TRANSLANGUAGING PRACTICES IN WRITTEN PEER FEEDBACK: A CASE STUDY IN A SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING CLASS IN INDONESIA

Candrika Citra Sari[a], Agita Risma Nurhikmawati[b]
([a]candrika.citra@polinema.ac.id; [b]a.nurhikmawati@unsw.edu.au)

[a]*Politeknik Negeri Malang*
Jalan Soekarno Hatta No.9, Jatimulyo, Lowokwaru, Malang, East Java, 65141, Indonesia

[b]*The University of New South Wales*
Sydney NSW 2033, Australia

Abstract: This study aims to examine the use of translanguaging in peer feedback among Indonesian EFL learners and their perceptions of it, addressing a research gap in a naturally multilingual context. This study is based on qualitative data, comprising written peer-feedback and a transcription of a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) discussing views and attitudes related to translanguaging in peer-feedback. The data were collected from thirty university students of an English Paragraph Writing class, all of whom spoke Javanese or Indonesian as their first language (L1). The results reveal that translanguaging occurred most frequently in commentary feedback, relating to both content and form. It facilitated negotiation of meaning by lowering affective filters. Students viewed this practice positively, as it scaffolded their understanding of writing components. The findings suggest the potential for translanguaging to enhance L2 writing instruction. Further research could explore syllabus designs that integrate translanguaging and cultural knowledge within learning activities and examine whether translanguaging can enhance the writing quality of multilingual learners.

In Second Language Writing classes, responding to students' writing is one essential component that enhances students' learning experience. Teachers are often seen as the main providers of feedback in L2 class because they are believed to be more proficient in writing using the target language. However, in recent times, teachers have begun integrating both teacher and peer-feedback in L2 writing class. This is probably because peer-feedback activities are also viewed as learning process for students, as they must recall their understanding of writing components, such as content, organization, vocabulary, language, and mechanics in the target language when providing feedback to their peers. With peer-feedback gaining more attention these days, several studies (e.g., Banister, 2023; Mehrpour et al., 2023; Saeli & Cheng, 2021; Saeli & Rahmati, 2023; Zhao, 2010) have stressed the positive role of peer feedback in the L2 writing class, especially in terms of increasing learners engagement.

Moreover, peer feedback may foster a sense of writing ownership among L2 learners (Tsui & Ng, 2000).

While peer feedback activities can have positive effects on L2 writing, the outcomes may not always meet expectations due to various sociocultural contexts and individual factors. For instance, students often have different levels of proficiency, with higher proficiency learners sometimes receiving less constructive feedback than their lower proficiency counterparts. Additionally, students may avoid pairing with peers of different proficiency levels. However, it is important to note that high proficiency students can also benefit from peer feedback, especially when they explain concepts to their peers, which can deepen their own understandings. Sociocultural contexts also play a role, as some students may place more trust in teachers rather than peers due to teacher's perceived authority (Chong, 2018, p.189). Furthermore, personal factors such as prior knowledge, self-regulation, and self-efficacy influence how students perceive and process peer feedback (Chong, 2018, p. 194). Given these complexities, it is crucial for the teachers to not only give clear examples on how to give feedback, but also help students recognize how they can mutually benefit from each other's perspectives.

Since the development of World Englishes (Kachru, 1992) to the more recent acceleration of Global Language Teaching (Rose & Galloway, 2019), English is seen as a global language. Consequently, the traditional view of prioritizing native-speakers standards and perceiving learners' first languages (L1s), multilingualism and multimodal practices as linguistics deficit is no longer considered absolute. This shift, along with the reality that non-native English speakers now outnumber native speakers of English, has lead scholars and educators to reconsider English learning strategy at schools from seeing learners' L1s and sociocultural backgrounds as hindering factors to embracing L1 and other sociocultural resources in English teaching and learning activities. One practical application of this inclusive approach is translanguaging, which can be applied in peer feedback activities. Canagarajah (2011a), a proponent of translanguaging, argues that for multilinguals, languages are not discrete. Instead, their linguistic repertoire is built upon different languages that function symbiotically. In L2 writing settings, translanguaging is defined as how L2 learners utilize their linguistics repertoires in L2 writing process (Kim & Chang, 2022). Students may learn from their translanguaging strategies while building their proficiency through dialogical pedagogy (Canagarajah, 2011b). This strategy is particularly useful because learners sometimes have difficulty explaining or understanding feedback given entirely in the target language.

