ORAL PEER FEEDBACK IN A FLIPPED SPEAKING JOB INTERVIEW CLASS: PRACTICE AND LEARNERS' ATTITUDES

Sumardi[1], Khairani Dian Anisa[2], & Lailatun Nurul Aniq[3]
[123]Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia
[1]*sumardi74@staff.uns.ac.id*; [2]*khairani.dianisa@student.uns.ac.id*;
[3]*aniqlailatunnurul@student.uns.ac.id*

Abstract: Since flipped learning facilitates student-centered approach, it is necessary to administer such assessment which involves students' participation. As the assessment as learning, peer feedback facilitates students to offer and receive comments from their peers. The present study aimed at investigating the practice and students' voices of peer feedback in their flipped speaking job interview class. Twelfth graders of a state vocational high school in Indonesia (n=30) participated in this case study. The data gathered from the result of observation, student questionnaire, and semi-structured interview. The study indicated that students had a positive attitude toward peer feedback. It fostered more interaction with peers resulting in a more dynamic atmosphere. Moreover, students perceived peer feedback as a useful activity to locate their errors and learn strategies to soften their comments. The study serves as a guideline for applying peer feedback in the speaking area utilizing flipped instruction.

Keywords: flipped classroom; oral peer feedback; students' attitudes; vocational high school.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, English is broadly used in business and education in Indonesia. The use of technology has progressively increased in schools and universities. Nevertheless, selecting the most appropriate and useful technology tools is complicated due to various software and hardware made. Under the circumstance, there are some considerations for EFL teachers to utilize technology in their

classroom, e.g. practicality, students' needs, and infrastructure. Therefore, EFL teachers need to plan the instructional design carefully.

Many researchers found that the flipped classroom model has revolutionized the teaching-learning process (Sams & Bergmann, 2013). Accordingly, many teachers have applied this model in their classrooms. As an illustration, the flipped classroom model can restrict the teaching-learning process outside the classroom and offer additional practices and activities in the classroom (Han, 2015). To put it another way, this model can contribute to the development of students' communicative competence since it facilitates student-student interaction. Several related studies showed that peer feedback can positively affect student-student interaction (Chien et al., 2020; Hung et al., 2016). For these reasons, EFL teachers need to apply effective assessment which provides student-student interaction so that both the teaching-learning model and assessment are harmonious and effective.

Some researchers have conducted similar studies in the umbrella of research about peer feedback. Some researchers examined the effect of peer feedback on students' motivation (Jenkins, 2005; Lee, 2015) and students' voices of peer feedback (Wang, 2014; Yu, 2019). Some academicians analyzed strategies to offer peer feedback (Hu, 2005; Mendonça et al., 1994) and figured out the relationship between student-student interaction and ZPD (de Guerrero & Villamil, 2000).

Moreover, advanced studies examine teachers' and learners' attitudes towards feedback and the way feedback is put into the teaching-learning process in EFL classrooms. First, Tian & Li (2019) examined the perceptions of sixty-nine Chinese EFL sophomore towards the written and oral peer feedback they provided, received and observed in triads during an English writing course. The results indicated that students enjoyed providing and receiving oral and written feedback, and observing the peer feedback interaction between the other two peers in the group. However, they preferred to give positive oral feedback and receive negative written feedback.

Second, Chien et al. (2020) investigated the impacts of peer assessment within the proposed approach, i.e. spherical video-based virtual reality (SVVR), on 69 Taiwanese high school students' English-speaking performance. The findings implied that Praise feedback was helpful for the students' English-speaking performance, while Criticism feedback might have been unfavorable in this case. Third, Hung, et al. (2016) explored how peer and self-assessment can be implemented to evaluate young EFL learners' oral presentation in two sixth grade classes at a public elementary school in southern Taiwan. The findings presented some benefits of combining peer and self-assessment, e.g. improvement of students' oral grade.

Last, Russell (2009) claimed that there is an important requirement for more future researches to seek teachers' and students' attitudes regarding feedback since there is a discrepancy between students' and teachers' attitudes. Nevertheless, those previous studies have not explored students' attitudes and classroom practices of peer feedback in a flipped classroom in secondary school. Furthermore, there are only a few researches have examined students' attitudes toward the practices of peer feedback in the classroom by employing technology.

In addition, researchers found some issues before conducting the present study. First, most Indonesian teachers rely on tests at the end of the learning process (assessment of learning). They rarely apply assessments during the learning process (assessment for learning). They hardly ever involve students in assessment (assessment as learning). Peer feedback provides the opportunity for a teacher to apply assessment as learning. Second, students do not get enough feedback from teachers because of the limitation of time. Third, research on vocational high school is so rare. Fourth, most researchers have conducted studies about peer feedback on writing skills, while other skills have not been examined.

