



UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA PARTICULAR DE LOJA
La Universidad Católica de Loja

**FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS SOCIALES, EDUCACIÓN Y
HUMANIDADES**

**CARRERA EN CIENCIAS DE LA EDUCACIÓN MENCIÓN
INGLÉS**

Trabajo de titulación previo a la obtención del título de:

LICENCIADO EM CIENCIAS DE LA EDUCACIÓN MENCIÓN INGLÉS

The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the
improvement of writing skills in high school students

Autora: Altamirano Ortega, Andrea Susana

Directora: Celi Celi, Liliana Fernanda

CENTRO UNIVERSITARIO SAN GABRIEL

2022



Esta versión digital, ha sido acreditada bajo la licencia Creative Commons 4.0, CC BY-NC-SA: Reconocimiento-No comercial-Compartir igual; la cual permite copiar, distribuir y comunicar públicamente la obra, mientras se reconozca la autoría original, no se utilice con fines comerciales y se permiten obras derivadas, siempre que mantenga la misma licencia al ser divulgada. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/deed.es>

2022

Aprobación del director del trabajo de titulación

Loja, marzo, de 2022

Magíster

Alba Bitalina Vargas Saritama

Directora de la Carrera de Ciencias de la Educación, Mención Inglés

Ciudad.-

De mi consideración:

El presente trabajo de titulación denominado: The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students realizado por Andrea Susana Altamirano Ortega, ha sido orientado y revisado durante su ejecución, por cuanto se aprueba la presentación del mismo. Así mismo, doy fe que dicho trabajo de titulación ha sido revisado por la herramienta antiplagio institucional.

Particular que comunico para los fines pertinentes.

Atentamente,

Mgtr. Celi Celi Liliana Fernanda

C.I: 0924399200

Correo electrónico: lfceli@utpl.edu.ec

Declaración de autoría y cesión de derechos

“Yo, Andrea Susana Altamirano Ortega, declaro y acepto en forma expresa lo siguiente:

Ser autor(a) del Trabajo de Titulación denominado: The role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students, de la Titulación Ciencias de la Educación Mención Inglés, específicamente de los contenidos comprendidos en: Chapter 1. Literature Review, Chapter 2. Method, 3. Discussion, analysis and interpretation of results, Conclusions y Recomendations, Mgtr. Liliana Fernanda Celi Celi, directora del presente trabajo; y, en tal virtud, eximo expresamente a la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja y a sus representantes legales de posibles reclamos o acciones judiciales o administrativas, en relación a la propiedad intelectual. Además, ratifico que las ideas, conceptos, procedimientos y resultados vertidos en el presente trabajo investigativo son de mi exclusiva responsabilidad.

Que mi obra, producto de mis actividades académicas y de investigación, forma parte del patrimonio de la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja, de conformidad con el artículo 20, literal j), de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior; y, artículo 91 del Estatuto Orgánico de la UTP, que establece: “Forman parte del patrimonio de la Universidad la propiedad intelectual de investigaciones, trabajos científicos o técnicos y tesis de grado que se realicen a través, o con el apoyo financiero, académico o institucional (operativo) de la Universidad”.

Autorizo a la Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja para que pueda hacer uso de mi obra con fines netamente académicos, ya sea de forma impresa, digital y/o electrónica o por cualquier medio conocido o por conocerse, sirviendo el presente instrumento como la fe de mi completo consentimiento; y, para que sea ingresada al Sistema Nacional de Información de la Educación Superior del Ecuador para su difusión pública, en cumplimiento del artículo 144 de la Ley Orgánica de Educación Superior.

Firma:

Autor: Andrea Susana Altamirano Ortega

C.I.: 0401811195

Correo electrónico: asaltamirano@utpl.edu.ec

Dedication

I dedicate this work to a group of people who have great significance in this process and in my life. My parents Carmen and Heriberto because they are my strength and inspiration to move forward, especially my mother for her constant moral support throughout my career. My brothers because I know that at some point my dreams were also their dreams, and my sisters because from them I learned that with effort and perseverance many things can be achieved, especially Silvana for supporting me and believing in me. Finally, I dedicate this work to a great woman who I admire and esteem Fany because I am writing these lines thanks to her, my gratitude forever.

Andrea

Acknowledgment

First of all, I want to thank God for always being with me. Also, I wish to express my gratitude to my thesis tutor Mgtr. Verónica Espinoza for her time and great disposition, and to my thesis director Liliana Celi for her support and guidance in this work. In addition, I want to thank my classmates and teachers at UTPL for contributing to my formation, not only as a professional but also as a human being. Finally, a special thanks to a group of women whom I admire Olga, Tibisay, Blanca, and Elizabeth for helping me when I needed it, and for showing me that distance is not a barrier to maintaining a beautiful friendship.

Andrea

Contents

Cover.....	i
Aprobación del director del trabajo de titulación.....	II
Declaración de autoría y cesión de derechos.....	III
Dedication	V
Acknowledgment.....	VI
Contents.....	VII
Abstract	1
Resumen	2
Introduction	3
Chapter one	5
Literature Review	5
Writing EFL In The Context.....	5
Written corrective feedback (WCF) on EFL learners	10
Previous studies.....	14
Chapter two	17
Method	17
Settings and participants:.....	17
Procedure.....	17
Chapter three	19
Description, interpretation and analysis of results	19
Conclusions.....	34
Recommendations	36
References	37
Appendix	47
Appendix A: Rubric	47
Appendix B: peer’s feedback checklist	49
Appendix C: students’ survey	50

List of tables

Table 1: Pre and post test results	19
Table 2: Teacher and peer feedback results	20
Table 3: Students perception about teacher and peer feedback	27

Abstract

This study focuses on the role of peer correction and teacher feedback in the improvement of writing skills in high school students. The aim was to analyze the differences between both types of feedback and their efficacy for the improvement of morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors in EFL writing. The participants of this study were 30 students from the first year of high school from a public institution located in the city of San Gabriel, Carchi. The applied method was mixed comprising quantitative and qualitative approaches. Also, a pre and post written test, a rubric, a checklist, and a survey were administered as instruments. The results showed that morphological errors were the most common on the participants' writing, and that both teacher and peer feedback had significant effects on improving written errors although teacher feedback showed more relevance.

Keywords: feedback, morphological, semantic, syntactic errors, written correction.

Resumen

Este estudio se centra en el papel de la corrección entre compañeros y la retroalimentación del maestro en la mejora de las habilidades de escritura en estudiantes de secundaria. El objetivo fue analizar las diferencias entre ambos tipos de retroalimentación y su eficacia para la mejora de los errores morfológicos, semánticos y sintácticos en la escritura. Los participantes de este estudio fueron 30 estudiantes del primer año de secundaria de una institución pública ubicada en la ciudad de San Gabriel, Carchi. El método aplicado fue mixto comprendiendo enfoques cuantitativos y cualitativos. Asimismo, se administraron como instrumentos una prueba escrita previa y posterior, una rúbrica, una lista de cotejo y una encuesta. Los resultados mostraron que los errores morfológicos eran los más comunes en la escritura de los participantes y que tanto la retroalimentación del maestro como la de los compañeros tuvieron efectos significativos en la corrección de errores de escritura, aunque la retroalimentación del maestro mostró mayor relevancia.

Palabras clave: corrección escrita, errores morfológicos, semánticos, sintácticos, retroalimentación.

Introduction

Nowadays, English is a universal language that is taught as a foreign language in many countries around the world. Although teaching English focuses on each of these skills; speaking, listening, reading, and writing, the latter represents an essential element in the teaching and learning of this language. According to Khazrouni (2019), writing helps students increase vocabulary, strengthen their knowledge in grammatical rules, develop their critical thinking, share knowledge, and communicate with people from different parts of the world. In addition, a large percentage of the information is written in English, and much of the learning process is developed through writing, so it is important that students have a mastery of this skill. However, for many EFL students writing in English is a complex task, since they must organize and interpret their ideas clearly and these must be well structured grammatically (Salma, 2015). For students to achieve good writing, they need not only knowledge but also constant practice and correction, so feedback plays a fundamental role in improving writing.

Regarding the topic, many researchers have conducted studies to know the effect of feedback on writing improvement. For instance, Aghajani and Zoghipour (2018) conducted a study to know the grammatical mistakes in students' writing and to know the feedback that has the best effect on correcting grammatical errors. For this, three variables peer correction, self-correction, and teacher feedback were considered. The results obtained showed that both peer correction and teacher correction achieved favorable results in the participants, while self-correction did not show any results.

Wihastyanang et al. (2020) conducted a study to determine the effect of feedback on students' writing. For this, they considered the combination of three aspects: teacher feedback, peer feedback, and Edmodo, a platform that allows providing written comments and feedback online. The final results concluded that students who received teacher feedback in a conventional manner improved their writing considerably, while students who

received feedback from both teacher and peers through the Edmodo platform did not perform well in their writing.

Pitoyo et al. (2019) conducted a study with the aim of finding out the effect of different types of comments on EFL learners' writing error correction. The results obtained showed that the students had great difficulty in writing paragraphs, especially they had problems in vocabulary usage and grammar comprehension, and that both peer correction and teacher feedback had significant results in writing improvement.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences between peer correction and teacher feedback and their efficacy for the improvement of morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors in EFL writing. Besides, this study aims to answer the following research questions: Which are the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of the morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors? And which type of feedback, peer correction and teacher feedback do EFL students prefer for writing?

This study is divided into three chapters, the first chapter presents the literature review that contains relevant information from different authors on the topic of the research. The second chapter includes the research method and comprises settings and participants, and procedures. The third chapter presents the description, interpretation, and analysis of the obtained results. Finally, based on the results of the research, conclusions and recommendations were presented.

This study mainly benefits the institution where the research was conducted because through this study both teachers and students of the first year of high school can know the main writing errors in morphological, semantic, and syntactic aspects that make students in writing paragraphs. In the same way, the results of this work are useful for educational institutions and all people who are interested in learning about the effect of feedback on students' academic performance. Finally, this study may contribute to future investigations related to the topic of this research.