In addition to teacher feedback, students can also provide feedback among themselves to enhance learning experiences. Peer feedback is defined as the activity of which learners provide comments in oral or written form to evaluate each-other's works. This activity is deemed to be beneficial as it encourages discussion about language (Yu & Hu, 2017), develops reader awareness (Rollinson, 2005), enhances evaluation skills (Yu & Lee, 2014), and reduces writing anxiety (Zhang & Hyland, 2022). Translanguaging, in peer-feedback, allows multilingual learners to shuttle between L1 and L2 in providing feedback for their peers, and therefore they could draw upon multiple languages they acquire for meaning making and thus enhance their target language learning. While translanguaging has been researched within L2 context, to our knowledge, there are limited studies that have examined the effect of

translanguaging in peer feedback activity (e.g. Kim & Chang, 2022; Saeli & Rahmati, 2023; Yeh, 2018; Yu, 2016; Yu & Lee, 2014). These studies were conducted in variety of settings, such as Vietnam, Japan, Chinese, and Iran; and they yielded mix results.

The earliest study conducted by Yu and Lee (2014) explored how translanguaging affects the peer-review process among Chinese L2 learners. They investigated the written peer evaluations of 22 colleges and conducted interviews to learn why these students switched between their native language (L1) and their second language (L2). The results revealed that L1 was mainly used for issues related to content and organization, whereas L2 was predominantly used for providing corrective feedback on language usage. Factors that influence such behaviors include learners' proficiency in L2, students' beliefs and goals, task requirements, examples from the teacher's feedback practice, and the power relations between peer reviewers and writers.

In the same setting where the L1 of the students is Chinese, Yu (2016) conducted an experimental study of which one group was only allowed to provide feedback in their L1, while the other group was only permitted to use L2. The results indicated that the L1 helped to facilitate cognitive resources in working memory. The L1 usage allowed learners to produce more comments on content and provide more specific feedback for their peers. In another investigation, Sun and Zhang (2022) explored the effects of translanguaging in Chinese context. The result indicated that the experimental group who were allowed to use both L1 and L2 in providing peer feedback improved their writing quality more than the control group who used English only.

In Taiwan, Yeh (2018) conducted a study to explore the use of the students' L1 and L2 in providing peer-feedback. The study found that despite a greater tendency to digress from the main task, the students made more comments in L1 than L2. Similar to the finding of Yu and Lee (2014), it was observed that students primarily use L1 to comment on global aspects related to contents and organizations. They wrote questions and encouraged their peers to elaborate on the content. On the other hand, L2 was used more to provide feedback related to language forms. Most importantly Yeh (2018) found that students also code-switch from L2 to L1, indicating that L1 use may contribute to meaning negotiation and mutual scaffolding. The learners revealed that although they believed L2 usage was important for L2 learning, they still had a positive view using L1 to aid the L2 learning process.

Kim and Chang (2022) conducted a study on translanguaging in written peer feedback among learners who speak Japanese as their L1. Specifically, this study examined how learners use L1, L2, and symbols when providing feedback and what factors influence their choices. The study found that learners used more L2 and symbols when providing corrective feedback related to language form (grammar, expression, and mechanics) and content, organization, and format. In contrast, L1 was frequently used for providing commentary feedback on both language forms and content organization. The learners' choices were influenced by their own language proficiency as well as their paired partner's language proficiency. Furthermore, L1 was used to avoid ambiguity, and L2 was predominantly used as the learners involved in the study belief that practicing using the target language is important.

The most current study was conducted in Iran by Saeli and Rahmati (2023), examining translanguaging and peer feedback in a qualitative study. They found mixed results: one learner chose to provide feedback in English, seeing it as an opportunity to practice the target language, while another learner developed a positive perception of providing feedback in their L1, as it seemed less judgmental and could help lower-proficiency learners by making the feedback easier to understand. Similar to the finding of Yeh (2018) and Yu and Lee (2014), this study also found that when learners decided to provide feedback in their L1, they mostly evaluated content, while L2 usage was primarily for feedback related to language forms. In terms of affective engagement, Saeli and Rahmati (2023) found that learners were concerned about the quality of feedback provided by their peers, particularly when it involved grammar, as they often had difficulty understanding it. Interestingly, learners viewed that L1 should probably be used for providing feedback on grammar because they could understand it more easily. Moreover, they believed they could understand the root of their grammar mistakes more effectively when the feedback was delivered in Persian, their first language. In this study, learners also perceived the use of L1 positively for feedback related to content, as content related issues need clearer explanation.