The present study is significant in the EFL area since this study can link the findings presented by the previous studies and future studies so that it provides insights for future researchers. Besides,

many studies have not covered the above research gaps. Finally, it is indicated that there was a lack of research into the practice and students' attitudes about oral peer feedback in a flipped classroom. Hence, the study aimed to investigate the practice and learners' attitudes on oral peer feedback in a flipped speaking job interview class. This study has been guided by the research question:

(1) How is the practice of oral peer feedback in a flipped speaking job interview class?

(2) What are the learners' attitudes on oral peer feedback in a flipped speaking job interview class?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Nowadays, English language teaching becomes one of the most significant precedence in the global education (Chen Hsieh et al., 2017; Choe & Seong, 2016; Köroğlu & Çakır, 2017). At the same time, the development of technology has guided the shift of teachers' and students' beliefs. As a consequence, researchers are required to examine new educational methods that are appropriate with the new teachers' and students' profiles (Chuang et al., 2018; Hao, 2016; Wu et al., 2017). Further, practitioners encourage new consideration for English as a foreign language teaching namely learner-centered approaches which are more efficient when contrasted to teacher-centered approaches (Turan & Akdag-Cimen, 2019). The flipped learning model, then, is an active learning model that arises as an answer to questions for a method that provides the transforming requirements of the new era, and it has been promptly introduced by researchers and practitioners.

Flipped classroom model

The flipped classroom model is pioneered by Sams & Bergmann (2013). The flipped classroom model, in brief, is a learning model in which the instruction and homework are switched and learning is beyond the classroom (Wang et al., 2019). In this flipped classroom model, teachers find or create learning materials that have the

functions as to provide the traditional lecture time in the classroom and to assign as homework in which students may watch on any computer or smartphone at home.

It is crystal clear that second language acquisition needs more effort, patience, and time (Turan & Akdag-Cimen, 2019). As a consequence, students should participate in as many activities as possible to get a better acquisition of the second language to get more beneficial outcomes in their EFL classrooms. Nevertheless, teachers have limited time allotment to provide comprehensive explanations and limited opportunities for practices in the traditional way. By using the flipped classroom model, then, it can contribute to language learning outcomes by restricting the instruction outside the classroom and providing room for additional practices and activities in the classroom (Han, 2015). The flipped classroom model is a helpful instruction in foreign language teaching as it promotes two key points to success: student-centered learning and autonomy (Han, 2015).

Specifically, the main aim of a flipped classroom model is to explore the quality of time among teachers and students in the classroom. Most teachers have claimed that their lecturing at students has not been working before (Sams & Bergmann, 2013). Furthermore, the academicians have proposed that teachers have to spend the teaching-learning process in the classroom on applying the concepts at higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy (Sams & Bergmann, 2013).

There are huge benefits when the flipped classroom model is implemented properly. Firstly, it provides the students' excitement. Nowadays, students are accustomed to high technology (Defour, 2013). These students have already used to explore high-technology to ease their everyday activities. Consequently, those who have grown up with unlimited access to technology are not surprised by the flipped classroom model. Students express their joyfulness during the initial few weeks, but after that this flipped classroom model gives another expectation (Bergmann & Sams, 2012).

Secondly, there is more extra time. Teachers may alter a lecture that is used to take a whole class period and upload it as an 8-10

minutes video since they are not retelling students and answering those questions during the teaching-learning process. Moreover, students can re-watch the lecture videos as they desire. Teachers, then, may build extra time (Bergmann & Sams, 2012). This extra time is beneficial since teachers, for example, may help students in preparing for the exam so that it can potentially promote students' scores.

Thirdly, it increases students' participation. Students have control of their learning by working at their desire in the flipped classroom (Chen Hsieh et al., 2017). In the traditional model, some students may miss important information for working through formative assessments when the teacher presents the lecture too quickly (Goodwin & Miller, 2013). Students can re-watch the material they may miss when the instruction and lectures are recorded in the video. In another case, when students are absent, they will still get the same subject matter that other students get and they would just miss out on face-to-face time with their teacher and peers (Springen, 2013).

Furthermore, learners can access new knowledge online when they are out of school, e.g. videos. Learners participate in hands-on activities and perform under the teachers' instruction in the classroom (Chen Hsieh et al., 2017). Another key point is the flipped classroom model offers opportunities for learners to participate and promote the interactive learning environment (Chuang et al., 2018). Besides, the flipped classroom model provides an interactive learning environment, flexible learning time, and a deep investigation of concepts (Chen Hsieh et al., 2017).

