. The relatively high proportion of neutral responses indicates that peer feedback was not experienced as equally motivating by all students. This finding can be considered in relation to Harmer (2015), who identifies motivation and confidence as important aspects of speaking learning.

Students also reported trying new speaking strategies based on their peer feedback experiences. 58.5% agreed and 11.8% strongly agreed, whereas 25.5% were neutral and 3.9% disagreed. These findings suggest that a majority of students reported making adjustments or trying different approaches in their speaking practice after receiving peer feedback. However, the neutral responses indicate that not all students reported the same level of engagement in changing their speaking strategies. This finding is in line with Fatahhela Dewi et al. (2020), who found that peer feedback was associated with students' efforts to make improvements in speaking.

Overall, the findings show that students generally reported applying peer feedback and trying new speaking strategies, while their responses concerning motivation were more varied. The presence of neutral and negative responses is important because it indicates that students did not experience digital peer feedback in exactly the same way. Therefore, rather than suggesting that digital peer feedback directly improves speaking skills, the findings indicate that students reported different ways of responding to and using peer feedback in their speaking practice. This variation highlights the importance of considering students' individual engagement with feedback when examining their experiences of digital peer feedback.

CONCLUSION

This study examined EFL students' experiences of giving and receiving digital peer feedback during English-speaking practice. The findings indicate that students generally reported positive experiences in participating in digital peer feedback activities. Most students reported giving and receiving feedback and engaging with feedback from their peers, although neutral responses indicate that participation was not experienced consistently by all students. The findings also show that students reported several benefits from their experiences with peer feedback. Most students reported reflecting on feedback, recognizing their strengths and weaknesses, understanding the relevance of peer feedback to their speaking practice, and recognizing characteristics of effective feedback. However, the presence of neutral and negative responses suggests that these experiences varied among students. In relation to speaking practice, most students reported applying peer feedback and trying new speaking strategies. Students also reported that peer feedback was related to their motivation to practice speaking, although responses concerning motivation

were more varied, with a relatively high proportion of neutral responses. Overall, the findings suggest that students experienced digital peer feedback as a part of their speaking practice through processes of giving, receiving, reflecting on, and applying feedback. Nevertheless, the variation in students' responses indicates that engagement with digital peer feedback was not uniform. Therefore, teachers may need to provide clear guidance and feedback criteria to support students in engaging more consistently with peer feedback activities.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, T. (Ed.). (2008). *The theory and practice of online learning* (2nd ed.). Athabasca University Press.
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Ding, Y., & Zhu, J. (2025). Mobile-based peer feedback in EFL speaking: Learners' motivation, behavioral engagement in feedback provision, and achievement. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00314-9>
- El Mortaji, L. (2022). Public speaking and online peer feedback in a blended learning EFL course environment: Students' perceptions. *English Language Teaching*, 15(2), 31–43. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v15n2p31>
- Fatahhela Dewi, E. N., Hasanah, N., & Nurul Huda, M. F. (2020). Formative peer feedback on undergraduate students' speaking ability. *Al-Lisan*, 5(2), 116–129.
- Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci004>
- Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.
- Kusumayanthi, S., & Lestari, I. (2022). The effect of peer feedbacks on students' speech. *English Journal Literacy Utama*, 7(1), 603–611. <https://doi.org/10.33197/ejlitutama.v7i1.183>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Renita, R., & Irawan, R. (2024). The effectiveness of peer feedback through Instagram on tenth-grade students' speaking skills in an EFL high school. *ELTR Journal*, 8(1), 18–32.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.