While these previous studies provide valuable insights into translanguaging in peer feedback across different settings, there is a notable gap in the context of Indonesia. Although the setting differs, referencing these studies is important because, similar to the participants in the current study, those in the previous studies were also multilingual individuals learning English as a foreign language in Asia. Given that prior studies have focused on countries such as China, Japan, Taiwan, and Iran, it is important to conduct a study for better understanding of how translanguaging in peer feedback is practiced within an EFL writing course in Indonesia. To date, studies in Indonesia have primarily focused on the practice of translanguaging in general EFL contexts without focusing on specific skills, often measuring students' attitude toward translanguaging (e.g., Emilia & Hamied, 2022; Kuncoroningtyas et al., 2025; Raja et al., 2022) or examining translanguaging as a form of oral feedback (e.g., Silalahi et al., 2023). Overall, these studies have shown positive results, with the understanding that translanguaging should not be performed excessively, as students still need to become familiar with the target language. Despite the valuable contribution of previous studies, to the authors' knowledge, no previous research has specifically explored translanguaging practice in peer feedback within EFL writing courses in Indonesia. Translanguaging strategy may be particularly useful because learners sometimes have difficulty explaining or understanding feedback given entirely in the target language. Furthermore, as a multilingual country where Bahasa Indonesia serves as the national language and many local languages are often used informally in daily life and community-based activities, Indonesia presents a unique context for foreign language learning. In this setting, translanguaging could be a valuable strategy to support language acquisition.

To address the aforementioned gap, this study presents a case study of translanguaging in peer-feedback activities conducted in an English writing class, including how translanguaging is used by the learners in delivering their feedback and how their perspectives are. To be specific, this research is intended to answer the following questions:

1. What is the pattern of translanguaging in the peer feedback practices of English learners in a writing class?

2. How are the perspectives of the learners regarding translanguaging in peer-feedback activities?

By examining these aspects, this research seeks to contribute to the understanding of translanguaging in multilingual education environments and provide insights that may inform teaching practices, especially in the context of teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesia.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative case study approach, focusing on a single English classroom as its setting. Data were derived through document analysis and a Focus Group Discussion (FGD). Specifically, the study investigates two focal aspects: (1) written peer-feedback, defined as any form of evaluation, either corrective or commentary, on aspects of L2 writing, comprising content, organization, grammar, punctuation, vocabulary that are examined through document analysis, (2) learners' perspectives, including their attitudes, emotions, and evaluations related to the use of translanguaging in peer feedback activities that are examined through the Focus Group Discussion. .

Research Context and Participants

The data for this study were collected from an English writing class at a university in Indonesia, involving 30 students with varying levels of English proficiency. Before data collection, a brief survey was conducted to identify the students' local languages. The results showed that 29 students spoke Javanese as their local language, while one student from Sumatra spoke Batak with her local dialect. These participants were relevant to the study as they are all multilingual. They have advanced command of Bahasa Indonesia as the national language while using their local languages in informal settings. Additionally, all of them are learning English as a foreign language, allowing them to draw on their linguistics resources or repertoire to develop their English skills. Although one student indicated that she does not speak Javanese, she reported having developed an understanding of the language, particularly expressions essential for daily interactions. This language adaptation occurred due to social pressures that encouraged her to learn Javanese for better interactions with the community. For that reason, this student was not excluded from this study. Considering the students' background, incorporating translanguaging could be beneficial for their learning. Since this study examines translanguaging practices, the participants' linguistic backgrounds are particularly relevant. In this study, one of the researchers also acted as the teacher. Yet, to avoid bias, especially during the data analysis stage, a clear coding strategy was developed.

Data Collection and Analysis

According to the syllabus, the writing course was held twice a week, with each session lasting 150 minutes, over a period of 16 weeks. The data collection was on the 10th, 11th, and 13th weeks. Before the data collection, the students received materials about how to construct a paragraph, including how to brainstorm ideas, structure a paragraph, write topic sentences, develop supporting details, link ideas, and write closing sentences for different type of paragraphs. In addition, students also learned to apply the theory by writing various types of paragraphs, such as descriptive paragraph, process paragraph, opinion paragraph, and comparison and contrast paragraph. The data of this study were taken closer to the end of the semester to allow the students to learn and practice the theory of developing ideas, structuring descriptive and process paragraphs and being exposed to the way a writing composition could be evaluated based on form, content and organization, and lexical choice through written feedback. This is important because this course is the first writing course that the students took, and they were not yet familiar with knowledge of constructing written composition and providing evaluation.

In the first week of the data collection, the students were instructed to write an opinion paragraph about one interesting tourism spot. They were then given a week to write their paragraphs. In the next stage, after completing their paragraphs, students were randomly paired to review and provide written feedback for their partners. Random pairing system was used to prevent the students from feeling discriminated. A concise peer-feedback guideline was provided to ensure students stayed on track. Overall, students were asked to evaluate the content of the paragraphs, including the topic sentence, supporting sentences, conclusion as well as grammar, punctuation and lexical choice. They were also told that they are allowed to use English as well as other languages to provide feedback.