Chapter one

Literature Review

Writing is one of the most important skills in the process of learning English as a foreign or second language. Therefore, written correction between students or with the teacher is a fundamental part for improving this linguistic skill. For this reason, the following section shows some topics that include relevant information on writing aspects such as; Writing in the EFL context, The importance of writing in the EFL students, Challenges in EFL writing, The most common and frequent written errors: morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors, Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) on EFL learners, The importance of effective feedback, Written Peer correction, Written Teacher feedback and some previous studies that show research in relation to the subject.

Writing EFL In The Context

English is a universal language that helps people communicate on a global scale around the world (Irmawati et al., 2021). According to Yusuf et al. (2018), the English language has its own grammatical bases, so it is not enough to know how to speak, it is also essential to know how to write to understand the language in a better way. Moreover, Jashari and Fojkar (2019) affirm that writing is one of the main skills of the English language, which must be mastered to achieve good communication. In agreement with this, Hyland (2004) argues that people communicate and share ideas through writing skills. Therefore, Hyland points out that writing is a communicative action that connects feelings between people, it is also a bridge that allows sharing personal meanings and expressing own ideas on any topic of interest.

Furthermore, according to Klimova (2014) writing has a special focus on the teaching of languages since the knowledge of this skill involves the development of other skills. Klimova mentions that writing in another language is an essential factor in communicating with foreign people. Therefore, writing in English is one of the main skills taken into account to evaluate students who want to study in English-speaking countries (Irmawati et al., 2021). Along the same lines, Hosseini et al. (2013) argue that writing is considered a great tool for

sharing knowledge, especially in the educational area. In addition, these authors conclude that writing correctly, especially in English, constitutes a great platform to achieve greater opportunities in the work' area.

The importance of writing in the EFL students

Currently, English is one of the languages that is most widely taught as a foreign language in most countries where English is not their native language. According to Al-Mahrooq et al. (2015) although all language skills are important, writing skill has a fundamental role for students. Writing according to Khazrouni (2019) helps EFL students develop their critical thinking skills, as well as improves the use of grammatical structures, spelling, and vocabulary in student-written texts. Likewise, this skill allows the writing of different sources of written information such as letters, reports, academic articles, etc. (Toba et al.,2019). In addition, Malinda (2020) mentions that writing is a language skill that allows sharing ideas and knowledge so that most aspects of learning are carried out through writing.

Additionally, Afrin (2016) maintains that writing is one of the first skills that are taken into account to evaluate knowledge. At this point, the author mentions that, although each skill has its own way of being evaluated, one of the ways that is most used to verify student learning is the written evaluation. Therefore, writing plays a fundamental role in the academic achievement of foreign language students (Aliyu, 2020). Furthermore, according to Abadikhah et al. (2018) the knowledge and mastery of writing in English allows students of any discipline to share their academic knowledge around the world.

On the other hand, Guo et al. (2021) affirm that although writing in English constitutes one of the most important skills for communication around the world, it has not been emphasized in teaching. Accordingly, Salma (2015) states that writing correctly in English is not an easy task for EFL students. Salma considers that achieving good writing requires a lot of practice, and also the knowledge of grammar rules represents an essential base to achieve correct writing (Nasser, 2018).

Challenges in EFL writing

According to Meza (2020), EFL students face many challenges in language characteristics especially when they are in the process of learning and practicing writing. At this point, Ghoorchaei and Khosravi (2019) mentioned that one of the main problems of writing in English is lack of knowledge and mastery of skill, which affects the ability of students and delays their learning. In the same line, Sukandi and Rianita (2018) argue that the proper use of grammar rules and the organization of ideas are the greatest difficulties for students when writing a text. In a study carried out by Singh et al. (2017) the authors found that although students have received a lot of information about the use of grammar rules since primary school and then secondary school they have many grammatical errors in their writing, especially in the use of verb tenses (Ratnawati et al., 2018). In accordance with this, Abas and Aziz (2016) mention that writing in English and using appropriate vocabulary and grammar is a complex process for most students so that to be able to write a good script, students are required to have a lot of knowledge and practice of the language (Sukandi & Syafar, 2018).

Furthermore, Aziz et al. (2020) state that one of the main factors that lead to errors in the production of the English language is interlingual transfer. According to Olana et al. (2015) most of the grammatical errors that students make in their writing are largely influenced by first language interference, this interference lies in the culture of the students (Jabali, 2018). Moreover, Silalahi et al. (2018) mentioned that the transfer of the mother tongue creates confusion in the knowledge of students, leading them to mix the structures of languages and as a consequence of this they make semantic, morphological, syntactic errors, among other interlinguistic errors, so that the development of writing skills is affected in a high percentage by L1 interference (Budiharto, 2019; Nair & Krish, 2021). However, Elkilic (2012) discovered that interference decreases as the level of knowledge of students increases. This author mentions that students with an elevated level of knowledge have the ability to write texts in English that present clear and well organized ideas.

The most common and frequent written errors: morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors.

According to Lennon (1991 as cited in Al-Shormani and Al-Sohbani, 2012) the authors define "error" in general as "a linguistic form or combination of forms which, in the same context and under similar conditions of production, would, in all likelihood, not be produced by the speakers' native speaker counterparts" (p. 2). In other words, it refers to linguistic and grammatical errors, as well as word order, omission, misformation, and other errors that people who are not native speakers can make when they speak or write in a second language. Accordingly, Terzioğlu and Bensen Bostanci (2020) affirm that the majority of errors found in written essays correspond to morphological and syntactic aspects. Based on this, Al-Badawi (2012) mentions that the lack of knowledge of the language produces morphological errors and the interference of L1 leads to syntactic errors.

With respect to morphology, it is a linguistic aspect considered part of grammar and studies word-formation. According to Adha and Dania (2020) English learners make many morphological errors in their writing, the most common of which are presented by improper use of adjectives, nouns, verbs, and in most cases in derivation and inflection. According to the authors, inflection and derivation are morphological aspects that are part of grammar and are used in writing. Derivation in morphology occurs when words derived from other words are created. For example, from the word "beautiful" words like "beautifully" or "beauty" can be derived. Inflection is used to show a grammatical aspect of a word, for example, to indicate whether verbs are regular or irregular. In addition, in a study carried out by Gayo and Widodo (2018) they found that the highest rate of morphological errors is found in errors of "inflection, derivation, preposition, article, copula be, personal pronoun, auxiliary verb, and demonstrative" (p.8) and the highest percentage of errors originate in the use of the verb be. Moreover, the author mentions that morphological errors occur because students add, omit or change the order of words in their writing. In the same way, Baykalova et al. (2018) conducted a study to find the main typing errors. Based on the morphological aspect, the authors found that the most common errors occur in the use of verb tenses, also a

displacement of the auxiliary verb, the incorrect use of prepositions, omission of the plural -s, and inappropriate use of articles and adjectives (Terzioğlu & Bensen Bostanci, 2020).

Another factor to consider in writing is the semantic field. According to Crystal et al. (2021) semantics studies the meaning of natural language. So, it is very common for students learning a foreign language to make semantic errors. For example, in a study by Jassim (2016) it was found that EFL students have a high percentage of semantic errors as a result of the literal translation of expressions from the mother tongue. Besides, inappropriate use of terms was found, and a high percentage of words with distorted and erroneous meaning for the English language. Rezai and Davarpanah (2019) claimed that the majority of semantic errors that learners of English as a foreign language make are presented in the use of similar forms, and also in the placement of words with related meanings and synonyms in sentences. Furthermore, Akbarnezhad et al. (2019) conducted a study to know the greater degree of semantic errors that students of English as a foreign language have in the use of verbs. They found that students have more difficulty in the perception of transitive verbs. To carry out this study, they examined “the order of difficulty of argument structures: transitive, intransitive and ditransitive and their semantic categories such as state, activity, achievement, and accomplishment” (p.9). Consequently, the results of the study indicated that the highest percentage of semantic errors was found in the use of transitive verbs in the accomplishment category.

Furthermore, syntax is another element in which most errors can be found. According to Miller (2013), syntax is fundamental in academic writing since it allows writers to carry out formal writing through the construction of appropriate structures. Miller mentions that many students can speak and read in English, however, their writing is informal and lacks syntactic structures. In accordance with this, Handayani et al. (2019) argued that there are many syntactic errors that students make in their writing when they are learning a language. In a study carried out by Handayani with students of English as a second language, it was found that the majority of syntactic errors that students make in their writing are presented in the incorrect use of verb tenses, as well as in the use of “subject-verb agreement, tenses,

gerund, passive, article, preposition, word order, redundancy, parallelism, modality, noun, verb, pluralization, relative pronoun, possessive pronoun, correlative conjunction, and syntactic ambiguity” (p.105).

Additionally, the authors Gayo and Widodo (2018); Singh and Maniam (2020) found that the highest percentage of syntactic errors occurs in subject-verb agreement. Likewise, another study by Ababneh (2017) points out that there is a high percentage of syntactic errors in the use of verbs. For example, in the writing tests, it was found that participants mixed the verb tenses and used the verbs incorrectly and, in many cases, formed sentences that lacked a subject or verb, so that the highest error rate of syntax was found in the use of subject-verb agreement (Gayo & Widodo, 2018). Similarly, Singh and Maniam (2020) investigated that the majority of syntactic errors occur in the use of verb tenses, the incorrect use of articles, the inappropriate use of pronouns, and mostly in agreement between subject and verb. Therefore, the author concludes that the majority of syntactic errors that students make in their writing are due to the transfer of structures from their first language.

Written corrective feedback (WCF) on EFL learners

Written corrective feedback (WCF) according to Zhang and Cheng (2021) is considered of great importance for the correction of errors in writing and it can be applied both in teacher feedback and in peer correction, also this type of correction can be provided by using special software. Rezai and Davarpanah (2019) refer to (WCF) as a process through which teachers provide written comments to correct and improve linguistic errors found in students' writing. According to Amano (2018) there are four types of written feedback. Direct feedback consists of marking the errors found in a writing and teaching the correct writing. Metalinguistic feedback consists of marking errors with codes so that students can identify the kind of error made in the text. Indirect feedback consists of identifying student errors without providing any kind of comment. In this type of feedback the students are the ones who have to recognize the type of error. Lastly, question feedback which is not focused on correcting grammatical errors, but it is intended to help students

through questions, for example, why did you put that noun? Although this type of correction is less used than the others.