Oral peer feedback

Since the flipped classroom model provides student-student interaction, it is necessary to administer such an assessment which also promotes student-student interaction. The term assessment often refers to marking, measuring, grading, or ranking (Topping, 2009). Assessment can be categorized into three distinct approaches, namely

assessment of learning, assessment for learning, and assessment as learning (Earl, 2003).

Comparing others, however, assessment as learning is not a mainstream of formative assessment. Assessment as learning allows students to be involved in the assessment process. Students can criticize and review their peers' works, allow feedback to others, and stimulate discussion and collaboration in the assessment as learning (Strijbos & Sluijsmans, 2010). The growth of assessment as learning has been well established in education since the 1990s (Topping, 2009). The latest studies also declare several instructional benefits of assessment as learning. Assessment as learning involves some assessment techniques, e.g. peer feedback.

Peer feedback, that is also known as peer review, is a procedure-oriented pedagogical activity in which students give feedback on their peers' performance and receive feedback on their performance (Hansen & Liu, 2005). Peer feedback is an assessment technique in which learners recognize the grade, measure, or quality of their peers' product or performance (Topping, 2009). Each learner can perform as a reviewer or a receiver in a peer feedback session. Peer feedback is a communicative and interactive process in which a student acts as a feedback giver and/or a feedback receiver (Lee, 2017). The reviewer reviews other's drafts and gives some advice and comments. The receiver receives this advice and comments. The reviewer and the receiver, then, discuss it (Tsui & Ng, 2000). In brief, peer feedback is a combination of ideas and activities to promote learners' abilities in skill improvement, confidence-building, self-monitoring, and language acquisition (Cao et al., 2019).

As an alternative to teacher feedback, peer feedback engages some benefits (Lee, 2017). Firstly, it substitutes a socio-cognitive learning activity. Secondly, it reflects language acquisition through 'languaging' and comprehensive input. Thirdly, it runs like a main element that eases the process of making work. Finally, it explores Vygotskian terms, e.g. regulation, scaffolding and the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD).

METHOD

Since this study was conducted in a particular setting, this study employed a case study. Yin (2018) defines a case study as an empirical investigation that aims at examining a contemporary case to provide an in-depth description of the case. Flick (2009) adds that case studies could promote the inquiry of how to choose the case under study in a way that allows more universal conclusions to be extracted from the analysis. Moreover, he states that the case study can describe the process under the study in a very detailed and precise manner. This study employed a holistic single-case study as it describes a unique case (Yin, 2018).

Participants

The participants of this research were selected purposively. The researchers chose this sampling technique since the researchers wanted to observe, interpret, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be studied (Meriam, 1998). The participants were carefully selected by following these considerations; First, the English teacher has adequate experience and knowledge to apply oral peer feedback in her classes. Second, the students have sufficient experience of practicing oral peer feedback in learning English.

EFL students from a state vocational high school in Indonesia (N=30) participated in this study. This school was selected purposively with the primary consideration that the teachers at this school have implemented peer feedback as part of their teaching and learning practices. They were about 17-year-old, majoring in software engineering. They were in their last year at the secondary level and were taught by an experienced English teacher. Sixty-seven percent of the students were females, and their overall English proficiency level was intermediate.

Data collection

To describe the practice of oral peer feedback, the researchers observed the classroom. The researchers wrote field notes which comprised the description of the classroom setting, the real situation in the class, and the researchers' impressions about the class and oral peer feedback offered by the students.

Besides, a questionnaire using 5-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was employed to elicit students' attitudes of peer feedback. The questionnaire was adapted from Tian & Li (2019) and was revised before it used. The questionnaire attempted to investigate students' voices as feedback providers and feedback receivers during the oral peer feedback activity. The three facets examined in the questionnaire were students' voices of oral peer feedback, the preference for positive and negative feedback, and the usefulness of oral peer feedback. The questionnaire was translated into Indonesian for convenience reasons. Twenty students voluntarily completed the questionnaire.

Furthermore, a semi-structured interview was carried out to yield a comprehensive understanding of students' voices of oral peer feedback and reasoning. The interview guideline was adapted from Tian & Li (2019) and was revised before use. Four students consisting of two male students and two female students participated in the interview session. The interview was conducted in Indonesian to ease the students in conveying their meaning.