To explore the translanguaging practices implemented in the peer-review activities, adapted from Kim and Chang (2022), the written peer-review feedback in each of the student paragraph was analyzed qualitatively (*n documents=30*). The feedback was first coded based on two main categories: (1) corrective feedback (2) commentary feedback. Corrective feedback is when the feedback is given directly without any mitigation, whereas commentary feedback is in the form of explanations, suggestions, or questions. The feedback points in each part of the categories were then coded into three broad focuses: "form," "content and organization," and "lexical choices." The focus on "form" was subdivided into "grammar" and "mechanics" (e.g., capitalization, punctuation, and spelling). The coded feedback then was categorized according to language usage: L1 or L2. All the peer-feedback was tallied and counted based on the classification to be later presented in the form of tables. The amount of feedback in each category was used to find the students' patterns of Translanguaging: language choices in each category of the feedback. Terminologies related to grammar, such as "*be*," "*adjective*," "*verb*," and "*noun*," were categorized as L1 when students used these terms along with explanation written in the students' L1. However, when students used these terms along with comments written in English they were classified as L2. This decision was made because some English grammar terminologies do not have direct equivalents in Indonesian. Additionally, the lecturer for this subject consistently encourages students to use the English terminology when discussing English grammar to familiarize them with these terms and avoid confusion. This approach aligns with Carstens' (2016) finding where students in his research

expressed that using their mother tongue did not simplify understanding. Combining English grammar terminology with translanguaging practices in the classroom provides a framework to enhance students' understanding of grammar which is often seen as one of the most challenging aspects of language learning. Aoyama (2020) highlighted that practical instruction and appropriate scaffolds are important for students' gradual L2 development. Thus, in accordance to Aoyama (2020) and Carstens (2016), encouragement to use L2 terminology combined with L1 explanation is seen as a way to create a more supportive learning environment that may help students gradually understand and master difficult grammar concepts.

After performing the peer-feedback activities, students were asked to check the feedback. Then, an FGD was conducted for the students to orally discuss their views and attitude related to translanguaging in peer-feedback. Prior to the FGD, the students were informed that the discussion would be audio recorded for research purposes. Additionally, they provided verbal consent before participating. The important points of the recorded FGD were transcribed to be later included in the findings of this study. The data derived from the FGD were coded based on themes, such as "language preference," "using L1 in giving feedback", "using L2 in giving feedback", "using both L1 and L2 in giving feedback", "reasons for shifting between L1 and L2".

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Patterns of Translanguaging

The qualitative analysis of peer feedback from 30 documents containing a short paragraph written by the students reveals clear evidence of translanguaging practices. Out of 207 feedback points, a significant majority (126 or 60.86%) were written in L2, as seen in Table 1, while feedback in L1 comprised 72 instances (34.78%). Notably, there were 9 instances where feedback was delivered using a combination of L1 and L2. This indicates that the students were comfortably switching between languages to convey their feedback. Furthermore, despite having Javanese and Indonesian as their first languages, the students appear to choose Indonesian for their L1 feedback, highlighting their ability to choose which L1 to use in a formal classroom context. The summary of the learners' language choices is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Learners' Language Choices in Written Feedback

	Corrective Feedback	**Commentary Feedback**	**Total**
L1	18 (8,69%)	54 (26.08%)	72 (34.78%)
L2	48 (23.18%)	78 (37.68%)	126 (60.86%)

Both L1 and L2	0 (0%)	9 (4.34%)	9 (4.34%)
Total	66 (31.88%)	141 (68.11%)	207 (100%)

The feedback instances given in each category (Corrective and Commentary) were then classified based on the "focus" of peer-feedback (e.g., Form, Content, and Lexical Choices). The distribution of the feedback and the learner's language choices are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2. Learners' Language Choices and Focus of Corrective Feedback

	Form		Content	Lexical Choices	Total
	Grammar	**Mechanics**			
L1	0	18 (100%)	0	0	18 (100%)
L2	12 (25%)	18 (37.5%)	0	18 (37.5%)	48 (100%)
L1 & L2	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3. Learner's Language Choices and Focus of Commentary Feedback

	Form		Content	Lexical Choices	Total Grammar
	Grammar	**Mechanics**			
L1	9 (16.67%)		39 (72.22%)	6 (11.11%)	54 (100%)
L2	12 (15.38%)	12 (15.38%)	33 (42.3%)	21 (26.92%)	78 (100%)
L1 & L2	6 (66.67%)		3 (33.33%)		9 (100%)

From the information shown in Table 2, most of the corrective peer-feedback, where learners directly correct each other without any explanation, was given in L2 with 48 instances compared to only 18 instances in L1. None of the corrective peer-feedback was related to content. For the corrective feedback delivered in L2, most feedback points were focused on form, including grammar and mechanics, 12 and 18 instances respectively. This was followed by feedback on lexical choices, with 18 instances. In contrast, corrective feedback delivered in L1 was only about form, specifically related to mechanics, such as punctuation and capitalization.