In regard to written feedback Cinar (2017) states that it favors the learning and development of students' writing. Cinar mentions that students take feedback in a positive way since it helps them understand and rectify errors in their writing, especially in the use of grammatical structures. According to Rashtchi and Bakar (2019), most students prefer that the errors found in their tasks be marked and also include their respective comments. Students consider that if errors are marked, they can easily find them and rectify them. However, in many cases providing written feedback on each of the errors found, becomes a complicated task for teachers, especially if the class is large.

On the other hand, Zhang and Cheng (2021) claim that although it is proven that providing WCF to students has positive results and contributes to improving original writing accuracy, some researchers consider that providing written comments to students is not more relevant to their writing and learning performance. According to Gad et al. (2016) in many cases students do not understand the feedback provided by the teacher, which interrupts the process of developing their writing. In the same lines, Yu et al. (2020), argue that written corrective feedback influences students' motivation in a negative way, while other types of feedback such as scoring feedback, expressive feedback, or peer and self-feedback, lead students to improve their writing. However, Mao and Crosthwaite (2019) mention that although there are many investigations that affirm that written corrective feedback does not contribute to improve the written precision of students. Most research has shown that written feedback helps students improve their writing and gain greater knowledge of the language, especially in terms of grammar.

The importance of effective feedback

In recent years feedback has been widely accepted in learning environments, this has become a guide that helps students to improve errors and deficiencies in learning (Cárcamo, 2020). In accordance with this, Bitchener and Knoch (2008) mention that effective feedback is one that includes clear and concise information so that students can understand

and correct their mistakes both in the idiomatic context and in grammatical structures. In the same way, Schuldt (2019) indicates that for feedback to be effective, it must be based on the students' knowledge in relation to the responses to its work. In addition, it is important that the information is clear, constructive, and timely so that students can understand, correct and at the same time reinforce their learning for the next tasks. Therefore, Lee, (2015) suggests that to achieve effective feedback it is necessary to have prior training on the subject, since good feedback does not only provide adequate information to students, it also provides valuable information to teachers. Therefore, many of the researchers who study the effects of feedback consider that it is an essential factor in the learning and production of writing in a second language (Benson & DeKeyser, 2019). However, according to Abalkheel and Brandenburg, (2020) researchers still have many unknowns about the efficacy of corrective feedback. Consequently, although the effectiveness of the correction of errors in the precision of writing is questioned, it is still one of the strategies most used by teachers in the classrooms of teaching English as a foreign language (Castro, 2017).

Written Peer correction

Peer correction is a form of error correction through which students provide and receive written comments of their classmates on their tasks in order to improve and correct writing errors (Ramírez and Guillén, 2018). In other words, it is the correction of writing between students. According to Tsurroya (2020) peer correction helps them to reduce reliance on teachers for review and correction. In a study carried out by Tsurroya found that correction between peers considerably increases motivation, it also encourages reflection and development of critical thinking in writing. Therefore, the author considers that peer correction is an essential tool to improve writing in English. Furthermore, Hansen and Liu (2005) argue that correction among students encourages companionship and increases trust between them. In a study carried out by Lee (2015) it was found that many students prefer evaluation by their peers since feedback between peers involves an aspect of trust and fosters an environment of more effective learning.

However, Tsuroyya (2020) states that on many occasions teachers do not trust peer correction, since they consider that not all students have sufficient knowledge and skill necessary to make an adequate correction to the work of their classmates. Similarly, many students do not feel satisfied with the written correction provided by their peers, so they prefer their written work to be reviewed by the teacher (Cinar, 2017). Therefore, Demir (2021) argues that many writers believe that peer correction is not always reliable. According to Muncie (2000) students do not have the level of knowledge that the teacher has, so they are not in the capacity to give final comments to classmates' work. Muncie suggests that peer corrections should be supervised by the teacher for greater reliability. Based on this, Hansen and Liu (2005) claimed that the prior training by the teacher to the students plays a fundamental role in peer correction since the guidelines that the teacher provides help the students to make a better correction on classmates' tasks.

Written Teacher feedback

Teacher written feedback refers to the written feedback that teachers use to indicate writing errors to their students and at the same time provide correction comments based on the errors found in order to improve the writing (Sermsook, 2017). According to Sermsook, written teacher feedback is divided into two categories; focused and unfocused both elements are used in the correction of grammatical errors. For instance, focused is based on the errors that the teacher considers necessary to correct, and unfocused is characterized by correcting all errors found in written text.

Additionally, Yu and Yang (2021) manifest that written feedback from the teacher constitutes an essential element in language learning since the comments provided by the teacher during teaching help students correct and improve their errors in composition and writing (Eslami & Sahragard 2021). In the same way, Sermsook et al. (2017) found that written feedback is one of the best tools that teachers use to help students improve deficiencies in writing and especially in grammar. Moreover, according to Hashemifardnia et al. (2019) teacher feedback encourages students to improve their texts by focusing students' attention on inaccurate points in their writing.

However, Amano, (2018) indicates that for teachers it is almost impossible to give feedback for every written error made by students, so most feedback is based on a single factor. Moreover, Silver and Lee (2007) argue that sometimes the way the teacher uses to give feedback is a disadvantage since in some cases the students do not understand the indications provided by the teacher. In addition, Irwin (2017) states that sometimes the grammatical errors found in students' work are beyond the knowledge of the teacher, so the teacher prefers to omit a comment and simply cross out the error. Irwin states that almost half of the students do not review the comments provided by their teachers. This represents a significant number of students who do not take advantage of the feedback provided to improve their errors, which is contradictory for the development of learning.

Previous studies

According to Tian and Zhou (2020) in recent years, different sources of feedback and error correction have been investigated, in order to understand the role and importance they have in the teaching-learning of writing in foreign language students. Consequently, there are many studies based on correction and written feedback that has the purpose of finding valuable information that is useful to improve aspects based on the subject studied, these studies have been carried out in different contexts but focused on one topic. For the purpose of providing truthful information and results based on actual research, six of these are defined below.

Aghajani and Zoghipour (2018) conducted an investigation to find out the grammatical knowledge of the students, and to identify what type of feedback and correction of errors students responded best with to the correction of their peers, the self-correction, or teacher' feedback. To carry out this study, 60 students were selected who were divided into groups of 20 students, each group received a different type of feedback. In addition, a quasi-experimental design was used and the method to analyze the data obtained was quantitative; parametric tests were also used to compare the students' scores in the grammar tests. The results obtained showed that both peer correction and teacher feedback had a low range of scope, while self-correction did not show any type of significance.

In the following study, Wihastyanang et al. (2020) set out to identify teacher effectiveness online with peer feedback on student performance in writing. For this, the combination of three aspects was considered: teacher feedback, peer feedback, and Edmodo, the latter is a platform used to give online feedback to written assignments. To develop the research, 55 English students from the State University were taken into account. This study was quasi-experimental in which preliminary and subsequent tests were administered., writing tests Students', scoring rubric Students', and questionnaires were used to find out the results of the students. The final results concluded that the students who received feedback from the teacher in a conventional way improved their writing considerably, while peer feedback and online feedback provided to students through the Edmodo platform did not have favorable effects on students' writing.

Pitoyo et al. (2019) conducted a study to find out the effect of different types of comments on the quality of students' writing. The sample for this research was 108 students. A quasi-experimental approach was used with a quantitative method with experimental design. The results obtained showed that the students had great difficulty writing paragraphs, especially they had problems in the use of vocabulary and understanding of grammar. On the other hand, it was found that all types of feedback helped improve writing. However, the researcher deduced that correction between peers and feedback from the teacher showed better results because these helped improve aspects of grammar and spelling in the students' writing..

Demir, (2021) proposed to carry out an investigation based on two purposes, the first consisted of investigating three error correction methods and trying to show which was more practical to reduce language errors in the students' essays and the second was based on the most common language mistakes made in writing. For this study, 30 students were taken into account. The instruments used for data collection were: a semi-structured questionnaire, a diagnostic test, tests on indications, and an editing template. In addition, to carry out the research analysis, the Wilcoxon, Kruskal-Wallis, and Mann-Whitney U tests were used. In this study, it was found that teacher correction is the best method to correct writing mistakes,

although peer correction also showed significant results. On the contrary, self-editing did not have good results, so the author considered that this method did not have relevance in error correction. In addition, the most common linguistic errors in students' writing were identified, and these were punctuation, spelling, and article errors. So, the results of this research contribute valuable information that can be used to improve students' writing skills.

Another study was carried out by Diab (2016), with the purpose of investigating the effect of different sources of corrective feedback based on the decrease in the relationship of pronouns and lexical errors in student essays. In this study, a quasi-experimental design approach was applied, and the instruments were pre-test and post-test. For the sample, three groups of university students were considered, the groups were heterogeneous between men and women, made up of 56 students and their ages ranged between 18 and 23 years of age and developed over a period of approximately 4 months. As a result of the research, it was found that all three groups slightly increased their pronoun relation errors in the immediate posttest, but reduced these errors in the delayed posttest. Furthermore, the researcher found an increase in the percentage of lexical errors from the pretest to the immediate posttest and a decrease in that percentage of error from the immediate posttest to the late pos test.

Nguyen (2018) conducted a study to know the effectiveness of the teacher and peer feedback on students' writing, in order to help to improve participants' writing accuracy. The sample for this study was 48 English major students from a university. The instruments applied in this study were three; paragraph writing, short written compositions, and five paragraph essays. The aim of this study was to analyze the results, in order to find solutions that help teachers reduce writing errors and also improve the quality of students' writing. This research showed that the main factor that leads students to make writing errors is L1 interference, and that the best way to correct errors is through corrective feedback. Therefore, the researcher concluded that feedback provided first by the students and then supervised by the teacher has positive results on the students' writing accuracy.