Data analysis

In analyzing the data, this study followed a model of analyzing the data by Miles et al. (2014). This model comprises four stages, i.e. data collection, data condensation, data display, and drawing and verifying the conclusion. After the data from the observation, questionnaires, and interviews were obtained, the data then classified into some categories, i.e. the practice of oral peer feedback, students' attitude of oral peer feedback, students' preferences for positive and negative feedback, and the usefulness of oral peer feedback for

students. The data from the questionnaire were presented in the form of tables. The conclusions were drawn based on the data gathered afterward.

Procedure

The study was carried out for four weeks in a state vocational school in Indonesia. The students were assigned to create a job interview video in pairs after they had studied the material provided by the teacher. The videos, then, were sent to the teacher and were displayed in the following meeting. The teacher invited each group to present their videos and the other students offered oral comments. Peer feedback rubrics were not distributed to the students as students might give more attention to the rubric rather than their peer's performance (Min, 2006). This divided attention might lead to a discouraging effect on peer interaction during the feedback activity (Hyland, 2000). Therefore, the students were given autonomy to provide feedback to their peers. This activity was conducted in the second and third meetings. At the end of each meeting, the teacher gave reinforcement to the students regarding the material. At the last meeting, the teacher and the students reviewed the material. The questionnaire and semi-structured interviews were administered after the review session. Twenty students voluntarily completed the questionnaire to reveal their voices of oral peer feedback. To obtain a detailed description, the semi-structured interview was carried out. Four students consisted of two female students and two male students involved in the interview.

FINDINGS

To answer the research questions, the result of the observation presented a description of the practice of oral peer feedback in a flipped speaking classroom. Furthermore, the students' stances of oral peer feedback in three facets i.e. their attitudes of oral peer feedback, preferences for positive and negative feedback, and the usefulness of

oral peer feedback drawn from the results of the questionnaire and the semi-structured interview.

The practice of oral peer feedback in flipped speaking job interview class

The flipped classroom model was carried out in delivering the job interview lesson. At the beginning, the teacher supplied online materials related to job interviews through the WhatsApp group. The students were required to read the materials sent by the teacher and provided in their textbook before coming to the class.

In the classroom, the teachers invited the students to discuss the teaching materials and ensure students' understanding of the teaching materials. Then, the teacher assigned the students to form a group of two based on their preferences to create a video practicing job interview. The videos then were sent online to the teacher and were presented in the subsequent meeting. After sending the video, the students presented their videos to their classmates in the classroom. As the video had been played, the students gave their oral feedback to their peers related to the video presented. The teacher also gave feedback related to the video presented by the students.

In this activity, the students acted as feedback providers and feedback receivers. As the feedback providers, the students offered the comments for their peers regarding their peers' performances and questioned things they did not understand concerning the content of the job interview performed by their peers. The feedback receivers, then, responded to the questions. Moreover, as feedback receivers, the students would ask the feedback providers if they did not understand the feedback given. The feedback providers would explain the feedback until both parties had a similar understanding. The teacher had a role as a facilitator during oral peer feedback activity. The teacher gave the chance for different students to deliver feedback to their peers. The students could give any comments about their peers' performance.

Most of the feedback delivered related to body language performed by their peers in practicing the role of an interviewer and an interviewee. For instance, one student gave feedback to a group about maintaining eye contact:

> '*I think it will be better if the interviewee looks at the interviewer during the job interview session. The interviewee kept looking down and it might indicate that she was not confident in this interview'. (Obs.S1)*

The feedback concerned the gesture shown in the video. The interviewee did not look at the interviewer which indicated that the interviewee was nervous during the interview session. The students argued that the interviewee should look at the interviewer as a sign that the interviewee was confident to answer the questions during the interview session.

Another feedback provided related to fluency. One student commented that the interviewee said filler "mmm..." too often during the job interview video:

> *They played their roles well, but the interviewee should minimize saying "mmm…" during the interview. (Obs. S4)*

The feedback provider commented on the fluency presented in the job interview video. The students had performed well in acting as interviewee and interviewer. Nevertheless, the feedback provider perceived that the interviewee should minimize filler, e.g. "mmm..". This repetitive filler was quite inappropriate in a real job interview session.

The students also commented on their friends' pronunciation in performing as the interviewer and interviewee:

> *The interview session seems quite natural. However, there is some unclear pronunciation during the session performed both by the interviewer and interviewee. (Obs.S1)*

The feedback provider considered that the interviewee and the interviewer had performed well as they looked quite natural. However, some mispronounced words causing some problems for the hearers. Therefore, the feedback provider gave insight that the group should improve their pronunciation skills so that the meaning can be delivered appropriately.