Based on the data in Table 3, all types of commentary feedback (Form, Content, and Lexical Choices) were identified in the peer-feedback given on each student's paragraph. Interestingly, the majority of the commentary feedback specifically addressed the content with 39 instances using L1, 33 instances using L2, and 3 instances using a combination of L1 and L2, whereas as shown in Table 2, this focus was entirely absent in the case of corrective feedback. The instances of the focused-on content commentary feedback were identified to be encouraging meaning negotiation as students posed questions to stimulate discussion, such as "what do you mean …?" or "what do you think …?" or "How if...?." Excerpts (1), (2), and (3) include instances of the questions focused on content feedback.

Excerpts

(1) I don't really get it. What do you mean?

(2) Rendang is already known as a dish that use beef, so you actually don't have to mention it. What do you think?

(3) Topic sentence *tidak nyambung dengan supporting details. Dalam* topic sentence *disebutkan warisan budaya, tetapi di* supporting details *hanya tentang tantangan dan wisata alam saja. Bagaiamana kalau aspek warisan budaya dihapus dari* Topic Sentence?

 (The topic sentence does not connect with the supporting details. The topic sentence mentions cultural heritage, but the supporting details are only about challenges and nature tourism. How about removing the cultural heritage aspect from the topic sentence?)

In addition, to stimulate discussion and mitigating the strength of the feedback, students appeared to use hedging in their advice, such as "*maybe* you can mention …" or "It *might* be better if …." Excerpts (4) and (5) show instances of focused on content feedback containing hedging advice.

Excerpts

(4) Maybe you can mention at least 1 ride in Jatim Park 1. So, people know about what kind of rides that you review.

(5) *Menurut saya paragraphnya terlalu to the point sehingga pembaca kurang mendapat gambaran tentang tempat yang dimaksud. Mungkin akan lebih baik jika ditambah dengan beberapa contoh aktivitas atau beberapa spot agar bisa membangkitkan imajinasi pembaca tentang tempat yang dimaksud.*

 (I think, the paragraph is too straightforward, and so the readers cannot get a clear picture of the place. It might be better if you add some examples of activities or some spots to help spark the readers imagination about the place.)

In addition, there are some instances of using L1 combined with L2 in providing feedback related to content. When the combination occurs, L1 is always used to clarify the evaluation given in L2, as demonstrated in Excerpt (6).

Excerpts

(6)   Maybe this sentence is not needed because it seems like repetition. *Maksudku, kamu sudah berbicara kalau di alun-alun banyak wahana yang ramah anak. Jadi, kamu ga perlu bilang lagi bianglalanya ramah anak karena sudah dijelaskan kalau semua wahana ramah anak* (I mean, you already mentioned that all the rides at the square are child-friendly. So, you don't need to again that the Ferris wheel is child friendly because it has been explained that all the rides are child-friendly."

Commentary feedback points for focused on form were mainly delivered in L2, accounted for 12 for each focused-on form related to grammar and focused-on form related to mechanics and 21 followed by focused on form related to grammar delivered in L1 and combination of L1 and L2 with 9 and 6 instances, respectively. Excerpts (7), (8), (9) demonstrated focused on form feedback delivered in L2, L1, and combination of L1 and L2.

Excerpts

(7)   a. as I said before model verb should be followed by present verb or verb 1.
      b. Like I said before add coma after "So".

(8)   *Setelah Jawa Timur Park tambahkan* be *karena setelah subyek sebelum adjective harus ada* be (After Jawa Timur Park, add "be" because in between subject and adjective, there should be a "be")

(9)   No subject? Where is the subject of this sentence? *Setelah* (after) even though *sebelum* (before) have been restored *harus ada subyek supaya jelas apa yang dibahas* (there must a subject to make the content clear).

Similar to commentary feedback that focused on form, most of the commentary feedback that focused on lexical choices were also delivered in L2 (21 instances) as opposed to only 6 instances of feedback delivered in L1. Of all the commentary feedback occurred in the students' work, it is important to note that there is no instance of positive feedback in the form of praise or encouragement were delivered in either L1 or L2. Additionally, given that the students speak Javanese as their L1, it is interesting to note that there was no evidence of Javanese being used as the language in providing peer feedback.