Chapter two

Method

Settings and participants:

The present study was conducted in the city of San Gabriel, Carchi province. The sample selected for this research consisted of 30 students from a public school. Their ages ranged from 15 to 17 years old. Students belonged to the first year of secondary school. In addition, in the Educational Institution where the research was carried out the teachers taught the classes virtually through the Teams platform. Also, it is worth mention that students participated actively in collaborative writing learning, in total, there were eight sections that were developed in a period of four weeks.

Procedure

The first step of this research began with the review of the literature, in this section relevant information was collected from different primary and secondary sources, such as scientific articles, books, and academic journals. The information collected corresponds mainly to topics about the writing of EFL students, the main morphological, syntactic, and semantic errors that students make in their writing, and the effect that peer correction and teacher feedback has on the efficacy of writing. The mixed-method was applied for research with a qualitative and quantitative approach. The qualitative approach was used during the data collection process, and the quantitative approach was used to gather and tabulate the information obtained for this investigation.

To gather the data, the work was done virtually through the Teams platform. The techniques used were pre test and post test, six written narrative paragraphs, and a survey. The first instrument used was a pre written test. To apply the pre test a written narrative paragraph of 120-150 words was considered, the theme was *Last vacation*. Following the application of the pre test, the researcher asked the students to write six more paragraphs with different topics and with the same pre test instructions, in order that three of the required paragraphs received feedback from the researcher, and the other three paragraphs received corrections from thepeers. Feedback was emphasized in correcting and improving

semantic, syntactic, and morphological aspects in the students' writing. After completing all six paragraphs, the post written test was applied. Then a rubric was used to grade the pre test, post test, and paragraphs reviewed by the teacher, the rating parameters were the following: Excellent (10 –7.6), Good (7.5 - 5.1), Fair (5 - 2.6), Poor (2.5 - 0). The results and errors found in each paragraph were placed and organized in an Excel document for their respective tabulation.

Moreover, a checklist was used and completed by the researcher, which consisted of five parameters; never, rarely, sometimes, often, always, and ten statements questions related to feedback between students. The parameters showed the frequency and contribution provided by the students in the work of their classmates.

The last instrument was applied through the Google forms platform, in which the researcher asked the students to fill out a survey that includes a Likert scale. This included three parameters; agree, neutral, disagree, and twelve statements based on the students' perception about teacher feedback and peer correction. The data obtained from the survey, pre test, the six written paragraphs, and post test, which add up to a total of eight paragraphs for each participant were tabuled in an Excel document. Then, these were analyzed and then interpreted. Finally, based on the results of the research conclusions and recommendations were presented.

Chapter three

Description, interpretation and analysis of results

This chapter presents the information obtained from the data collected in the investigation. The first table shows the average score obtained from pre test and post test and the variance that exists between them. The following table shows the percentage of semantic, syntactic, and morphological errors found in the paragraphs written by the participants, in both teacher feedback and peer feedback. The two tables are focused on determining the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of writing errors based on the aspects already mentioned. In the last table, the aim is to know the students' perception about teacher feedback and peer feedback. Each table reflects the percentages and includes its respective analysis and interpretation. Furthermore, the analysis has been supported by the scientific information summarized in the literature review.

Which are the effects of peer and teacher feedback on the correction of the morphological, semantic, and syntactic errors?

Table 1.

Pre and post test results

Pre-test	Post-test	Variance
8	8,4	0,08

Note: This table shows the results and variance of the pre-test and post-test.

Based on this table, the first percentage indicates that the average obtained in the pre-test is 8 out of 10, while in post-tests the results correspond to 8.4 out of 10. Therefore, the table indicates that the variance is 0.08. It is necessary to mention that the post test was applied after three weeks of having applied the pre test. In the interim between pre and post test, the other six paragraphs written by the students were corrected and given feedback. In addition, it should be taken into account that the classes were virtual, so it was not possible to show if the students used some type of technological tool such as; translator, dictionary, or examples of other paragraphs provided by websites to improve their writing.

Furthermore, activities undertaken by students were continually assessed, shared between peers, and given ample feedback. Although the results between pre and post test did not show a significant difference, it is important to emphasize that the feedback provided to the students helped to obtain better results in the post test. For example, in the pre test some students used the expression *In my last vacation* then when the post test was applied, they used the same expression again, but this time they changed the preposition. Thus, the expression was written as *On my last vacation*, so it can be evidenced that the students took into account the recommendations of both teacher feedback and peer correction.

Besides, it is important to mention that the time that the research lasted was short, so achieving good results in the students' writing represents a difficult task for both researchers and teachers, especially since knowledge is acquired through practice. According to Salma (2015), students require a lot of practice and knowledge of grammar rules to achieve clear and correct writing. However, when analyzing the results, it can be seen that the feedback provided had a positive impact on students' writing because it helped them improve grammatical errors such as capitalization, punctuation, sentence construction, spelling, as well as helping to improve students' writing in terms of morphological, syntactic, and semantic. In this context, Pitoyo et al. (2019) mention that both peer and teacher feedback help to improve writing skills, as the comments provided by teachers and classmates in the feedback represent a kind of guidance that can help students correct and improve their writing errors. This idea is corroborated by Cinar (2017) who mentions that written corrective feedback in most cases favors the learning and development of writing, and also helps students to understand and rectify mistakes in their writing, especially in the use of grammatical structures.

Table 2.*Teacher and Peer feedback results*

	Teacher's feedback	Peer's feedback
Semantic	22%	0%
Syntactic	36%	46%
Morphological	42%	54%

Note: The percentages correspond to the writing errors found in the paragraphs of the participants, both by the researcher and students.

In relation to table number 2, the percentage of semantic errors found in teacher feedback corresponds to 22%, while in peer feedback the percentage was 0%. As can be seen in the table, teacher correction obtained a large percentage of semantic errors found in the students' paragraphs. In contrast, in peer feedback, the students did not report semantic errors, so that they did not provide feedback based on this aspect.

Moreover, semantic errors were detected, it was not only in the paragraphs corresponding to teacher feedback, but also in the paragraphs that corresponded to the peer correction. For example, one of the students wrote; "*Daddy Yankee is a success singer.*" In this example, there is a confusion between adjective and noun, since this expression mentions that the singer is successful. So, it is necessary to use an adjective to express a characteristic of the singer, the word *success* is used incorrectly because this is a noun. In this case, the adjective that replaces the noun *success* is *successful*, so the correct phrase would be the following; *Daddy Yankee is a successful singer.* According to Rezai and Davarpanah (2019) this type of error corresponds to the lexical grammar category and is produced by the incorrect use of adjectives instead of nouns, verbs, or adverbs and vice versa.

Besides, in another paragraph the researcher detected the following expression "*My family and I look series on Netflix on Saturdays.*" In this sentence, the verb look is used incorrectly since this verb is defined in the Cambridge dictionary as: "Turn out eyes in a particular direction to see something". In this expression, the participant used the verb in

order to express that they were watching a series. The correct verb for this expression is *watch*, which refers to look at something and pay attention to what happens, for example, watch at a film, movie, video, or television. So, the correct expression is *My family and I watch series on Netflix on Saturdays*. This error corresponds to the semantic category collocation, according to Rezai and Davarpanah (2019) collocation is a phenomenon of the language that is produced by the literal translation of a word or expression from one language to another without taking into account the context in which it is used.

According to Jassim (2016) one of the aspects in which students make grammatical errors is in the semantic field, so it is very common to find errors of this type on the writing. The previous examples correspond to the teacher feedback because as was mentioned at the beginning the participants did not give peer feedback so that it is not possible to evidence semantic errors and neither feedback provided by them. When the students were asked to give feedback on this topic, most of them answered that it was not necessary because the paragraphs of their classmates did not have semantic errors. Nevertheless, the researcher found some semantic errors in the corrected paragraphs between students, so it can be inferred that they did not have knowledge about semantic aspects. Accordingly, Muncie (2000) states that in some cases students do not have enough knowledge to give feedback to their classmates, which is why the author considers that peer corrections should be supervised by the teacher.

Additionally, it is necessary to mention that the teacher emphasized feedback on this aspect and provided feedback based on the grammatical errors found on the paragraphs in order to improve the written skills of the students, but the participants did not show favorable results in terms of identifying semantic errors. In this respect, Rezai and Davarpanah (2019) point out semantic knowledge is one of the most difficult aspects to master, as it is related to the context of language, therefore, this aspect is perfected through the acquisition of new vocabulary and correct use of this one. However, it should be said that feedback helped the students reduce the number of semantic errors in their writing. Based on the above, it can be deduced that, although the teacher's feedback did not get that the students identify the

semantic errors in the paragraphs of their classmates, at least it helped to reduce the rate of errors in their writing.

The results indicate that in the semantic aspect teacher feedback had a greater effect compared to peer feedback. In this respect, Brookhart (2017) points out that teachers have better results than students when identifying writing errors, so that in most cases teacher feedback has great significance in improving writing errors.

The next aspect to analyze is syntactic errors, the subcategories that were taken into account for this aspect correspond to syntactic errors of prepositions, word order, and conjunctions. As shown in the table two, 36% corresponds to errors found by the teacher-researcher, this percentage was divided as follows 12% of prepositions errors, 14% of word order errors 8% of conjunctions errors. In contrast, 46% corresponds to errors found by students in their classmates' paragraphs. This percentage only corresponds to the category of prepositions, since the students did not find any errors in the other categories.

As the data shows, the teacher's correction was more significant, since the percentage of errors found is higher than the percentage identified in peer correction. However, it is clear that syntactic errors were found in both types of feedback. For instance, one of the most frequent errors in both teacher feedback and peer correction was the incorrect use of the preposition *in*. For example, the following expression was part of the feedback from Andrés one of the participants "*In Christmas day*" in his comment he mentioned; In this sentence, the preposition *in* is incorrectly used. The correct way to write the phrase is *On Christmas day*. So whenever special days are mentioned, the preposition *on* is used. For example, *On Christmas day*; *On my birthday*. Similarly, teacher research found errors with the same proposition; for example, a certain student wrote the following "*We traveled in airplane last summer*" in this expression the preposition *in* is incorrectly used, but this time in a different context than the previous example. In this case, the correct preposition is *by*. For example, *We traveled by airplane last summer*. This type of error occurs because in English most prepositions are used according to the context of the

sentence. Also, in these examples, the preposition **in** is a literal translation of (*en*) from Spanish, so it is very common for EFL students to make preposition errors.