Based on the observation, in the beginning, students were reluctant to offer feedback for their peers. As the teacher helped them to be confident in delivering the feedback, the students seemed quite confident in offering comments to their peers. The classroom atmosphere became more dynamic as the students took part in this activity. During the oral peer feedback activity, the comments provided by the students were mostly talking about their peer's gestures, fluency, and pronunciation in performing job interviews. The students were reluctant to provide comments related to the grammar or vocabulary as they consider their competence in these aspects were inadequate. They considered that these aspects should be commented on by the teacher.

Through oral peer feedback activity, students learned how to offer their comments in English. This activity helped them to practice their speaking ability. Moreover, when they had disagreements, they tried to communicate their meaning effectively. As the feedback receiver, students recognized some improvements for their speaking ability, particularly the job interview ability.

Students' voices of oral peer feedback

The students' voices of oral peer feedback comprised their attitude of oral peer feedback, preferences for giving and receiving positive and negative feedback, and the value of oral peer feedback in the job interview material.

The attitude toward oral peer feedback

There were seven items inquired about students' oral peer feedback. The result of the questionnaire is presented in Table 1.

The questionnaire results showed that as the feedback providers, students enjoyed offering oral feedback to their peers about their job interview performance. Moreover, they took some consideration when offering feedback for their peers. As the feedback receivers, the students considered listening to oral feedback as a

positive experience and students took into account their peer comments and listened to almost all of the comments offered.

Table 1 the mean score for students' attitude of oral peer feedback

Role Type	Statement	N	Mean	SD
Feedback Provider	I like offering oral feedback to my peers about their job interview performance.	20	4.2	0.62
	I carefully offered oral feedback to my peers about their job interview performance.	20	4.3	0.57
Feedback Receiver	I like listening to my peer's oral feedback on my job interview performance.	20	4	0.80
	I carefully listened to my peer's oral feedback on my job interview performance.	19	3.65	1.03
	I carefully listened to almost all of the oral feedback from my peers.	19	3.55	1.01
	I would ask my peer to give me more oral feedback.	19	3.8	1.20
	When disagreeing with the oral feedback from my peer, I would keep silent.	19	2.6	1.00

Besides, they welcomed to have more feedback from their peers. However, students had a different attitude when they disagreed with the feedback given. Some preferred to explain, for instance:

> One friend asked me why I used my mobile phone during the interview session and I replied that I used it as the property. However, he disagreed as he thought that it was inappropriate. I explained that it depends on the context. I gave him an explanation because I wanted him to know my reason. I also wanted to hear feedback from others and the teacher about this. (Int. S2)
> When I disagreed with the feedback provided by my friend, I explained why I did such a thing because I think that they need to know my reason. I also sought for my teacher comment to know if it was right or wrong (Int. S3)

The result of the interview from S2 and S3 indicated that they explained the reason for the feedback providers to avoid misunderstanding. Moreover, through this explanation, the students welcomed more comments from their peers and the teacher. Hence, the feedback receivers obtained thorough comments from their peers. The teacher gave comments for the students on some incorrect

comments as well so that students could learn things they should and should not do during the job interview session.

Preference for positive and negative feedback

Students' voices regarding their preference in providing and receiving oral peer feedback were examined as well. Table 2 presents the results of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire results showed that as feedback providers, the students preferred to give positive feedback than negative feedback. The reasons could be taken from the students' responses in the semi-structured interview.

> *I give positive comments to my peers as an appreciation for their work. I know they have tried their best to perform as interviewer and interviewee. I hope that my comments can motivate them to improve their skills. (Int. S1)*

> *Receiving and providing positive feedback makes the class happier. (Int. S4)*

S1 argued that providing positive comments on a peer's performance was a way to appreciate the peer's performance and could motivate them. Moreover, S4 opined that listening to and offering such positive feedback could build a friendly environment.

The questionnaire results showed that students were reluctant to offer negative comments to their peers. S1 and S4 revealed the reason as follows.

> *I am afraid of hurting my friend's feelings when I give such a negative comment on their performance (Int. S1).*
> *I don't want to say negative comments directly to my friends. I don't want to offend them. (Int. S4)*

Both S1 and S4 were reluctant to offer negative comments on their peers' performance. They considered offering negative feedback might offend and embarrass their peers. Their responses showed that maintaining a harmonious relationship with their peers was their consideration of avoiding giving negative feedback to their peers.

Sumardi, Anisa, K. D., & Aniq, L. N. (2020). Oral peer feedback in a flipped speaking job interview class: practice and learners' attitudes.