The translanguaging practice in peer-feedback activities observed in this study occurred in both corrective and commentary feedback. The majority of peer feedback, regardless of type, was delivered in L2. Corrective feedback, whether in L1 or L2, was primarily used to address form and lexical choices. In contrast, commentary feedback covered aspects of form, content, and lexical choices, with L2 being the dominant language. When feedback focused on content, L1 was used most frequently, followed closely by L2, and occasionally a mix of both. Additionally, prompts encouraging negotiation of meaning were evident, particularly in content-related feedback, where students used questions and hedging strategies in L1, L2, or both. Commentary feedback often involved a combination of L1 and L2, with L2 mainly used for explanations and clarifications. Notably, none of the commentary feedback provided in either language included positive reinforcement, such as praise or encouragement.

Learners' Perspectives Related to Translanguaging

The Focus Group Discussion (FGD) has revealed that peer-feedback activity is perceived positively by the learners. There are several reasons for that. First of all, learners see this activity as a medium to apply the paragraph writing theory they learned in class. Secondly, different from receiving teacher feedback, receiving peer-feedback allows them to discuss their writing further without feeling inferior and anxious. Lastly, giving and receiving peer-feedback allows them to practice using the target language. As a result, they do not see different language proficiency as a barrier of the interactions with their peers, but as a learning opportunity. Excerpts (10), (11), (12) are students' statements during the FGD.

Excerpts

(10) We can learn to evaluate our friends' works based on the theory we learned in class.

(11) We know teacher is not always correct, but sometimes we have the tendency to just receive the feedback because we feel reluctant because we think that she is more experienced. With our friend, we can discuss our disagreement and any evaluation freely without feeling very anxious.

(12) We do not think about our partners language proficiency. In Peer-feedback we see it as a change to learn using the target language from each other.

Additionally, translanguaging aids in providing and clarifying feedback. Using their first language (L1) for content-related feedback allows students to articulate their thoughts more clearly, ensuring their partners can understand the feedback and make revision accordingly, as shown in Excerpt (13). Some students also mentioned that receiving grammar-related feedback in L1 helps them better understand their mistakes, as grammar is already challenging for them, and explanation in L2 would make it even more difficult to comprehend, as exemplified in Excerpt (14). Lastly, since grammar in the target language is complex, feedback in L1 allows them to provide equal context in L1 for better comprehension, as shown in Excerpt (15).

Excerpts

(13) I use L1 because evaluation about content is clearer with L1. I can talk how the supporting details do not match the topic sentence and how the conclusion does not represent the content.

(14) Grammar is difficult, when explanation is provided in L2, there will be more possibilities for us to see or read difficult words in the feedback, so that it becomes harder to comprehend. If it is in L1, we can provide clear explanation until our friend understands their grammar mistakes.

(15) In L1 we can also provide context of how the grammar between L2 and L1 is different. So, our friends will be able to understand it better.

Regarding the use of L2 in peer-feedback, students mentioned that 'when discussing grammar, it can be difficult to explain in L1 because our language does not have equivalent forms'. Also, concerning lexical choices, one student noted that 'giving feedback in L2 is

easier because we can simply provide alternative words that we think are more appropriate'. Most importantly, students agreed that 'peer-feedback activities should be seen as a way to practice explaining and understanding concept in L2'. Overall, students agree that translanguaging or shifting between L1 and L2 is very helpful in providing and understanding feedback. They also emphasized that conducting peer-feedback prior to teacher feedback helps them feel more involved in their writing process, as they can negotiate the feedback instead of just receiving it from the teacher. Nevertheless, they still believe that teacher feedback is crucial to resolve disagreements between peers and provide reassurance regarding the quality of their work.

Discussion

The findings indicate that translanguaging practices occurring in both corrective and commentary feedback align with the finding of Kim and Chang (2022). Although students were permitted to use L1 to provide written feedback, the same as Kim and Chang (2022) and Yu and Lee (2014), the majority of the feedback points were written in L2, the target language. This finding is supported by the learners' belief in this study showing that peer-feedback activities provide valuable opportunities to practice using the target language. Additionally, they stated that being allowed to evaluate each other's written compositions lowered their affective filter. As Yu and Lee (2014) noted, power relations are seen as a factor influencing students' language choices when providing feedback. Since peer-feedback is essentially an interaction between friends, the perception of equality among peers resulted in increased confidence to practice the target language.

In line with Yu and Lee (2014), Kim and Chang (2022), and Saeli and Rahmati (2023), this study found that corrective feedback was primarily focused on form and lexical choices with most feedback delivered in L2. This is likely because corrective feedback involves directly correcting a peer's work, which is easier to deliver in L2 than in L1. Regarding content related feedback, similar to previous studies (Kim & Chang, 2022; Saeli & Rahmati, 2023; Yeh, 2018; Yu, 2016; Yu & Lee, 2014), this study found that peer-feedback related to content was mostly given in L1. Additionally, in accordance to Cenoz et al. (2022), participants in this study testified that shifting flexibly between their L1 and L2 in pedagogical translanguaging reduces anxiety and potentially increases their learning understanding.