Moreover, in one of the paragraphs reviewed by the teacher-researcher, the following example was identified "*Always we go to the beach*" in this sentence the student placed the adverb of frequency in the wrong way because mostly in the present tense the adverbs of frequency are used between the subject and the action verb, in such a way that the correct order is; *We always go to the beach* this type of error corresponds to the word order category. Another error that was identified by the teacher-researcher was; "*My parents gave me a computer by my excellent grades.*" In this example, the message can be understood, but an error can be evidenced when using the conjunction in the next part: *a computer by my excellent grades*. In this case, the correct conjunction would be **for** because this is a conjunction that indicates result, and in this sentence, the student mentions that he received a computer "*for his good grades.*" In such a way that the correct expression would be; *My parents gave me a computer for my excellent grades*, this type of error was placed in the conjunction category corresponding to syntactic errors.

Regarding peer feedback, it is necessary to mention that there were inaccuracies in terms of identifying syntactic errors, in the categories of conjunction and word order. Thus it can be inferred that the cause of this problem is the lack of knowledge on the part of the students about grammar rules. In this respect, Nasser (2018) stated that knowledge of grammar rules constitutes a fundamental element to achieve a good writing, in such a way that, if students do not have sufficient knowledge of a subject, it is difficult for them to avoid making mistakes in their writing. In addition, one aspect that must be taken into account is that the context of the English language is different from the Spanish language, which in this case is the L1 of the participants, so the interference between languages represents a great factor for students to make syntactic errors as stated (Al-Badawi, 2012). At the same point, the authors Silalahi et al. (2018) found that the transfer of the mother tongue generates confusion in the knowledge of the students, leading them to mix the structures of the languages and as a result of this the students have gaps in the domain of the English

language. Consequently, peer feedback did not have favorable results in all syntactic aspects, since the feedback focused only on prepositional errors. Although it should be mentioned that in peer feedback the students made positive comments about the work of their classmates, which encouraged students to correct their mistakes and improve their writing. This is corroborated by Tsurroya (2020) who mentions that peer correction increases motivation considerably, it also encourages reflection and the development of critical thinking in students.

Nevertheless, peer feedback focused only on correcting prepositions, while teacher feedback considered other aspects such as; word order, prepositions, and conjunction. This means that the teacher feedback achieved a positive effect in correcting errors. According to Sermsook (2017) written teacher feedback is one of the best tools that teachers use to help students improve deficiencies in writing and especially in grammar. Thus, in most cases the feedback provided by the teacher leads students to reflect on their mistakes and therefore to correct them.

Another aspect to analyze is morphological errors, As can be seen in table number 2, 42% corresponds to the teacher's feedback, while 58% corresponds to errors found by the students in peer's feedback. The categories that were considered for this aspect were, omission, addition, misinformation, disordering. As the data show, both teachers-researcher and students found morphological errors in the paragraphs that the participants wrote.

Furthermore, in teacher feedback some errors were identified in the morphological aspect, in fact, it is the aspect in which the most errors were found. Specifically, in omission errors, the teacher-researcher found 10% of the total morphological errors. For example, a participant wrote the following expression "*the movie ends when meet*" in this expression the personal pronoun **they** is omitted so the correct expression would be *the movie ends when they meet*. According to Londoño (2008) errors of omission are produced by the lack of an element in a sentence. Next, in the following category, the teacher researcher identified 6% of addition errors. For example, a participant wrote; "*We were travel to Colombia last month*" in this example, the verb is in the present tense and the participant

refers to an action that happened in the past, so the verb must be in the past tense, in that case, the correct sentence should be; *We traveled to Colombia last month*. Another error that was identified in the same category is the following; *“My favorite dish is french fries and fish and avocado and salad.”* In this example, the conjunction is repeated twice in a single idea so the correct phrase would be: *My favorite dish is french fries, fish, and salad*. According to Londoño (2008) addition errors are produced when unnecessary elements are added to sentences.

Besides, in misformation errors, the researcher found 12% of the total morphological errors. One of the examples that was considered in teacher feedback was; *He has 34 years old* in this expression a misformation error was identified, this is evidenced in the use of the verb *have*, to say the age in English, the verb to **be** is used instead of the verb to *have*. For example, *He is 34 years old*. Finally, in the disordering category, 14% errors were found. For example, in one of the paragraphs a student wrote *“We went to Esmeraldas with my family.”* In this example, a disorder in the structure of the sentence could be identified, one of the ways that make the sentence clearer is *My family and I went to Esmeraldas*. According to Londoño (2008) misinformation errors are produced by the incorrect use of vocabulary, and disordering errors are produced by the incorrect placement of morphemes in expressions.

Additionally, the following are some of the morphological errors found in the corrected paragraphs among students, it is necessary to mention that they only found omission and disordering errors. In the omission category, the students identified 26% of the total morphological errors. For instance, peer correction was found the following expression; *“We visited a place where there were many tree.”* This sentence was identified as an error of omission, for this example, the comment provided by one of the students was the following, *the word tree should be written in plural form because in the sentence the idea is that there are many trees, not one, in this case, the correct phrase would be; We visited a place where there were many trees*. Also, in the disordering category, the students found 28% errors, one example that was taken into account for the feedback was the following; *“It was a place beautiful where there were many ducks.”* About this expression, the student mentioned that

in English adjectives come before the noun, not after, as it is used in Spanish. So, the correct phrase is; *It was a beautiful place where there were many ducks.*

As shown in the previous examples, morphological errors correspond to the category with the highest percentages of written errors made by students. According to Terzioğlu and Bensen Bostanci (2020), most of the writing errors found in the written essays correspond to morphological errors. In the same line Gayo and Widodo (2018) argue that morphological errors occur because students add, omit or change the order of the words in their writing, this information agrees with some of the examples previously stated in this section.

In closing, it is important to say that although the students did not consider all the morphological criteria in their feedback, their participation was active in this aspect. On the other hand, in the teacher's feedback, all the categories corresponding to morphological errors were considered, so that, in most of the classes, the feedback was carried out in a general way, taking into account the categories of morphological errors that were considered for this study.

Regarding the research question and taking into account the results obtained in the morphological aspect, it can be evidenced that teacher feedback has better results than peer feedback in correcting writing errors. In agreement with this, the following authors Wihastyanang et al. (2020) argued that teacher feedback has a greater effect on improving writing errors than peer feedback. These authors found that, although peer correction motivates students to improve their writing, teacher feedback reinforces students' knowledge and helps them to correct their writing errors considerably.

Which type of feedback: Peer correction and teacher feedback do EFL students prefer for writing?

Table 3.*Students perception about teacher and peer feedback*

N°	Statements	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Total
1	I consider it is important to receive peer feedback in written assignments	85%	15%	0%	100%
2	I consider it is important to receive teacher's feedback in written assignments.	85%	12%	0%	100%
3	The feedback delivered by my peer helps me to improve my writing skills.	33%	60%	7%	100%
4	The feedback delivered by my teacher helps me to improve my writing skills.	85%	15%	0%	100%
5	My peer provides me with feedback through comments, questions or additional information.	3%	14%	83%	100%
6	The teacher provides feedback through comments, questions or additional information.	28%	64%	3%	100%
7	The feedback delivered by my classmate is clear and easy to understand.	7%	18%	75%	100%
8	The feedback delivered by the teacher is clear and easy to understand.	83%	14%	3%	100%
9	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my peer.	83%	17%	0%	100%
10	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my teacher.	87%	13%	0%	100%
11	The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve in...				

Grammar use(Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization and Punctuation)	53%	40%	7%	100%
Word formation (Spelling)	50%	43%	7%	100%
Vocabulary misuse	37%	53%	10%	100%
12 The feedback provided by the teacher has helped me to improve in.....				
Grammar use(Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization and Punctuation)	67%	30%	3%	100%
Word formation (Spelling)	27%	60%	13%	100%
Vocabulary misuse	30%	67%	3%	100%

Note: This table shows the percentage of a survey was give to the participants to know their perception about teacher and peer feedback.

In relation to the results of table 3, according to the first statement, 85% of the participants considered that it is essential to receive feedback from the teacher in the written tasks because written corrections help them improve their texts; as a result, they improve their academic performance. Similarly, in the second statement, 85% of the students agreed that it is important to receive peer feedback in written assignments. This fact was corroborated by the researcher since more than a half of the students responded positively to the comments provided to their written works. Undoubtedly, feedback is an element that contributes to effecting necessary correction in any aspect that needs room for improvement in the field of learning. Also, it motivates students to improve because when they are able to understand the topics in which they have lapses, they feel more confident about their knowledge and as a result, they achieve better academic performance. Thus, most students prefer to receive written feedback, either from the teacher or from their peers. In agreement with this, Pitoyo et al. (2019) argue that teacher feedback improves the quality of writing in

students' essays, and peer correction motivates them to engage with their classmates' learning. For these reasons, both types of feedback have considerable effects on student performance.

With respect to statements three and four, 85% of the students agree that the teacher's feedback helps them improve their writing skills. In contrast, in statement four, 60% of the participants answered to the neutral parameter, which means that more than half of the students are not sure that peer correction helps them to improve their writing skills. Based on the results, it can be considered that students prefer teacher feedback, mainly because it allows them to know their weaknesses in writing, which helps them focus on what they need to improve. Therefore, participants showed more interest in this type of feedback because it is a valuable resource that positively influences their learning process. According to Kang and Dykema (2017), teacher feedback represents a major resource to improve learning since it allows teachers to guide students with the objective of achieving greater performance in their activities in class. On the other hand, regarding peer correction, it was deduced that although students doubt the effectiveness of this feedback, most of them consider that peer correction probably helps them improve their writing errors. According to Rotsaert et al. (2017), peer feedback helps students develop their critical thinking skills, also allows them to exchange their knowledge and learn from their classmates. This is corroborated by Perdani (2020) who claimed that when students correct their peers' assignments, they not only check the writing errors such as grammatical structure, punctuation, spelling but also look for the correct answers and provide corrective comments.