Table 2 the mean score for students' preference for positive and negative feedback

Role Type	Statement	N	Mean	SD
	I like to orally give positive comments on my peer's performance in practicing job interviews.	20	4.45	0.51
	I like to orally give negative comments on my peer's performance in practicing job interviews.	20	2.9	0.91
	When orally evaluating my peer's performance, I direct almost full attention to helping my peers improve their performance.	20	4.35	0.88
	When orally evaluating my peer's performance, I direct almost full attention to avoiding my negative comments embarrassing my peer.	20	3.55	0.89
	Realizing that my peer did not understand the negative oral feedback I offered, I would give further explanations.	20	3.45	1.05
	Realizing that my peer disagreed with the negative oral feedback I offered, I would make further explanations.	20	3.6	1.05
Feedback Provider	When I orally evaluated the errors in my peer's performance, I would say *I feel* or *I think*.	20	4.2	0.89
	When I orally evaluated the errors in my peer's performance, I would use adverbs like *fast*.	20	3	0.86
	When I orally evaluated the errors in my peer's performance, I would utter euphemistic words.	20	3.95	0.51
	When I orally evaluated the errors in my peer's performance, I would avoid uttering derogatory words.	20	4.1	1.02
	When I orally evaluated the errors in my peer's performance, I would maintain eye contact with my peers.	20	3.85	0.67
	When I orally evaluated the errors in my peer's performance, I would articulate excuses for my peer's error.	20	3.95	1.05
	When I orally evaluated the errors in my peer's performance, I would keep smiling.	19	4	1.12
	When I orally evaluated the errors in my peer's performance, I would use interrogative sentences rather than declarative sentences.	20	3.15	0.81
Feedback Receiver	I like to listen to positive oral comments from my peers.	19	4.1	1.1
	I like to listen to negative oral comments from my peers.	19	3.35	1.22

However, when students offered negative comments and their peers could not understand the feedback, students would give more explanation to their peers.

> *When I had a different point of view with my friend, I do not say it when he/she is still in front of the class. I do not want to embarrass him/her. I will say my opinion directly to him/her after presenting the material. (Int. S4)*

Instead of explaining the negative comments when her peers were in front of the class, S4 explained her comments after the presentation. S4 considered that her peers might be embarrassed when the negative comment was delivered when her peers were still in front of the class. S4 would deliver her comment in-person to her peers and discuss the improvement for her peers.

Moreover, students performed several strategies to mitigate their negative comments, for instance, by using indirection, euphemistic words, avoiding negative words, specifying peer problems, and articulating excuses. Besides using linguistic strategies, students used their body language to soften their negative comments, such as maintaining eye contact and smiling.

The questionnaire and the interview results showed that as feedback providers, students valued maintaining a good relationship with their friends more than insisting on their opinions. Besides, when the negative comments were offered, students would use several strategies to mitigate the negative comments.

As can be seen in the result of the questionnaire, as feedback receivers, students preferred listening to positive comments to negative comments. A similar result also represented in the interview result as follows.

> *When I listen to positive feedback from my peers, I feel like I am confident enough to speak English and I want to learn more to be more fluent. (Int. S2)*

S2 felt positive feedback could help her to learn more about the material. The positive comments encouraged S2 to practice speaking English and study English more. In other words, the positive comment motivated students to learn English more.

The usefulness of oral peer feedback

Generally, students perceived peer feedback as a useful activity to improve their speaking ability as presented in Table 3.

Sumardi, Anisa, K. D., & Aniq, L. N. (2020). Oral peer feedback in a flipped speaking job interview class: practice and learners' attitudes.

Table 3 the mean score for students' voice of usefulness of oral peer feedback

Role Type	Statement	N	Mean	SD
In general	The peer feedback activity in this job interview material improved my speaking ability.	20	4.35	0.67
Feedback Provider	I like to offer oral feedback on my peer's performance helps me improve my speaking ability.	20	4.2	0.77
Feedback Receiver	I understand almost all of the oral feedback I received.	20	3.65	0.99
	Listening to the oral feedback, I knew how to improve my speaking ability.	20	4.2	0.70
	I adopted almost all of the oral feedback.	20	3.7	0.86
	The oral feedback I received is useful for improving my speaking ability.	20	4.3	0.73

Students regarded peer feedback as a beneficial activity both as the feedback providers and the feedback receivers. As the feedback providers, peer feedback helped students to improve their speaking ability by trying to offer their feedback in English. Meanwhile, as feedback receivers, students could recognize what aspects they need to improve. Moreover, they regarded the feedback received was useful for their speaking development.