The findings show that learners often used questions and hedging advice to scaffold their partners thinking and to encourage meaning negotiation. This also occurs in commentary feedback related to form, such as grammar and mechanics, and leads to the enhancement of students 'engagement in peer feedback (Fan & Xu, 2020). Those two features, translanguaging and meaning negotiation, promote students' enjoyment within the classroom and concurrently lessen anxiety (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014). It is essential to lower learners' affective filters to increase the success of communication goals.

It is important to highlight in this study that students perceived translanguaging in peer-feedback activity positively, to the point that it allows them to understand their grammar mistakes, not just accepting the direct correction from their peers. Also, translanguaging allows them to scaffold their feedback not only for grammar related feedback, but also content as well

as vocabulary related feedback. This seems to be in line with Swain and Lapkin (2000) who found that allowing students using their shared L1 can increase participation which is required for better L2 learning and for making the task manageable, without drawing a firm line to push them leaving their identities (Baker, 2024; Ollerhead, 2019). Interestingly, this study does not find any positive feedback in the form of praise or encouragement delivered either in L1, L2, or combination of both. It is probably because students are focused more on providing corrections. Also, Indonesian cultural norms where people tend to emphasize areas for improvement rather than commenting on aspects that have been done correctly may as well contribute to the absent of the positive feedback.

Yet, it is worth noting that in the peer-feedback guideline provided for the students, the teacher did not specifically emphasize words of encouragement to be included. On the other hand, research found that praise encouraged endorsement of growth in developing speaking skill (Zarrinabadi et al., 2023). Even though the skill that is explored in this study focused mainly on writing skills, both speaking and writing are categorized as productive skills, and therefore it is important to note that words of encouragement and praise should also be endorsed in peer-feedback guidelines.

Students generally perceive the use of their L1 to support L2 learning positively, consistent with the findings of Liu et al. (2024). They see the opportunity to use their L1 as a valuable tool for negotiating meaning, understanding complex grammar, and improving the coherency of their paragraph. Similar to the findings of Hu and Lei (2014) and Hurst and Mona (2017), students in this study felt that using only the target language increased the complexity of the materials, especially those related to grammar, and also reduced their confidence. Most importantly, the Focus Group Discussion (FGD) revealed that peer feedback activities, especially when supported by translanguaging encouraged students to become active learners because they actively reinforce their knowledge and understanding by providing and clarifying feedback with lower level of anxiety. This reflects the belief that L1 has a place in the target language classroom. Allowing translanguaging in EFL setting demonstrates teachers' empathy toward students difficulties in understanding complex materials and helps scaffold students' understanding (Brevik & Rindal, 2020). Incorporating peer-feedback and translanguaging seems to be well-suited with this current education trend where teachers are expected to act more as facilitators, triggering active discussions and collaboration among students. As Rabbidge (2019) notes, translanguaging can shape participation positively and allow students to understand more of the lesson.

CONCLUSION

This study highlights translanguaging patterns and learners' perspectives on translanguaging during written peer-feedback activity in an L2 writing class composed of multilingual students. The results reveal that students actively engage in translanguaging as a result of safe space existence, applying their L1 and L2 to provide more thorough and understandable comments. This approach facilitates students gain an understanding of the target language and the components of writing. The preference for L1 when offering feedback

on content and L2 on lexical and grammatical choices clarifies how linguistic repertoires should be strategically employed to optimize the efficacy of peer feedback. Furthermore, the positive learners' perspective on these activities emphasizes its significance to L2 writing instruction.

This research brings implications by offering insights for teachers, especially foreign language teachers and education officials. For teachers, they can integrate translanguaging practices, specifically in L2 writing classes with clear designs. For education officials, they should provide more space within curriculum for translanguaging practices including integrating regular peer feedback activities to promote student collaboration. This study is limited to examining the translanguaging practices in written peer-feedback activities and investigating students' attitudes toward this practice. Given that the result is positive, future study is recommended to explore whether translanguaging genuinely contributes to enhancing the quality of students' writing.

REFERENCES

Aoyama, R. (2020). Exploring Japanese high school students' L1 use in translanguaging in the communicative EFL classroom. *TESL-EJ*, *23*(4), 1–18. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1242655.pdf

Baker, C. (2024). Biliteracy and transliteracy in Wales: Language planning and the Welsh national curriculum. In H. Hornberger, Nancy (Ed.), *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (pp.71-90). Multilingual Matters.