The results of the following statements show that about statement five 83% of the students consider that peer correction does not provide feedback through comments, questions, or additional information. According to the results, it can be evidenced that most participants do not provide or receive any type of written comment from their classmates. In accordance with this, Perdani (2020) states that there were two disadvantages of peer-correction in the writing class that was based on students' opinions and the peer correction technique that took much time. In this case, it can be inferred that students do not give

feedback because they do not know about the class topic, or they were not confident with their ability to review their classmates' paragraphs. Also, not all students have the ability and time to understand an essay, so the time required will vary for each student. Moreover, Ghoorchaei and Khosravi (2019) mention that the main problem of students when writing a text is the lack of knowledge and mastery of the language, so it is difficult for them to give feedback on a topic that they do not dominate. In this respect, Liu (2005) suggests that previous training by the teacher is essential in peer correction since the guidelines provided by the teacher help students to make a better correction to work among classmates.

On the contrary, in the sixth statement, 64% answered the neutral option, this indicates that teacher feedback does not always provide corrective comments or additional information to the students' assignments. In this regard, it can be inferred that teachers do not provide comments to all the tasks because giving written feedback is not an easy task for them due to factors such as time, number of students, number of errors encountered, type of essay, among others. According to Rashtchi and Bake (2019) in many cases providing written corrective comments could be tedious to teachers as it becomes an arduous task, especially if the class is large. Another reason teachers do not provide comments could be due to their inexperience in the area of teaching. In this respect, Irwin (2017) mentions that sometimes teachers omit written comments on students' assignments because they are not knowledgeable to provide adequate corrections.

Considering the results, according to the seventh statement, 75% of the students answered to the *disagree* option. The results indicate that most of the students consider that the comments provided by their classmates were not clear and easy to understand. In this respect, it is important to mention that during the research process the researcher found that some students did not provide comments or feedback to the paragraphs of their classmates. As such, participants were able to assess very few comments. For this reason, many students do not agree that their peers correct their writing tasks. Based on this, Tsuruyya (2020) affirmed that some students do not trust the knowledge of their classmates, so they prefer that their work be corrected by the teacher. According to Zhang and Hyland (2018),

written teacher feedback has many more benefits than peer feedback since teachers are trained to carry out both work corrections and feedback on the topics developed in class. On the other hand, according to statement eight, 83% of students answered the parameter *agree*. The results indicate that most participants agree that teachers' feedback provided written corrective comments easy to read and understand. This is because, unlike students, teachers have the commitment and responsibility to help students improve their academic performance, so they use various strategies to help students improve their skills. For example, the use of marginal notes, codes, mark errors, among others. In line with this, Yu and Yang (2021) stated that the teacher's written feedback constitutes an essential element in language learning, since the comments provided in the feedback help students to correct their mistakes and achieve better results in the next writing.

As the data show, in statements nine and ten, the following percentages were found, 83% of the students responded that they felt comfortable receiving comments from their peers. Similarly, in the ten statements, 87% of the participants responded that they felt good about receiving teacher feedback, It is important to mention that students did not mark the parameter *disagreement*. Based on the results, it can be inferred that most participants agree with both statements because feedback is a normal process of teaching-learning. Besides, they feel comfortable receiving feedback because it helps them to better understand class topics. According to Kileri and Listyani (2021) students trust the teacher's feedback because it helps them correct their grammatical mistakes and improve their writing skills. In the same way, in a study carried out by Lee (2015), it was found that many students prefer correction by their peers since feedback among classmates implies an aspect of trust and provides a more effective learning environment. Therefore, it is clear that students feel comfortable receiving feedback from both teachers and classmates.

Based on statement eleven which mentions some aspects that peer correction helped to improve students, 53% agreed that peer correction helped them to improve grammar aspects such as verb agreement, sentence construction, capitalization, punctuation, and word formation; while in the vocabulary misuse aspect, 53% answered

neutral option, this indicates that that in this aspect peer correction did not have meaningful results. However, in the first two aspects, it was evident that most participants agree that peer correction has a positive effect on improving students' writing skills. Therefore, it can be deduced that, although peer correction does not meet students' expectations in all aspects, it has positive effects on students' learning. Regarding the aforementioned, Rotsaert et al. (2018) stated that students improve their writing skills significantly when they provide feedback to their classmates, in such a way that they expand their knowledge and as a result improve their performance in class. In the same way, Ramírez and Guillén (2018) mentioned that peer correction is an effective resource that helps students improve their writing through cooperation and exchange of knowledge between students.

Finally, statement twelve refers to whether the comments provided by the teacher help students to improve grammar aspects such as; verb agreement, sentence construction, capitalization and punctuation, word formation (spelling), and vocabulary misuse. It was found that in the first aspect, 67% of the students answered agree, while in the word formation, 60% responded *neutral*, likewise, in vocabulary misuse, 67% answered *neutral*. According to the results, most students consider that teacher feedback helps them correct their grammatical errors in the first category, while in the word formation and vocabulary misuse category, students consider that the teacher's correction probably helped them correct their mistakes. Hence, it can be deduced that some participants did not perceive improvements in the last two categories.

Even though teacher feedback did not have a favorable impact in the categories of word formation and vocabulary misuse. It is important to mention that a group of students marked the parameter *agree*, and only a minimal percentage of the students considered the feedback to be ineffective in minimizing their writing errors in the aforementioned categories. In this perspective, Mao and Crosthwaite (2019) state that there are many investigations that mention that written corrective feedback does not contribute to improving the writing. However, in some cases, the problem is that students do not consider the corrections made to their work. According to Irwin (2017) some students do not review the feedback provided

by their teachers so they cannot know their mistakes, which is contradictory to their learning. Therefore, it is concluded that if students take into account the recommendations of teachers and take advantage of the feedback, it is most probably that they will achieve excellent results in their academic performance. In accordance with this, Hashemifardnia et al. (2019) mentioned that the written feedback provided by teachers to their students not only helps them to understand and correct their weaknesses in writing but also allows them to reinforce their knowledge and skills to write new texts.

Conclusions

It was demonstrated that both teacher and peer feedback had significant effects on students' learning. The feedback improved the precision of the students' writing and helped them to reduce some semantic, morphological, syntactic errors, and also helped students to identify these types of errors in their classmates' paragraphs.

This research showed that teacher feedback had more possibilities to improve academic performance than peer feedback, which was relevant to the group of participants that were considered for this study. During the research process, it was found that the feedback provided by the teacher was well accepted by the students and that they took into account some of the recommendations provided by the teacher to improve their writing skills.

It was noted that peer feedback had many gaps as to identifying writing errors on semantic, morphological, and syntactic aspects. In addition, the participants rarely agreed to give feedback and provide written comments on the participants' work, this attitude can be attributed to the fact that the students did not know the topic of the class or lack of mastery of the language.

The current study showed that feedback on the morphological aspect was less effective, since morphological errors were most common in the students' paragraphs, particularly in the categories of disorder and omission.

The results indicated that most of the students prefer the teacher's feedback since they showed a positive attitude towards the comments and corrections provided by the teacher, especially in the correction of grammatical errors.

Feedback provided positive results on students' writing accuracy, knowledge, engagement, and self-perception. Also, a crucial factor that helped students feel engaged in improving their writing skills was motivation because, undoubtedly, motivated students are more involved in learning and therefore achieve better academic results.

Recommendations

Regarding teacher feedback and peer feedback used, teachers and students should constantly apply these techniques to work in the classroom setting, if possible after each class, in order to reduce semantic, morphological, syntactic errors. In this way, students will not make the same writing errors in future texts.

For teacher feedback to have significant effects on students' writing, the level of knowledge of the students must be considered. Besides, EFL teachers should implement strategies and use materials based on actual trends, in order to encourage students to learn this language.

It is important to encourage students to give and receive feedback, for this purpose the teacher must carry out all kinds of activities to provide group work among students so that they can achieve their learning goals. In addition, through teamwork students can not only reinforce their shortcomings while writing but also talk and share their interests and insights on the class matter.

To reduce the number of morphological errors in writing, teachers must engage in activities that allow them to correct and provide feedback about the errors made by students in their writings. One of the best activities is to give written feedback is the correction of paragraphs or essays. So, it is advisable that written tasks be carried out constantly to improve the student's accuracy in written English.

To maintain the positive effect of feedback, it is important to create an adequate classroom environment where effective communication between teachers and students prevails, as a good atmosphere helps students feel safe, motivated, and focused on their class activities. Also, teachers should be prepared to answer students' questions and clarify all their doubts in relation to new knowledge.

Motivation plays a crucial role to promote students' learning that should be considered in the teaching method, even in the correction procedure, since it can influence the direct behavior towards the goals and lead to the improvement of the students' academic performance.