DISCUSSION

Grounded on the results of this study, some substantive theories can be drawn: (1) Oral peer feedback fosters more dynamic flipped classroom atmosphere; (2) Maintaining a harmonious relationship with peers is a value that students hold when listening to and offering oral peer feedback; (3) Oral peer feedback can help students to have better English proficiency.

Such a lively environment demonstrates students' willingness to take part in peer feedback activities (Lee, 2015). The peer feedback facilitates the students to have direct interaction with their peers which ease them to negotiate their meaning each other (Mendonça et

al., 1994) and developed their strategies and behavior in delivering and receiving feedback (Hu, 2005), and attempted to foster ownership of text if disagreement occurred (Tsui & Ng, 2000). Furthermore, the collaboration between peers at parallel proficiency levels promoted scaffolding (Carson & Nelson, 1996), and students' zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978) might also be stimulated (de Guerrero & Villamil, 2000).

Regarding the students' voice of oral peer feedback, the students in this study reported a positive attitude of offering and receiving feedback from the peers of their job interview performance. This result is in line with the finding from (Tsui & Ng, 2000). The result of this study also showed that the students treated their peer feedback as important insights for their speaking development. However, when students disagreed with feedback from their peers, they would explain the reason instead of remaining silent. This result is in line with Tian & Li (2019) which found that students prefer to elaborate their reason if disagreement occurred.

In the present study, students expected to receive positive feedback from their peers. The positive feedback could motivate students to learn more about the material and was an example of appreciation of their work. Meanwhile, as the feedback providers, students were reluctant to provide negative feedback as they consider their competence was not adequate. They relied on the evaluation of the teacher which is similar to the findings from (Tsui & Ng, 2000). Moreover, the positive feedback serves as a way to sustain a harmonious relationship which becomes one of the values in a collective culture (Carson & Nelson, 1996). The result of the present study is rather different from findings from Tian & Li (2019) which claim that students prefer listening to negative to positive oral feedback. This discrepancy might occur since the students perceived negative feedback as discouraging. Hence, they preferred listening to positive comments to negative comments.

The questionnaire results showed that the students perceived peer feedback could help them to improve their speaking ability. This

result is similar to the previous researches (Chien et al., 2020; Hung et al., 2016). The students could locate their errors and learn how to improve errors. As a result, their speaking ability could increase.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined how peer feedback was implemented in a flipped speaking classroom in a vocational high school. Moreover, the students' voices of this activity were investigated. The results indicate that the classroom atmosphere becomes more active as peer feedback promotes more student-student interaction. Students learn how to negotiate meaning and some strategies to deliver comments to their peers. Due to maintaining a harmonious relationship with peers, students are unwilling to offer negative feedback to their peers. Meanwhile, as the feedback receivers, students prefer listening to positive comments since they perceive those positive comments as an encouragement to develop. However, when they disagree with their peers, they are willing to explain the reasons to their peers in such a way that they may not be causing embarrassment.

Despite limited participants in a given setting, this study contributes to the ELT area. This study may become a guideline for those who want to adopt peer feedback in their classrooms. Moreover, peer feedback serves as an alternative assessment instruction which can promote student-centered sense. Further study may investigate the teacher's voice related to the instruction. Besides, larger participants and different types of feedback are worth to explore.

REFERENCES

Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2012). *Flip your classroom: Reach every student in every class every day*. International Society for Technology in Education.

Cao, Z., Yu, S., & Huang, J. (2019). A qualitative inquiry into undergraduates' learning from giving and receiving peer feedback in L2 writing: Insights from a case study. *Studies in*

Educational Evaluation, *63*(2019), 102–112.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.08.001

Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *5*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(96)90012-0

Chen Hsieh, J. S., Wu, W. C. V., & Marek, M. W. (2017). Using the flipped classroom to enhance EFL learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *30*(1–2), 1–21.
https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2015.1111910

Chien, S. Y., Hwang, G. J., & Jong, M. S. Y. (2020). Effects of peer assessment within the context of spherical video-based virtual reality on EFL students' English-Speaking performance and learning perceptions. *Computers and Education*, *146*(2020), 103751.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103751

Choe, E., & Seong, M.-H. (2016). A case study of the flipped classroom in a Korean university general English course. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, *20*(2), 71–93.
https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1129484

Chuang, H. H., Weng, C. Y., & Chen, C. H. (2018). Which students benefit most from a flipped classroom approach to language learning? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *49*(1), 56–68.
https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12530

de Guerrero, M. C. M., & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal*, *84*(1), 51–68. https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00052

Defour, M. (2013). 'Flipped classrooms' spreading in Wisconsin. *Community College Week, 25*(16), 10.
http://connection.ebscohost.com/

Earl, L.M. (2003). *Assessment as learning: Using classroom assessment to maximize student learning*. Corwin Press, Inc.