Banister, C. (2023). Exploring peer feedback processes and peer feedback meta-dialogues with learners of academic and business English. *Language Teaching Research*, *27*(3), 746–764. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820952222

Brevik, L. M., & Rindal, U. (2020). Language use in the classroom: Balancing target language exposure with the need for other languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, *54*(4), 925–953. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.564

Canagarajah, S. (2011a). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *2*(2011), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1

Canagarajah, S. (2011b). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Carstens, A. (2016). Translanguaging as a vehicle for L2 acquisition and L1 development: Students' perceptions. *Language Matters*, *47*(2), 203–222. https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2016.1153135

Cenoz, J., Santos, A., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging and teachers' perceptions of anxiety. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *27*(9), 1234–1245. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.2021387

Chong, I. (2018). Interplay among technical, socio-emotional and personal factors in written feedback research. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(2), 185–196. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1317712

Dewaele, J.-M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2014). The two faces of Janus? Anxiety and enjoyment in the foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *4*(2), 237–274. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.5

Emilia, E., & Hamied, F. A. (2022). Translanguaging practices in a tertiary EFL context in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, *33*(1), 47–74. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i1/47-74

Fan, Y., & Xu, J. (2020). Exploring student engagement with peer feedback on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *50,* article 100775. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100775

Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2014). English-medium instruction in Chinese higher education: A case study. *Higher Education*, *67*(5), 551–567. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9661-5

Hurst, E., & Mona, M. (2017). "Translanguaging" as a socially just pedagogy. *Education as Change*, *21*(2), 126–148. https://doi.org/10.17159/1947-9417/2017/2015

Kachru, B. B. (1992). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching*, *25*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800006583

Kim, S., & Chang, C. H. (2022). Japanese L2 learners' translanguaging practice in written peer feedback. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *25*(4), 1363–1376. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1760201

Kuncoroningtyas, F. S. A., Sumardi, S., & Putra, K. A. (2025). EFL students' attitudes towards translanguaging practice: Its implications for willingness to communicate in Indonesian vocational classrooms. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, *13*(1), 255-267. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i1.12711

Liu, D., Deng, Y., & Wimpenny, K. (2024). Students' perceptions and experiences of translanguaging pedagogy in teaching English for academic purposes in China. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *29*(5), 1234–1252. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2129961

Mehrpour, S., Hoomanfard, M. H., & Vazin, E. (2023). Peer feedback accuracy in synchronous and asynchronous computer-mediated conditions in an EFL context. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *11*(1), 97–116. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2023.121274

Ollerhead, S. (2019). Teaching across semiotic modes with multilingual learners: Translanguaging in an Australian classroom. *Language and Education*, *33*(2), 106–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1516780

Rabbidge, M. (2019). The effects of translanguaging on participation in EFL classrooms. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *16*(4), 1305–1322. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.4.15.1305

Raja, F. D., Suparno, S., & Ngadiso, N. (2022). Students' attitude towards translanguaging practice in Indonesian EFL classes. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *14*(1), 979–988. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i1.1149

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, *59*(1), 23–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci003

Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Saeli, H., & Cheng, A. (2021). Peer feedback, learners' engagement, and L2 writing development: The case of a test-preparation class. *TESL-EJ*, *25*(2), 1–18. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1314054.pdf

Saeli, H., & Rahmati, P. (2023). Developments in learners' affective engagement with written peer feedback: The affordances of in situ translanguaging. *Assessing Writing*, *58*, article 100788. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100788

Silalahi, R. M. P., Widianingtyas, N., Murniati, M., Novia, J., Sanjaya, F. A., & Karlin, G. (2023). The perceptions of the use of translanguaging as a form of oral feedback in Indonesian tertiary English language teaching context. *Studies in Media and Communication*, *11*(7), 77-89. https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v11i7.6284

Sun, P. P., & Zhang, J. L. (2022). Effects of translanguaging in online peer feedback on Chinese university English-as-a-foreign-language students' writing performance. *RELC Journal*, *53*(2), 325–341. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221089051

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, *4*(3), 251–274. https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880000400304

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

Yeh, C. (2018). L1 versus L2 use in peer review of L2 writing in English. *Asian EFL Journal*, *20*(9), 124–127.

Yu, S. (2016). An exploratory study on the role of L1 use in peer written feedback of L2 writing. *Porta Linguarum*, *25*, 135–146. https://doi.org/10.30827/digibug.53894

Yu, S., & Hu, G. (2017). Understanding university students' peer feedback practices in EFL writing: Insights from a case study. *Assessing Writing*, *33*, 25–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2017.03.004

Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2014). Peer feedback in second language writing (2005-2014). *Language Teaching, 49*(4), 461-493. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000161

Zarrinabadi, N., Lou, N. M., & Darvishnezhad, Z. (2023). To praise or not to praise? Examining the effects of ability vs. effort praise on speaking anxiety and willingness to communicate in EFL classrooms. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *17*(1), 88–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1938079

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

Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. *Assessing Writing*, *15*(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.01.002