References

- Ababneh, I. (2017). Analysis of written English: the case of female university students in Saudi Arabia. *International journal of social science studies*, 5, 1-5.
10.11114/IJSS.V5I4.2264
- Abadikhah, S., Aliyan, Z., & Talebi, S. H. (2018). EFL students' attitudes towards self-regulated learning strategies in academic writing. *Issues in Educational Research*, 28(1), 1-17. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier28/abadikhah.pdf>
- Abalkheel, A., & Brandenburg, T. (2020). Effects of written corrective feedback: a synthesis of 10 quasi-experimental studies. *English Language Teaching*, 13(7), 97-103.
0.5539/elt.v13n7p97
- Abas, I. H., & Aziz, N. H. (2016). Exploring the writing process of Indonesian EFL students: the effectiveness of think-aloud protocol. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(2), 171-178. Doi: 10.7575/aiac.all.s.v.7n.2p.171
- Adha, A. D., & Dania, R. (2021, February). Students' morphological errors in using word formation in writing an essay. In journal of physics: *Conference Series Vol. 1779*, No. (1), p. 012026. doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1779/1/012026
- Afrin, S. (2016) Writing problems of non-English major undergraduate students in Bangladesh. *Open journal of social sciences*. 4, 104-115.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jss.2016.43016>
- Aghajani, M., & Zoghipour, M. (2018). The comparative effect of online self-correction, peer-correction, and teacher correction in descriptive writing tasks on intermediate EFL learners' grammar knowledge the prospect of mobile assisted language learning (MALL). *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*. 7(3), 14-22.
- Akbarnezhad, S. Sadighi, F. Bagheri, S. (2019) Iranian EFL learners' perception of the English verbs' argument structure and their language proficiency: A semantic-syntactic approach. *Cogent Education*. 6. (1), 1674576.
10.1080/2331186X.2019.1674576

- Al-Badawi, K. (2012). An analysis of phonetic, morphological and syntactic errors in English: A case study of Saudi BA students at King Khalid University. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 2(6), 536. DOI: 10.7763/IJSSH.2012.V2.165
- Aliyu, M. M. (2020). Exploring the nature of undergraduates' peer collaboration in a PBL writing process. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(2), 11-23. 10.26858/ijole.v4i2.8406
- Al-Mahrooqi, R., Thakur, V. S., & Roscoe, A. (Eds.). (2015). Methodologies for effective writing instruction in EFL and ESL classrooms. *IGI Global*.
<https://doi.org/10.4018/978-14666-6619->
- Al-Shormani, M. Q., & Al-Sohbani, Y. A. (2012). Semantic errors committed by Yemeni university learners: classifications and sources. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(6), 120-139. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n6p120>
- Amano, S. (2018). Students' choices of types of written teacher feedback in EFL writing instruction. *Journal of the Chubu English Language Education Society*, 47, 103-110. https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/celes/47/0/47_103/_pdf
- Aziz, Z. A., Fitriani, S. S., & Amalina, Z. (2020). Linguistic errors made by Islamic university EFL students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(3), 733-745. 10.17509/ijal.v9i3.23224
- Baykalova, E. D., Artyna, M. K., Dorzhu, N. S., Ochur, T. K., & Mongush, D. S. (2018). Morphological interference in the process of mastering English speech in conditions of interaction of Tuvan, *Russian and English as a foreign language*. *Opción*. 34(85-2), 35-60. <https://www.redalyc.org/jatsRepo/310/31057290005/31057290005.pdf>
- Benson, S., & DeKeyser, R. (2019). Effects of written corrective feedback and language aptitude on verb tense accuracy. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(6), 702-726. <https://bit.ly/3l0Nfpa>
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The relative effectiveness of different types of direct written corrective feedback. *System*. 37(2), 322-329. 10.1016/j.system.2008.12.006

- Brookhart, S. M. (2017) How to give effective feedback to your students. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.
- Budiharto, R. A. (2019). Native language interference on target language writings of Indonesian EFL students: An exploratory case study. *Indonesian EFL Journal*. 5 (1), 107-116. 10.25134/ieflj.v5i1.1630.
- Cárcamo, B. (2020). Classifying written corrective feedback for research and educational purposes: A typology proposal. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*. 22(2), 211–222. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v22n2.79924>
- Castro, M. C. (2017). Errors and corrective feedback in writing: Implications to our classroom practices. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 20(2), 158-166. doi.org/10.24071/llt.2017.200210
- Çinar, S. (2017). The Efficacy of Corrective Feedback on L2 Writings of EFL Students. *European Journal of Language and Literature*, 3(2), 110-120. https://revistia.org/files/articles/ejls_v3_i2_17/Senanur.pdf
- Crystal, D., Robins., & Robert, H. (2021, November 2). Language. Encyclopedia Britannica. Accessed 21 November 2021. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/language>
- Demir, C. (2021). Determining efficient post-writing activity for error correction: Self-editing, peer review, or teacher feedback? *Porta Linguarum: revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjera.*, (36), 101-117. 10.30827/portalin.v0i36.15824
- Diab, N. M. (2016). A comparison of peer, teacher and self-feedback on the reduction of language errors in student essays. *System*, 57, 55-65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.12.014>
- Dictionary, C. E. (2021). Cambridge English dictionary. Retrieved on December 28, 2021. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/es/diccionario/>
- Elkilic, G. (2012). Mother tongue traces of Turkish university students on composition papers written in English. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 47, 656-664. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.713

- Eslami, M. y Sahragard, R. (2021). Investigation of the effect of the development of self-regulation strategies on the metadiscoursal writing ability of Iranian students of English as a foreign language. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*. 21, 54-65. doi:10.32038/ltrq.2021.21.04
- Gad, E. E., Li, Y., Kliewer, J., Langberg, M., Jiang, A. A., & Bruck, J. (2016). Asymmetric error correction and flash-memory rewriting using polar codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*. 62(7), 4024-4038. <https://hdl.handle.net/1969.1/177882>
- Gayo, H., & Widodo, P. (2018). An analysis of morphological and syntactical errors on the English writing of junior high school Indonesian students. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*. 17(4), 58-70. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.17.4.4>
- Ghoorchaei, B., & Khosravi, M. (2019). On the relationship between iranian EFL students'. *Journal of Linguistics and Education Research*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.30564/jler.v2i1.377>
- Guo, W., Bai, B., & Song, H. (2021). Influences of process-based instruction on students' use of self-regulated learning strategies in EFL writing. *System*. 101, 102578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102578>
- Handayani, R., Ihsan, D. & Mirizon, S. (2019). Interlanguage analysis of syntactic and diction errors found in theses written by magister students. *Indonesian International Journal of Education and Teaching*. 3 (1), <https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.2019.030110>
- Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. *ELT journal*. 59(1), 31-38. 10.1093/elt/cci004
- Hashemifardnia, A., Namaziandost, E. & Sepehri, M. (2019). The effectiveness of giving a grade, corrective feedback, and corrective feedback plus grade on grammar accuracy. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*. 8 (1), 15-27. 0.5861/ijrsl.2019.3012

- Hidayati, K. H. (2018). Teaching writing to EFL learners: an investigation of challenges confronted by Indonesian teachers. Langkawi: *Journal of the Association for Arabic and English*, 4(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v4i1.772>
- Hosseini, M., Taghizadeh, M. E., Abedin, M. J. Z., & Naseri, E. (2013). In the importance of EFL learners' writing skill: Is there any relation between writing skill and content score of English essay test. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 6(1), 1-12. [10.18052/www.scipress.com/ILSHS.6.1](https://www.scipress.com/ILSHS.6.1)
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press
- Irmawati, D., Asri, T., & Aziz, A. (2021). How EFL Teachers Deal with Pedagogical Competence Development for the Teaching of Writing: A Study on Higher Educational Level in Indonesian Context. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*. 8(1), 42–51. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2021.81.42.51>
- Irwin, B. (2017). Written Corrective Feedback: Student Preferences and Teacher Feedback Practices. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*. 3(2), 35-58. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1167256.pdf>
- Jabali, O. (2018). Students' attitudes towards EFL university writing: A case study at An-Najah National University, Palestine. *Heliyon*, 4(11), e00896. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2018.e00896>
- Jashari, L., & Fojkar, M. (2019). Teachers' Perceptions of Developing Writing Skills in the EFL Classroom. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*. 16(2), 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.16.2.77-90>
- Jassim, L. L. (2016). An Analysis of Semantic Errors in Iraqi EFL Learners' Writings. *University of Thi-Qar Journal*. 11(4), 162-186. <https://bit.ly/3DKClv4>
- Kang, H., & Dykema, J. (2017) Critical discourse analysis of student responses to teacher feedback on student writing, *Journal of Response to Writing*. 3. (2), 2. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol3/iss2/2>

- Khazrouni, M. (2019). Assessment for improving ESL learners' writing skills among undergraduate students: A case study of Skyline University College. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(1), 30–44. <https://bit.ly/30oAoGr>
- Kileri, Z. H., & Listyani, L. (2021). Academic writing students' perceptions on teacher feedback. *Prominent*, 4(2), 106-115. <https://jurnal.umk.ac.id/index.php/Pro/article/view/6187>
- Klimova, B. F. (2014). Approaches to the Teaching of Writing Skills. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 112, 147–151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1149>
- Lee, M.-K. (2015). Peer feedback in second language writing: Investigating junior secondary students' perspectives on inter-feedback and intra-feedback. *System*. 55, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.08.003>
- Londoño, D. A. (2008). Error analysis in a written composition. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, (10), 135-146. <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/prf/n10/n10a08.pdf>
- Malinda, E. (2020). The implementation of creative writing in EFL context for students' creativity. *Journal of World Language*, 5(2), 101. <https://n9.cl/e8hif>
- Mao, S. S., & Crosthwaite, P. (2019). Investigating written corrective feedback: (Mis) alignment of teachers' beliefs and practice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 45, 46-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.05.004>
- Meza, A., Rodríguez, I., & Caviedes, L. (2021). Fostering EFL preservice teachers' academic writing skills through reflective learning. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 23(1), 89–106. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v23n1.85145>
- Miller, J. (2013) *An Introduction to English Syntax*. Edinburgh University Press
- Muncie, J. (2000) Using written teacher feedback in EFL composition classes. *ELT Journal*. Volume 54, Issue 1, Pages 47–53, <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.1.47>
- Muncie, J. (2000) Using written teacher feedback in EFL composition classes. *ELT Journal*. 54, (1), 47–53. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.1.47>