Flick, U. (2009). An introduction to qualitative research (4th ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Goodwin, B. & Miller, K. (2013). Evidence on flipped classrooms is still coming in. *Educational Leadership, 70*(6), 78-80.

Sumardi, Anisa, K. D., & Aniq, L. N. (2020). Oral peer feedback in a flipped speaking job interview class: practice and learners' attitudes.

http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/mar13/vol70/num06/Evidence-on-Flipped-Classrooms-Is-Still-Coming-In.aspx

Han, Y. (2015). Successfully flipping the ESL classroom for learner autonomy. *NYS TESOL Journal*, *2*(1), 98–109. http://journal.nystesol.org/nystj_vol2_1.html

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

Hao, Y. (2016). Middle school students' flipped learning readiness in foreign language classrooms: Exploring its relationship with personal characteristics and individual circumstances. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *59*(2016), 295–303. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.01.031

Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language Teaching Research*, *9*(3), 321–342. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168805lr169oa

Hung, Y. J., Samuelson, B. L., & Chen, S. C. (2016). Relationships between peer-and self-assessment and teacher assessment of young EFL learners' oral presentations. In M. Nikolov (Ed.), *Assessing young learners of English: Global and local perspective* (Vol.25, 317-338). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22422-0

Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research*, *4*(1), 33–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880000400103

Jenkins, M. (2005). Unfulfilled Promise: formative assessment using computer-aided assessment. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, *1*(1), 67–80. http://eprints.glos.ac.uk/3610/

Köroğlu, Z. Ç., & Çakır, A. (2017). Implementation of flipped instruction in language classrooms : An alternative way to develop speaking skills of pre-service English language teachers *International Journal of Education and Development*, *13*(2), 42–55. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1153321

Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom Writing Assessment and Feedback in L2 School*

Contexts. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9

Lee, M. K. (2015). Peer feedback in second language writing: Investigating junior secondary students' perspectives on inter-feedback and intra-feedback. *System*, *55*(2015), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.08.003

Mendonça, C. O., Johnson, K. E., & Mendonca, C. O. (1994). Peer review negotiations: revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(4), 745. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587558

Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis a methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Min, H. T. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *15*(2), 118–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.01.003

Russell, V. (2009). Corrective feedback, over a decade of research since Lyster and Ranta (1997): Where do we stand today. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *6*(1), 21–31. https://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/archive/v6n12009.html

Sams, A. & Bergmann, J. (2013). Flip your students' learning. *Educational Leadership*, *70*(6), 16-20. http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/mar13/vol70/num06/Flip-Your-Students'-Learning.aspx

Springen, K. (2013). Flipped: A revolutionary approach to learning presents pros and cons for educators. *School Library Journal*, *59*(4), 23-26. https://www.slj.com/?detailStory=flipping-the-classroom-a-revolutionary-approach-to-learning-presents-some-pros-and-cons

Strijbos, J. W., & Sluijsmans, D. (2010). Unravelling peer assessment: Methodological, functional, and conceptual developments. *Learning and Instruction*, *20*(6), 265–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.002

Tian, L., & Li, L. (2019). Chinese EFL learners' perception of peer oral

Sumardi, Anisa, K. D., & Aniq, L. N. (2020). Oral peer feedback in a flipped speaking job interview class: practice and learners' attitudes.

and written feedback as providers, receivers and observers. *Language Awareness*, *27*(4), 312–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2018.1535602

Topping, K. J. (2009). Peer assessment. *Theory into Practice*, *48*(1), 20–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577569

Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*(2), 147–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00022-9

Turan, Z., & Akdag-Cimen, B. (2019). Flipped classroom in English language teaching: A systematic review. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *32*(7), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1584117

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wang, N., Chen, J., Tai, M., & Zhang, J. (2019). Blended learning for Chinese university EFL learners: Learning environment and learner perceptions. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *32*(3), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1607881

Wang, W. (2014). Students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing: A longitudinal inquiry. *Assessing Writing*, *19*(2014), 80–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.008

Wu, W. C. V., Hsieh, J. S. C., & Yang, J. C. (2017). Creating an online learning community in a flipped classroom to enhance efl learners' oral proficiency. *Educational Technology and Society*, *20*(2), 142–157. https://www.j-ets.net/collection/published-issues/20_2

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Yu, S. (2019). Learning from giving peer feedback on postgraduate theses: Voices from Master's students in the Macau EFL context. *Assessing Writing*, *40*(2019), 42–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2019.03.004