- Nair, P. K., & Krish, P. (2021). Mother Tongue Interference in English Writing among Tamil School Students. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 21(1). 1
<http://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2021-2101-07>
- Nasser, S. M. (2018) Iraqi EFL Students' difficulties in Writing Composition. *International Journal of English Linguistics*; Vol. 9, No. 1; 2019 ISSN 1923-869X E-ISSN 1923-8703. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n1p178>
- Nguyen, T. L. (2018). The effect of combined peer-teacher feedback on Thai students' writing accuracy. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 6(2), 117-132.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1183796>
- Olana, T., Zeleke, T., & Jiregna, K. (2015). Mother tongue interference in English language writing at Derge secondary school: The case of grade 9 students. *Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal*, 4(4), 208-214. DOI:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/star.v4i4>
- Pangaribuan, T., & Manik, S. (2017). The Effect of Buzz Group Technique and Clustering Technique in Teaching Writing at the First Class of SMA HKBP I Tarutung. *English Language Teaching*. 11(1), 164. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n1p164>
- Perdani, Y. D. (2020). Peer-Correction Technique in Writing Class. *English Focus: Journal of English Language Education*, 4. 2, 29-41. DOI:10.24905/efj.v4i1.81
- Pitoyo, D., Raja, P., & Nurweni, A. (2019). The Effect of Teacher, Peer, and Self-Corrective Feedback Toward English Writing Quality of EFL University Students. *U-JET*, 8(1)
<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/291530604.pdf>
- Ramírez, B., & Guillén, P. M. (2018). Self and peer correction to improve college students' writing skills. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*. 20(2), 179-194.
<https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v20n2.67095>.
- Rashtchi, M., & Bakar, Z. A. (2019). Written corrective feedback: What do Malaysian learners prefer and why? *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 8(5), 1221-1225. 10.35940/ijeat. E1173.0585C19

- Ratnawati, R., Faridah, D., Anam, S., & Retnaningdyah, P. (2018). Exploring academic writing needs of Indonesian EFL undergraduate students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume, 9*. 420-432 <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no4.31>
- Rezai, M. J., & Davarpanah, F. (2019). The study of formal and semantic errors of lexis by Persian EFL learners. *International Journal of Cognitive and Language Sciences, 13*(1), 41-47. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3607787>
- Rotsaert, T., Panadero, E., & Schellens, T. (2018). Anonymity as an instructional scaffold in peer assessment: its effects on peer feedback quality and evolution in students' perceptions about peer assessment skills. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 33*(1), 75-99. 10.1007/s10212-017-0339-8
- Rotsaert, T., Panadero, E., Schellens, T., & Raes, A. (2017). "Now you know what you're doing right and wrong!" Peer feedback quality in synchronous peer assessment in secondary education. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 32*(1), 101-117. 10.1007/s10212-017-0329-9
- Salma, U. (2015). Problems and practical needs of writing skill in EFL context: An analysis of Iranian students of Aligarh Muslim University. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 20*(11), 74-76. 10.9790/0837-201137476
- Schuldt, L. C. (2019). Feedback in action: Examining teachers' oral feedback to elementary writers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 83*, 64-76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.03.020>
- Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). The impact of teacher corrective feedback on EFL student writers' grammatical improvement. *English Language Teaching, 10*(10), 43-49. 10.5539/elt.v10n10p43
- Silalahi, M., Rafli, Z., & Rasyid, Y. (2018). The analysis of errors in translation of scientific text from English to Indonesian Language. *Journal of Education, Teaching and Learning, 3*(1), 23-27. file:///C:/Users/Acer/Downloads/article_209092%20(2).pdf

- Silver, R. & Lee, S. (2007) What does it take to make a change? Teacher feedback and student revisions. *ResearchGate*. 6, (1) 25-49.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255572055>
- Singh, A., & Maniam, M. (2020). A case study on the influence of first language syntax (l1) in writing English (l2) essays among form two secondary students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8, 2914-2920.10.13189/ujer.2020.080719
- Sukandi, S. S., & Rianita, D. (2018). Problems of Indonesian EFL students in writing thesis in the field of English education: *Proceedings of the 1st Bandung English Language Teaching International Conference*, 448–459.
<https://doi.org/10.5220/0008220004480459>
- Sukandi, S. S., & Syafar, D. N. (2018). EFL students' responses to learning basic reading and writing skills. *Studies in English Language and Education*. 5(1), 40–53.
<https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v5i1.8419>
- Terzioğlu, Y., & Bensen Bostanci, H. (2020). A comparative study of 10th grade Turkish Cypriot students' writing errors. *SAGE Open*, 10(1), 2158244020914541.
- Tian, L., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Learner engagement with automated feedback, peer feedback and teacher feedback in an online EFL writing context. *System*. 91, 102247.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102247>
- Toba, r., noor, w. N., & sanu, I. O. (2019). The current issues of Indonesian EFL students' writing skills: ability, problem, and reason in writing comparison and contrast essay. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1), 57–73. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506>
- Tsuroyya, C. (2020). Students' perception on peer correction in academic English writing: a case study in a higher education. *Research and Innovation in Language Learning*. 3(2), 85. <https://doi.org/10.36706/jele.v7i1.10674>
- Van der Kleij, F. M. (2020). Evaluation of the 'feedback engagement enhancement tool 'to examine and enhance students' engagement with feedback on their writing. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 66, 100907. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100907>

- Wihastyanang, W. D., Kusumaningrum, S. R. , Latief, M. A. & Cahyono, B. Y. (2020). Impacts of providing online teacher and peer feedback on students' writing performance. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*. 21 (2), 178-189. 10.17718/tojde.728157
- Yu, R. and Yang, L. (2021) ESL/EFL Learners' responses to teacher written feedback: reviewing a recent decade of empirical studies. *Front. Psychol.* (12), 735101. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.735101
- Yusuf, N. K., Md Yunus, M., & Embi, M. A. (2018). Workplace writing in I2 experiences among millennial workforce: learning to write in English. *3L The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*. 24(1), 145–161. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2401-11>
- Zhang, L. J., & Cheng, X. (2021). Examining the effects of comprehensive written corrective feedback on L2 EAP students' linguistic performance: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. 54, 101043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101043>

Appendix

Appendix A: Rubric

PARAMETERS	EXCELLENT (10 –7.6)	GOOD (7.5 - 5.1)	FAIR (5 – 2.6)	POOR (2.5 - 0)
SEMANTIC CRITERIA	<p>All words (more than 75%) were used correctly in the context of the paragraph. Uses grade appropriate language throughout.</p> <p>Each sentence supported the other and there were smooth transitions between thoughts.</p>	<p>Most of the words (75%) were used correctly in the context of the paragraph. Some use of grade appropriate language.</p> <p>All sentences were complete, but very few were underdeveloped.</p>	<p>Some words (50%) were used correctly in the context of the paragraph. Consistently uses language at a level one grade lower.</p> <p>There were several areas (50%) that were hard to understand.</p>	<p>A few words (less than 25%) were used correctly in the context of the paragraph. Consistently uses language at a level two grades lower.</p> <p>Sentences (more than 75%) are not complete, and they have no or little development.</p>
SYNTACTIC CRITERIA	<p>All words, phrases, and sentences were complete (more than 75%). There were no grammar errors in the sentences.</p> <p>All the sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement, depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)</p>	<p>Most of words, phrases, and sentences were complete (75%). There were a few grammar errors (less than 25%) in the sentences.</p> <p>Most of the sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)</p>	<p>Some of the words, phrases, and sentences were complete (50%). There were still several sentences (50%) that were underdeveloped.</p> <p>Some sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)</p>	<p>A few words, phrases, and sentences were complete (less than 25%). There were too many errors (more than 75%) in grammar, usage, or sentence structure, which made it hard to read.</p> <p>A few sentences follow an appropriate order respecting subject + verb + complement; depending on the type of construction. (Declarative, interrogative, imperative...)</p>
MORPHOLOGICAL CRITERIA	<p>Student correctly identified all the affixes that could be used with the root words.</p>	<p>Student correctly identified 7 out of 10 affixes that could be used with the root words.</p>	<p>Student correctly identified 5 out of 10 affixes that could be used with the root words.</p>	<p>Student correctly identified less than 5 out of 10 affixes that could be used with the root words.</p>

	The use of word borrowing is correct and word formation is accurate.	The use of word borrowing is partially correct and word formation is accurate.	The use of word borrowing is partially correct and word formation is inappropriate.	The use of word borrowing is not correct and word formation is inappropriate.
MECHANICS	Capitalization, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes are used appropriately. No errors were made in spelling and part of speech.	Capitalization, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes are used somewhat appropriately. Few errors were made in spelling.	Capitalization, paragraphing, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes were not used very appropriately. These errors make it more difficult to understand the message or meaning of the writing. Frequent errors made in spelling.	Capitalization, paragraphing, and punctuation, including commas and apostrophes were not used appropriately (or were not found in writing). These errors make it hard to understand the meaning/message of the writing due to these errors. Numerous errors made in spelling.

Appendix B: peer's feedback checklist

Criteria	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
The feedback provided by peers is useful and clear.					
The feedback provided by peers is closely related to the teacher's model.					
Feedback delivered by peers considers the criteria in the checklist.					
Feedback provided by peers follows different strategies such as the use of marginal notes, colors, codes, among others.					
The feedback provided by peers allows students to know their strengths and weaknesses.					
Peer feedback focuses on all the semantic errors in the task.					
Peer feedback focuses on all the syntactic errors in the task.					
Peer feedback focuses on all the morphological errors in the task.					
Further aspects apart from the semantic, syntactic, and morphological criteria were considered and corrected.					
Peer feedback delivered reflects high responsibility and commitment.					

Appendix C: students' survey

N°	Questions	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
1	I consider it is important to receive peer feedback in written assignments			
2	I consider it is important to receive teacher's feedback in written assignments.			
3	The feedback delivered by my peer helps me to improve my writing skills.			
4	The feedback delivered by my teacher helps me to improve my writing skills.			
5	My peer provides me with feedback through comments, questions or additional information.			
6	The teacher provides feedback through comments, questions or additional information.			
7	The feedback delivered by my classmate is clear and easy to understand.			
8	The feedback delivered by the teacher is clear and easy to understand.			
9	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my peer.			
10	I feel comfortable to receive feedback from my teacher.			
11	The feedback provided by my classmate has helped me to improve in...			
	Grammar use(Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization and Punctuation)			
	Word formation (Spelling)			
	Vocabulary misuse			
12	The feedback provided by the teacher has helped me to improve in.....			
	Grammar use(Verb agreement, sentence construction, Capitalization and Punctuation)			
	Word formation (Spelling)			
	Vocabulary misuse			